Promoting bilingual children's active participation in joint book reading

A case-study of two Russian-Norwegian preschoolers

Nataliya Honcharova

Master Thesis
Department of Education
Faculty of Educational Sciences

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

June 2015

TITLE: Promoting bilingual children's active participation in joint book reading: *A case study of two Russian-Norwegian preschoolers*

AUTHOR: Nataliya Honcharova

EXAM: Master in Pedagogy

Program: General
(In Norwegian: Allmenn studieretning)

SEMESTER: Spring 2015

KEYWORDS: joint book reading activity, language development and literacy acquisition, bilingualism

Promoting bilingual children's active participation in joint book reading: *A case study of two Russian-Norwegian preschoolers*

Abstract

This case study looks at how parents and preschool teachers engage two Russian-Norwegian preschool children in active participation in conversations during joint book reading and how bilingual children participate in these conversations in two different settings; home versus preschool, while using two different languages. The aim of the study is to develop knowledge about how adults can promote bilingual children's active verbal participation during joint book reading activities and how adults can utilize activities, such as joint book reading, to assist bilingual children in acquiring vocabulary, grammar and early literacy skills. I based my research on audio-recordings that are part of the study "Teaching for text comprehension: Supporting young second-language learners' text comprehension in urban multiethnic preschools in Norway". My study is built on a socio-cultural perspective that assumes that children's learning requires a social setting, which is dependent on adult assistance and cannot be considered separately from cooperation and interaction with others.

Consisting of in-depth analysis of 36 adult-child interaction episodes from home and preschool settings, my finding concludes that children's responses are consistent with adult's invitation to talk: strategies that place low cognitive demand on the child result in children's low cognitive demand answers, respectively high cognitive demand strategies are met to with high cognitive demand answers in the most cases. The findings show that low cognitive demand strategies prevail among adults as an invitation to children to talk. This study suggests the use of strategies that place a high cognitive demand on the child during reading activities as such strategies elevate a child's thinking, giving children an opportunity to exercise thinking skills and use more complex language. The findings show that both Russian-speaking parents use strategies that are successful in terms of engaging their children in conversations during joint book reading as both target children are active participants in conversations in home settings using the Russian language. The findings from preschool classrooms suggest that one of the target children needs more facilitation from the teacher in order to become an active participant in joint book reading events conducted in preschool. This study's findings suggest that the use of such strategies including asking children questions that connect the plot of the story to children's life, as well as asking children to narrate directly, seem to be two successful strategies that engage every child in conversations about the book in the preschool settings. This study's findings also document adults' persistence in their attempts to involve target children in the conversation by changing up

their strategies when children seem disengaged. There are also observations of a few instances of code-switching in the child's talk, suggesting that both target children seem to make use of their bilingual resources in the context of joint book reading. The study concludes that book reading activities provide great learning opportunities for bilingual preschool children in terms of vocabulary and literacy acquisition, also in terms of learning grammar and grammar improvement.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I will thank my supervisor, Svitlana Kucherenko, for her valuable guidance and help during the process of writing this thesis. I am sincerely grateful for your helpful suggestions, comments on my ideas and quick feedbacks on my work. I really appreciated your guidance during the year spent writing this thesis!

I would also like to thank Veslemøy Rydland for giving me the opportunity to work as a part of the project "Teaching for text comprehension: Supporting young second-language learners' text comprehension in urban multiethnic preschools in Norway". It was educational and interesting to be the part of the research group. Besides being educational, it was so engaging to work with children and children's language. I am very grateful that I had opportunity to borrow the data from the project. I will also thank those two families that I based my research on for participating.

With this thesis I am finishing my study at University of Oslo. I would like to thank the Faculty of Educational Sciences for the chance to study here. After graduating from university in Ukraine 8 years ago, it was very big transition for me, to be a student again, in new country, with a new language and new approach to teaching. I have met many incredibly nice people during two years of studying at Helga Engs. Thank you to my fellow students for guidance and a nice time when we studied together. I would also extend thanks to all my teachers, lectors, professors, and educators at this faculty. I gained precious knowledge that I am sure will help me in my future carrier. I am also thankful for the faculty advisors, who helped me with some administrative issues.

Finally, I thank my family for their support and patience during the process of my studying and thesis writing.

Nataliya Honcharova

Oslo, June 2015

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

This study looks at how parents and preschool teachers engage two Russian-Norwegian preschoolers to participate in joint book reading activities and at how these two bilingual preschoolers participate in book reading conducted in their two languages in two different settings. *Joint book reading* is operationally defined in this study as an activity where a parent or a teacher reads books to young children. In addition to reading the book, it includes the adult engaging the children in dialogue about the pictures/illustrations in the book before, during, and/or after the actual story reading (Sarano & Spodek, 2010).

Both children in my study speak Russian as their first language and they use this language in conversations with their family members. Norwegian is their second language, used as a primary language in preschool and with Norwegian friends. Both languages are used actively in children's everyday lives.

1.1 Purpose and significance of the study

The aim of the study is to develop knowledge about how adults can promote bilingual child's active verbal participation during joint book reading activity and how adults can utilize activities, such as joint book reading, to assist bilingual children in developing vocabulary, grammar and early literacy skills. I chose to study adult-child joint book reading activities, because this seems to provide a meaningful context for early language and literacy development (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Bus, 2003; Bingham, 2007). Adult-child joint book reading is reported to be an easy and natural way for children to acquire language (Neuman, 1996). As preschool children are unfamiliar with the stories in the books, they need adults' help to fill in the gap between the children's own worlds and what is presented in the book (Bus, 2003). That why children benefit from joint book reading may strongly depend on how adults conduct this activity and support children during this activity (Bus, 2003). Bus' (2003) study suggests that the way adults conduct the reading sessions affects how immersed a child is in books. According to Wells (1981) it is also important that the child contributes to interaction because children will benefit most from those conversations where both parties contribute to constructing and negotiating the meaning through talk. Studies from Dickinson & Tabors, 1991; Sénéchal, 1997; Morrow & Brittain, 2003; McKeown & Beck, 2003 show that children's verbal participation during joint book reading, plays an important role for

children's language and literacy development, development of comprehension, and gives them the possibility of mastering language that is of essential importance for the child's future school achievement.

My study uses a case study approach to look at strategies that Russian-speaking parents and Norwegian-speaking preschool teachers use to engage bilingual children in active verbal participation during joint book reading activities. I wanted to know how bilingual children participate usually during joint book reading activities at home as compared to in the preschool settings where different language is spoken. I think that it may be a good contribution to the existing literature to get more insight about how bilingual children respond to text that is read to and with them and what bilinguals can gain from joint book reading interactions. I was interested to know how bilingual children participate or respond to reading activity when not only parents, but also teachers with different language backgrounds conduct joint book reading (Barrera & Bauer, 2003). So this study focuses on adults' strategies that can lead to bilingual children's verbal participation during joint book reading and children's responses initiated by the adult's strategies.

Joint book reading activity is a daily activity commonly practiced in Russian-speaking families. With this work, I will show how Russian-speaking parents practice this activity in the home context with their bilingual children. I hope that this study will contribute to general knowledge of how Russian-speaking parents perform joint book reading activities and how such activities can be considered as a potential language learning and language development context. This study intends to shed light on the kind of strategies employed by the two Russian-speaking parents to support their children's active participation and promote the children's active language use during book reading activities.

This study also intends to show how two target children, Alexander and David, are being involved in joint book reading activities conducted by preschool teachers with a different native language. This situation is quite common for many preschool teachers in Norway especially in the big cities where the immigrant population is quite high. Many preschool teachers in Norway deal with children with immigrant background for whom Norwegian is their second or third language.

1.2 Background for choosing the topic

Children whose parents have immigrant background often grow up hearing two or more languages from early childhood. According to Simpson & Wigglesworth (2008) children's early language development is largely influenced by what they hear around them and they learn the language of the community they grow up in. Children almost always end up speaking the language which is accurate, fluent and complex and which reflects language or languages they hear around them, states Simpson & Wigglesworth (2008). Halliday (1978) implies that language plays an important role in the development of a child as a social being. With the help of language "a way of life" is transferred to the child; language is the means with the help of which a child learns to act as a member of society in different social groups and settings (Halliday, 1978). Learning one or more languages is crucial to child's ability to successfully function in society, underline Simpson & Wigglesworth (2008). Language is used for social relations, work, and education; language is the means though which children learn to make sense of their world, it plays a vital role while they learn how to think, and how to behave appropriately towards other people (Simpson & Wigglesworth, 2008). According to McKenna, Walpole & Conradi K. (2010) language is the means by which children can represent and interpret the world and has a foundational role in children's social, behavioral and academic development.

Language learning requires not only hearing the language, but also being able to actively use it. Adult-child joint book reading provides a natural context in which preschoolers are motivated to communicate with his/her adult partner and actively use language (Baracelli & Lavelli, 2010). A social-constructionist nature of joint book reading assumes that during joint book reading children and adults will jointly construct meaning from pictures or text in the book (Baracelli & Lavelli, 2010). Adult-child joint book reading is one of the beneficial activities that support children's early language and cognitive development (Ping, 2014). Joint book reading is an intensely social activity that provides an interactive context for children to acquire and practice developing verbal and conceptual skills (Neuman, 1996).

Starting spring 2014, I worked as research assistant at the project "Teaching for text comprehension: Supporting young second-language learners' text comprehension in urban multiethnic preschools in Norway" conducted by the Institute of Educational Sciences at the University of Oslo. Around 480 bilingual children aged 3 to 5 years and their parents and preschool teachers took part in the project. Participation in the PreComp project involved reading a variety of books with bilingual preschoolers who spoke 11 different mother tongues.

Among the bilingual participants of the project there was a group of children whose mother tongue was Russian. As Russian is one of my mother tongues too, I decided that it could be very interesting to see how adults assist Russian-Norwegian bilingual preschoolers to use and develop their language with the help of joint book reading activities. It also seemed important to me to look into joint book reading sessions conducted by preschool teachers in Norwegian in order to see how teachers supported children's participation in the preschool context. I wanted to use the opportunity to shed light on the book reading activity with the same children conducted in two different languages and two different settings. I wanted to give insight into the situation, which is common for many bilingual preschoolers in urban multiethnic cities. I was interested to know how adults contribute to bilingual child's language use and language development in the home and preschool settings with the help of joint book reading activity.

Both target children in my study have one of the parents who belong to the Russian immigrant group in Norway, further information on this group will be presented in the next section.

1.3 Background information on the Russian immigrant group in Norway

According to SSB[1], in April 2014 there were people with backgrounds from 221 different countries living in Norway (SSB.) There are around 759, 000 people that have immigrant background in Norway, 126, 000 of them are Norwegian-born with parents that have immigrant backgrounds. In 2014, immigrant groups constituted of 14.9 % of the total population of Norway. The Russian immigrant group is twelfth largest immigrant group with the population per January 2014 with around 16, 500 people that constitute 3 % of the whole immigrant population in Norway (SSB, January 22, 2015).

Immigrant populations from Russia have largely come to Norway after the Soviet Union dissolved in 1991. Russians are among those who have shortest duration of residence in Norway, 2 out of 3 have been in Norway less than 5 years according to 2006 statistics (SSB, 2007).

---

[1] SSB (In Norwegian - Statistisk sentralbyrå) is the statistical agency that has the primary responsibility for statistics about the Norwegian society http://www.ssb.no/

The majority of Russians came to Norway to obtain higher education. It is very usual to participate in higher education among people between the ages of 19 and 24 years in Russia. At this age, 31 % of first generation immigrants from Russia took higher education in 2005. There was significantly greater proportion of women (36%) who took higher education than men (24%). In terms of education degrees, 47% of the Russian immigrants, that SSB have information on, have obtained higher education. Russians have highest level of education of all immigrant groups that live in Norway currently (SSB, 2007).

Employment rates for Russian immigrants in Norway are low which is consistent with other groups with short residence stay. For those Russian immigrants that have been living in Norway more than six years, the employment rate is on the same level as for the majority population. Unlike the rest of the immigrant populations in Norway, women in this group have a higher level of employment than men. This is partly because many male immigrants are refugees from Chechnya and employment levels among refugee groups are generally low. According to this report, people belonging to the Russian immigrant minority group in Norway often work in hotels and the restaurant industry as compared with rest of the population. They are also represented, but to a lesser extent, in business, health, social and educational sector. Russians immigrants are overrepresented in the education sector as compared to non-Western immigrants that are underrepresented in this sector (SSB, 2007).

The Russian immigrant population has a relatively dispersed settlement pattern in Norway. Russian have settled in many counties, but most of them live in Oslo, followed by Rogaland, Akershus and the three most northern counties (SSB, 2007).

In the year 2007, there were twice as many women as men in the Russian immigration group in Norway. According to SSB, it is quite common for people with the Russian immigrant background to marry persons without an immigrant background. Therefore, there are relatively many children who have one Russian and one Norwegian born parent, three times as many as there are children with both parents with Russian background. Most of the children have a Russian-speaking mother. Women from Russia tend to have just one or two children, statistically speaking (SSB, 2007).

Family background of the children in my study

Given the information presented above, families of the two target children of this study seem to be typical representatives of the Russian immigrant group in Norway. Both parents from both families have immigrant backgrounds, they all came to Norway in their 20s and are in their mid 30s now. Both families live in a big multicultural city in Norway where children attend preschool. In my first case, Alexander's parents are from Estonia and Russia. In my second case, David's parents are from Russia and Ukraine. Both parents in both cases are highly educated and have full-time jobs in Norway. The mother in one of the cases works in the educational sector. Both target children in this study, Alexander and David, are 4 years old bilingual children with fluency in 2-3 languages. Parents in both cases are bilingual and speak the minority language to their child at home, thus the children are learning Norwegian in preschool. The concept *bilingual* will be used throughout this thesis and will be discussed in the theory chapter as both children and parents that I have my data on are bilinguals who have acquired two or more languages and use several languages in their everyday lives.

1.4 Presentation of research questions

My study is designed to gain insight into how adults engage bilingual Russian-Norwegian preschoolers to actively participate in conversations during joint book reading activities and to contribute understanding about how bilingual children participate in conversations at home and in preschool during book reading conducted in two different languages.

I formulated my research questions as follows:

➢ *How do parents and preschool teachers engage two Russian-Norwegian preschoolers to actively participate in conversations during a joint book reading activity?*

➢ *How do the two bilingual children participate in these conversations in two different settings, at home and in preschool, using two different languages?*

To answer these questions the audio-recordings of adult-child book reading interactions were used as a main data source for analysis, and structured interviews with parents as supplementary data-material. I will base my study on the theoretical assumption that child's learning requires a social setting, and is dependent on adult's assistance and cannot be considered separately from cooperation and interaction with others (Vygotsky, 1978; Bruner, 1983; Halliday, 1989; Rogoff, 1990; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Thus, this study is based on

socio-cultural perspective of language and literacy development where book reading activities are considered to be the potential arena for language and literacy development and provides an interactive context for children to acquire and practice developing verbal and conceptual skills (Neuman, 1996).

1.5 Thesis structure

This thesis is divided into 6 chapters. In *Chapter 1,* introduction, I present the purpose and significance of my study. Here I discuss the background for selecting this topic and conducting this particular study. The background information on the Russian immigrant group in Norway in general and on the two cases of the study is provided in this section. Research questions are also presented in this chapter.

In *Chapter 2,* I present a theoretical framework for my study. In this chapter, I discuss the theories that are relevant for my research interest. I employ socio-cultural perspective on language development and literacy acquisition. I will discuss the notion of bilingualism, theory of second language acquisition, discuss positive and negative interaction between languages and present similarities and differences between monolingual and bilingual children.

Chapter 3 outlines the literature review, existing research that has been done in the past. I will discuss studies that were conducted in Scandinavia, the USA and Europe regarding ways adults read to children and the impact of adult-child joint book reading on child's language development and learning outcomes as well as the role children's participation plays in language and literacy development. Finally, I will outline the contribution of my study to this field of interest.

In *Chapter 4,* I discuss the characteristics of the qualitative study as well as methodological choices I made while conducting this study. Methods of data collection and the sample selection for the study are described in this chapter. The case study methodology is presented in this chapter. My methods of data analysis will be outlined in this section also. Finally, the issues of trustworthiness, ethical considerations and limitations of this study are presented.

In *Chapter 5,* I will present my analysis. This chapter consists of 2 parts that correspond with the number of my research questions. In the first part the strategies used by adults to engage

target children in conversation about the book will be presented. In the second part I will discuss participation of target children in joint book reading at home and in preschool with two different languages.

In *Chapter 6,* the findings of the study are discussed. Here, the concluding remarks for the whole study as well as limitations and possibilities for further research are also presented. Literature list and 2 attachments (Attachment 1: Aspects of transcription; Attachment 2: Coding categories and definitions for child's and adult's behavior during joint book reading) will be found in the end of the thesis.

2 Theoretical framework

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the central theories of language and literacy development from the socio-cultural perspective. I will speak about the notion of bilingualism and the process of second language acquisition of minority children, the theory of second language development and discuss the peculiarities of growing up with two or more languages. My study is based on the theoretical assumption that children's learning requires a social setting, is dependent on adult's assistance and cooperation in addition to interaction with others (Vygotsky, 1978; Bruner, 1983; Halliday, 1989; Rogoff, 1990; Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Children in preschool year were chosen for this study because that age is considered to be a critical time for developing skills that are needed to succeed in school (Wasik, Bond, & Hindman, 2006). Additionally, these years are critical for developing the oral language of the child that is proven to be of vital importance in later literacy learning (Winch, Johnston, Hollida, Ljungdahl & March, 2001). Language is the means by which children can represent and interpret the world and has a foundational role in children's social, behavioral and academic development (McKenna, Walpole & Conradi K, 2010). The period from birth to five years is the fastest language-learning time in child's life (Winch et al, 2001). Vocabulary growth illustrates that a two-years-old manages to learn about 200 words, a three-years-old, about 1000 words, and a five-years-old, about 2000 words. An average adult's vocabulary, in comparison, is between 4000 and 5000 words (Winch et al, 2001).

2.1 Theories of literacy and language development

2.1.1 Socio-cultural theory

Socio-cultural theory of language and learning development is considered relevant for this study because of its focus on social interaction that is believed to be crucial for children's language and literacy development (Vygotsky, 1978; Wells, 1981; Bruner, 1983; Rogoff, 1990; Halliday, 2003). One of the most famous social constructivists is Lev Vygotsky, who states that human learning requires a social setting and is a process through which *"children grow into the intellectual life of those around them"* (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 88). He stresses that children's learning begins long before children attend school. Usually it is parents who are

first guiders and the role of guidance plays a significant role in the child's first years of life (Vygotsky, 1978). Those things that a child does with assistance one day, can be done by child without assistance next day, believed Vygotsky. This Vygotsky's statement corresponds with Wood's et al. (1976) concept of *scaffolding* which they refer to as a process that enables children to achieve goal, solve the problems or tasks with the help of an adult who controls parts of the task that are initially beyond the capacity of the child. In such a way, the adult is helping the child to complete those parts of the task that are within child's range of competence (Wood et al., 1976). Socio-cultural theory also stresses the role of imitation in the early years, stating that when children use imitation, they are capable of doing much more together with others or with the help of adult that guides them (Vygotsky, 1978).

As Vygotsky (1978) points out, each function in the child's cultural development emerges two times. The first time, on the social level that is between people, and afterwards, on the individual level that is inside the child. It is equally related to voluntary attention, logical memory, and to the formation of concepts. All the higher functions, according to Vygotsky (1978) arise as a consequence of relations between individuals. Panofsky (1994) states that it is important to see the development of cognitive processes as social in origin rather than individual. Cognitive processes, such as those reflected in the language of the preschool children, develop in social interactions like those which occur during joint book reading (Panofsky, 1994).

According to Vygotsky (1978), language arises as a means of communication between a child and an adult in his/her environment. One of the central concepts in socio-cultural theory is the concept of the zone of proximal development (ZPD): "*an essential feature of learning is that it creates the zone of proximal development; that is learning awakes a variety of developmental processes that are able to operate only when a child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his peers*" (Vygotsky, 1978, p.90). I think that this concept is important to my study because when a child is in ZPD mastering some task, providing assistance to the child will give him/her opportunity to solve this particular task. This means that a child who is less competent develops his/her skills with the help of more competent helpers within child's own ZPD. Wells (1999), who is influenced by Vygotsky's theory, mentions that the following conditions must be available for this development to take place: first, there should be a form of assistance that helps the child to achieve something that

child cannot achieve on its own. The other condition is that the assistance should be relevant to the child's own purposes (Wells, 1999).

Rogoff (1990) expands on the notion of zone of proximal development and stresses that children's and adult's roles are interconnected during the interaction. Rogoff (1990) proposes the concept of *guided participation*, by which she assumes that both guidance and participation are crucial for child's cognitive development. Her statement is in line with Wells (1981) statement who also believes that child will benefit in terms of learning outcomes best when he/she contributes to the interaction by participating. She believes that children become *skilled participants* through participation in routine, culturally organized activities with others, and sometimes by observing or being involved in instructional interactions, but always in social settings. According to Rogoff (1990) guided participation involves adult's arrangement of children's activities and responsibilities, where adults support children in the process of *problem solving*. By problem solving, Rogoff (1990) refers to cognition and thinking. In the process of communication and shared participation children have the possibility of obtaining skills that they would be able to apply in other settings and problem solving activities (Rogoff, 1990). During organized activities, children can solve manageable, but challenging tasks at comfortable for him/her level. These challenging tasks have to increase in the complexity along with the child's developing understanding and age (Rogoff, 1990). Here Rogoff (1990) mentions structured participation. Rogoff (2003) refers to the process when adults and children jointly structure the situation they are involved in. Adults, community practices and the child's own choice mutually decide the situation where the child has the opportunity to learn. The concept of guided participation is dominant in Rogoff's (1990) work. Guided participation is a process which builds bridges between what is known and what remains to be learnt by child, structuring and supporting children's endeavors by adults, providing direction and organization of activities that lead to a child's cognitive development and transfer to the child the obligation of managing their own problem solving. The roles of individuals and the socio-cultural context are central to this concept (Rogoff, 1990). I include Rogoff's (1990) theory in my study because it seems like the child's learning outcomes from joint book reading activity are dependent on how adult guides the participation of the child during this activity, how adult organizes this activity, and involves the child while supporting his/her activities (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Bus, 2003).

John-Steiner, Panofsky & Smith (1994) are also influenced by Vygotsky's work, and also consider the development of language and acquisition of literacy from the social and functional perspective. According to John-Steiner, Panofsky & Smith (1994), one acquires language and literacy during the process of development and this development emerges from the active interaction of social and individual factors. Employing the socio-cultural perspective on language and literacy development, John-Steiner, Panofsky & Smith (1994) argue that the analysis should be the process, not the product of language and literacy development. They argued that language and literacy acquisition cannot be separated from social contexts, roles and institutions.

Theorists (Halliday, 1978; Panofsky, 1994) speak about the importance of *context* in the process of human action and activities. Panofsky (1994) states that for understanding human action and development it is important to consider the context in which action and development takes place. Halliday (1978) also stresses the significance of the context of situation, which can play a crucial role in the child's transition into adult language.

During parent-child mutual activities, the child usually gains instructions that are related to his/her action (Halliday, 1978). One explanation or guidance is not going to make much difference for a child's development, but an accumulation of experiences of this kind may be highly significant for a child's learning outcomes (Halliday, 1978). However, according to Wells (1981), it is also important that the child contributes to the interaction. The child will benefit from those conversations where both parties contribute to constructing and negotiating meaning through talk (Wells, 1981). Wells (1981) focuses on interactions between adults and children at home and school settings and concludes that there is much continuity between the interactions at home and school settings. Yet, the participant groups, purpose and situations are different. I will mention the three main differences that Wells (1981) points out between participations at home and at school. Firstly, children are already acquainted with those demands that they meet at school from the home settings. The other difference lies in the asymmetry of contributions (Wells, 1981) to the interactions at home versus preschool, and third is interactional significance in the school contrary to the home. Wells (1981) stresses that the aforementioned differences can be based on the motivation that underlines the talk. At school, one can trace the pedagogical motivation behind the talk, while at home, the talk has much wider and scattered purposes. Secondly, the differences can be linked to special

demands revolving around maintaining the order in conversations that involve large numbers of participants (Wells, 1981).

2.1.2 Theory of situated learning

This theory if compared with above mentioned theories also stresses the importance of social setting for learning and makes it relevant to my study. Lave & Wenger (1991) in line with Vygotsky (1978), Rogoff (1990) also emphasize the importance of shifting focus from the individual as learner to learning as participation in the social world. Lave & Wenger (1991) developed theory of *situated learning* that focused on the relationship between learning and the social situations in which it occurs. Lave & Wenger (1991) view learning as situated activity that has a process that they call *legitimate peripheral participation*. Like Rogoff (1990), Lave & Wenger (1991) also stress that in order to develop or master knowledge or skills it is very important to participate in the socio-cultural practices of a community. Lave & Wenger (1991) believe that learning takes place while participating, it is not one-person act and it requires social interaction and collaboration. Lave & Wenger (1991, p. 34) define learning as "*an integral part of generative social practice in the lived-in world*". Theory stresses that learning is unintentional and takes place in activity. To my mind, learning during adult-child book reading activity can be considered as unintentional where the participation lying at the core as in Lave & Wenger's (1991) theory of learning.

2.1.3 Theories of language

As my study is about language use and language development among children, Halliday's (1978, 2003), Wells' (1981) and Bruner's (1983) theories of language are relevant for my study because they stress that learning a language is a constructive process that happens only while interacting with others, like during joint book reading activity when adults and preschool children construct and verbalize meanings together from the picture books. Halliday (1978), a famous British-Australian linguist and social constructivist is concerned about language in its social use. Language is the means, with the help of which the people interacting and we cannot look at language apart from the social context, states Halliday (1978). According to Halliday (1978) the child learns the norms of the culture through language, at the same time as he/she learns the language itself. Halliday (1978) stresses that for language to function, it needs an environment and it is not possible to experience language

in isolation. It is always experienced in relation to some people, action and events. Halliday (2003) believes that children construct reality with the help of language and language is a part of their reality. According to Halliday (2003) language is a part of the social system and it is not possible to learn anything without the latter. When a child talks, he/she constructs a system of meanings, in such a way the child builds his/her own model of social reality. According to Halliday (2003) this process happens in child's head and it is a cognitive process. However, this process occurs during social interaction, and by no means can this process occur without the context of social interaction. Children begin to learn language right after being born by listening to the adult's speech (Halliday, 2003). Later he/she learns language in the interactive process and that process demands the exchange of meanings between the child and others. Learning a language is a constructive process; children construct language, but not alone, but with others who are also actively engaged in the same process (Halliday, 2003). It seems to me that during book reading activity a child has a perfect possibility to construct the language together with others who are also involved in this activity given that adult will support this activity. Halliday proposes a model in which language is a three-level construct, not two, like in the field of psychology and linguistics. Thus, according to Halliday (2003) there are three stages in the coding process: meaning has to be encoded to be communicated; meanings first coded in wording (grammar, vocabulary) and then these wordings recoded in expressions, which can be transmitted. The main task for the child in learning language is to construct such a three level system. The child does it in several stages, but *always* in interaction with others (Halliday, 2003).

Learning is a social process and the environment in which learning takes place is that of a social origin (Halliday, 1989). Knowledge is transmitted in social contexts, through relationships, like those of parent and child, or teacher and pupil. They are defined in the value systems and ideology of the culture (Halliday, 1989). The words that are exchanged in these contexts get their meaning from activities in which they are embedded, which again, are social activities with social agencies and goals (Halliday, 1989). He characterizes the optimal learning environment as *"a milieu that is child-centered but in which the teacher functions as a guide, creating structure with the help of the students themselves"* (Halliday, 1978, p. 210).

Wells (1981) who studies children's language development argues also that learning happens through interaction. Wells (1981) considers talk as a form of social action. He believes that language is absolutely necessary for a child's development as it is the means for interacting

with others who are involved in a child's life. During child's early years, an adult is a more skilled participant who has the responsibility to help a child to develop his communicative skills at three different levels: preverbal, verbal and written language.

Alongside with Halliday (1978) and Wells (1981), Bruner (1983) also emphasizes the social and interactional nature of language development. Bruner (1983) accentuates that social interaction plays crucial role in child's cognitive development, especially in terms of language. He believed that for the child to be a native speaker, he/she must become proficient in language syntax, semantics and pragmatics, that are learnt interdependently to each other, and that are not separable in the process of language acquisition. According to Bruner (1983) a child begins to acquire language long before he/she begins to produce words. Language is first acquired in the process of mother-child interactions when they construct reality together. Similarly, the child cannot acquire language without a set of language learning capacities. For these capacities to function, the child needs adults to provide language acquisition support (Bruner, 1983). Therefore, for child to make it possible to enter the linguistic community and culture to which language gives access, interaction between language-learning capacities and adult who could support that language development is needed (Bruner, 1983).

Hasan (1989) also points out that learning to construct "texts" (Hasan refers "texts" to speech, speech acts) is a matter of social experience. People learn to speak the language by speaking the language and it does not automatically occur that learning a language comes with years (without social practice) or at a certain age. It does not matter if the child is two or five years old, children need social experiences in order to learn and develop their language (Hasan, 1989). According to Hasan (1989) one cannot separate the notion of text and the context in which this text is produced. Text functions in the context of situation and context of situation is constructed by the texts that are produced inside of community (Hasan, 1989).

2.1.4 Theory of dialogue

The theory of dialogue is also relevant for my study because as Tizard & Hughes (2002) argue, when a child is 3-4 years old, the dialogue is as important for a child as physical activity. The child explores as much through words as through physical activity. The theory of dialogue highlights that for interactive learning to take place, it is not enough with just one individual, there has to be at least two people to exchange utterances and to produce discourse (Linell, 1998). As the theory of dialogue deals with socially-constructed discourse, it makes it

relevant for my study. I think this theory is relevant because for interaction to take place during joint book reading activities the dialogue has to be at the core of this activity.

Linell (1998) believes that language can be conceptualized in two ways, as system/structure, or as discourse with practice and communication. Linell (1998) with his theory looks at language as discourse, stating that discourse is bound to specific situations like activities, places, persons and in situated discourse we deal with meanings made by people who communicate in real life. Linell (1998) mentions that discourse is deeply social and interactional in nature; it is *"socially constructed, sequentially organized and richly structured"* (p.xii). According to Linell (1998, p. 10) *"dialogue is interaction through symbolic means by mutually co-present individuals"*. Dialog's form and content is a product of social interaction, which can be seen as collaborative achievement where interlocutors complete each other's utterances and mutually influence each other (Linell, 1998). Dialogism looks primarily at dialogue itself, the meaningful discourse and interaction in its social as well as cultural contexts describing actors as participants in the various social activities (Linell, 1998). Dialogism considers the utterance as collaboratively generated and looks at communicative actions as contextualized, socially generated and culturally embedded (Linell, 1998). Dialogism stresses the contextual nature of interaction, and the relevant contexts are not only situational, but also socio-cultural and historically constituted (Linell, 1998).

According to Linell (1998), communication serves to develop shared and mutual understandings. Mechanism for exposing one's own and testing other's understandings is inherent in dialogue itself, in the steps of sequences of utterances (Linell, 1998). According to Linell (1998) utterances can be used to get the answer from interlocutor, expose or test their understanding of various topics, while interlocutors use their utterances to demonstrate to each other how they interpret what is going on. Linell (1998) states that understandings are inferred from utterances-in-contexts rather than expressed in utterances. Utterances are situated and context-bound. Linell (1998) underlines that no utterance should be analyzed in isolation from the context and sequence in which it is positioned. Considering Linell's (1998) statement I will make sure that all utterances during joint book reading recordings are analyzed and considered in relation to previous utterances and their sequence in the context.

2.2 Bilingualism

I will analyze the interactions of bilingual children during joint book reading in my study. I will also elaborate on the concept of bilingualism in this section. It seems like there are many definitions of concept bilingualism. Each researcher uses a definition that corresponds best with his/her field of study (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981). I chose the definition of a bilingual person that Skutnabb-Kangas (1981) provides, as I think it is more suitable for my research focus. According to Skutnabb-Kangas (1981) a bilingual speaker is someone who is able to function in two or more languages within a monolingual or bilingual community accordingly to socio-cultural demands made by the speaker or by the communities on individual's communicative and cognitive competence. Butler (2013) stated that bilingualism is highly complex and multidimensional linguistic, psychological and social behavior that is context-dependent and non-static. Bilingualism arises as a result of contact, states Hoffmann (1991). Over half of the population of the world is bilingual (Hoffmann, 1991), in most parts of the world bilingualism is the common notion and is not an exception anymore (Harris & Nelson, 1992). According to Baker (2007) young children become bilingual and learn languages as naturally as they learn to jump, run or play. While trying to speak, children are not worried about mistakes, but they are interested in providing their message and receiving desired information (Baker, 2007). As Baker (2007) states the language among young bilingual children is caught rather than taught. He speaks of this process not as language learning, but language acquisition. When children are young they acquire language in the process of interacting with people. Regarding learning two or more languages at the same time, Baker (2007) implies that child will not become equally fluent in two languages, except in a few cases. Even if the child grows up in a one-parent-one-language household, it is rarely that a child will have equal proficiency in both languages (Baker, 2007). Many bilinguals are "stronger" in one language than in the other, according to Baker (2007). For bilingual child each language has different purposes and function so proficiency in languages may change as a child move from one settings to other, like inside and outside family and school, for example (Baker, 2007).

2.2.1 Second language learning

All children learn a first language (Tabors, 2008). According to Tabors (2008) the learning of language occurs in the context of social interaction within the child's family structure. The process of language acquisition begins with the production of sounds when the child is approximately one year old and continues throughout early childhood (Tabors, 2008). Basic

oral language skills are acquired by the time a child is about 5 years old (Tabors, 2008). Second language acquisition among young children, according to Tabors (2008), may be simultaneous and sequential. Simultaneous acquisition of two languages occurs when children are exposed to two languages from a very early age (Tabors, 2008). Sequential acquisition occurs when a child begins to learn a second language after the first language is partly acquired (Tabors, 2008). For second language learner, second language acquisition is not a process of discovering what language is, but discovering what *this* language is (Tabors, 2008). Tabors (2008) states that children follow a defined development pathway while acquiring second language. When children find themselves in a situation where other people speak different languages, the children have two options, either to speak the language they have already acquired or stop talking at all together (Tabors, 2008). The latter occur when children enter a nonverbal period (Tabors, 2008) that is a period when children do not talk at all. According to Tabors (2008), this period is a typical feature of many children who acquire second language. In this period, children communicate nonverbally to get attention, request something, protest or joke. During nonverbal period, children not only communicate nonverbally, but also collect information about new language that they hear around them (Tabors, 2008). According to Tabors (2008) data gathering consists of two strategies: *spectating* (active observations and focusing on the language that is being used while in the nearness to native speakers) and *rehearsing* (rehearsing sounds, working on producing language while in close proximity to native speakers) (Tabors, 2008). Once children are comfortable and competent in a new setting, they begin to use what they have learnt. When children who learn a second language begin to use the new language, they use *telegraphic* (use of some words that are taken out from content and use it as an entire utterance) and *formulaic* speech (use of chunks or formulaic phrases in situations in which children observed others use these phrases) (Tabors, 2008). The second language learners begin the process of productive language usage when they have acquired new words and phrases, thus begin to build their own sentences (Tabors, 2008). Tabors (2008) mentions that there are four factors that influence the second-language acquisition process: motivation, exposure, age, and personality.

According to Fillmore (1991) who presented the model of second language learning in the social context, the following components should be present in the model of second language learning; that are *learners* who learn the target language and are motivated to do it, *speakers* of the target language, who can provide the learners with access to the language and help with

learning it, and *a social setting* with the help of which learners and speakers are in contact with each other to make learning language possible. Fillmore (1991) states that all three components; learners, speakers and a social setting are necessary for second language learning to occur. If one of these aspects does not function, language learning can be difficult or even impossible. Social, linguistic and cognitive processes come into play in second language learning and they are connected with each other, according to Fillmore (1991).

Cummins (1984), who developed the common underlying proficiency theory that deals with learning two languages at the same time, states that there is an underlying cognitive/academic proficiency which is common across languages. This "common underlying proficiency" makes it possible to transfer cognitive/academic or literacy-related skills across languages. Cummins (1984) points out that this transfer is much more likely to occur from minority to majority language because of the greater exposure to literacy in the majority language and the strong social pressure to learn it. Cummins (1984) introduced the "iceberg" metaphor, where bilingual proficiency is represented as "dual–iceberg" in which common cross-lingual proficiencies underlie in each language. According to Cummins (1984), this interdependence or common underlying proficiency principle implies that experience with one language can promote development of the proficiency in other languages, if there is motivation and exposure to both, either in school, or in the wider environment. If an immigrant child comes to a new country and knows some words in his/her first language, he/she just needs to acquire a new label in the second language for an already existing concept. If the child does not understand the meaning of the terms in his/her first language, he/she has difficulties acquiring the concept in the second language (Cummins, 1984). Baker (2007) supports the same idea, that bilinguals are not two monolinguals inside one person. He believes that bilinguals own a unique combination of two languages that are both separate but integrated within the thinking system. Baker (2007) states that one language helps the other to develop. Concepts and ideas from one language can easily be transferred into the other language (Baker, 2007).

2.2.2 Positive and negative interaction between languages

Oller & Jarmulowicz (2007) supports the view that the level of performance for bilingual children depends on the extent to which the two languages that the child is acquiring share structures, like phonological elements, letters of alphabet, words. If two languages share commonalities, bilingual children have good performing results when compared to

monolingual children, due to the transfer across languages. If the two languages share little or no structural elements, bilingual children may lag behind monolinguals in both languages (Oller & Jarmulowicz, 2007). This point of view contrasts with two other well known views that 1) bilingual children lag behind monolingual in academic tasks; 2) bilingual children outperform monolingual in many linguistic and cognitive tasks. Oller & Jarmulowicz (2007) speaks about negative and positive interactions between the first language (L1) and the second language (L2). Positive interaction arises when bilingual children use similar elements from L1 in L2. If L1 has, for example [s], bilingual children do not need to acquire [s] in their L2. If elements that exist in L2 do not exist in L1, the interaction creates negative results, like the English [r], for example, speakers of Arabic and Spanish, adopt it to L1 by producing taps, speakers of Italian, by producing trills, speakers of Hebrew by labial glides. Oller & Jarmulowicz (2007) conclude that transfer of elements from L1 to L2 occurs effectively when there are concrete similarities between two languages.

While speaking about interaction between L1 and L2, there are number of factors that may promote or hinder the transfer from one language to the other. Butler (2013) supports Oller & Jarmulowicz (2007) by saying that one of the major factors is language distance, that is, the degree of linguistic differences or similarities between L1 and L2. It is assumed that smaller linguistic differences lead to easier acquisition and processing of L2. Besides language distance, such factors as developmental stage, age, sociolinguistic factors and prototypicality (the degree to which a form or meaning is perceived as "prototypical") are other factors that can promote or hinder transfer from one language to another (Butler, 2013).

2.2.3 Similarities and differences between monolingual and bilingual children

As I analyze the recordings with participation of bilingual, not monolingual children during book reading activity, I got to thinking that it is relevant to mention how different or similar bilingual children are in comparison to monolinguals in terms of their development pathway, language constructing, level of performance. According to Malakoff & Hakuta (1991) the major difference between bilingual and monolingual children is that bilingual children experience what happens around them with the help of two languages and language experiences for bilingual children are extended over two languages. Things that children experience can be expressed in one language, in both, or can be switched between languages.

Malakoff & Hakuta (1991) speak about translation and code-switching that is considered to be a skill unique to bilingual children. They refer to translation as all models of reformulating message from source to target language. While translating, the child replaces an utterance in one language with the equivalent in the other language, simultaneously trying to generate the meaning that is as close as possible to that in the source language (Malakoff & Hakuta, 1991). In code-switching, the aims and requirements are different from those of translation. According to Malakoff & Hakuta (1991) one of the functions of code-switching is to enhance and supplement the speech of bilinguals with the aim not to reproduce what was said, but to enhance what was said.

Paradis (2007) says that children's language acquisition patterns for L1 and L2 are significantly similar, for example, in morphosyntax, vocabulary accumulation in L1 and L2 is the same among monolingual and bilingual children. How quickly bilingual child learns the target language is not confirmed, but the belief is that bilingual child learns L2 on the same level as monolingual child. The differences in performance between monolingual and bilingual children may be due bilingual nature of language competence of the latter, and not inferiority when compared to monolinguals (Paradis, 2007).

Learning two languages in childhood has both similarities and differences to growing up with only one language, underlines Serratrice (2013). According to Serratrice (2013), there is a strong relationship between development of lexical (vocabulary) and morpho-syntactic skills (morphological skills-structuring and forming of words in language, like inflection, derivation; syntactic skills-combining words and elements of the words to form grammatical sentence) among bilingual children. Among monolingual children this relation between lexical and morpho-syntactic development of skills is also strong. However, this relationship does not exist across languages, like lexical skills in one language cannot predict strong morphological skills in another language (Serratrice, 2013). Thus, bilingual children have the same developmental pathway as monolingual children regarding morpho-syntactic development, according to Serratrice (2013). Yet, knowledge of two languages can lead to systematic, and sometimes limited cross linguistic influence especially at the cross point of syntax, pragmatics (language in situational context, knowledge and beliefs of the speaker) and/or semantics (meaning in language) (Serratrice, 2013). Regarding receptive skills, bilingual children construct parallel vocabularies with translation equivalents and are somehow prevailing over monolinguals perhaps because they have this ability(Serratrice,

2013). Bilingual children may lack in speed and accuracy of language usage in comparison to monolingual, since they need more time to process language and that in its turn effects speed and accuracy overall (Serratrice, 2013). Although, it is different for every individual, young bilinguals generally vary in their phonetic accuracy and speed of language production (Serratrice, 2013). Another important factor that differentiates bilingual from monolingual children is the constant switching, both in language comprehension and in language production between two languages. Bilingual children who regularly use two languages have to instantly restrain one language when using the other (Serratrice, 2013). Being bilingual presents challenges, but also affords opportunities that are not available to children who grow up with only one language (Serratrice, 2013). According to Baker (2006) bilingualism is beneficial in many ways: cognitively, culturally and communicatively. Language competence includes not only linguistic competence, but also competence in different social and cultural situations with different people (Baker, 2006).

2.3 Joint book reading

Panofsky (1994) believes that one way to promote bilingual preschool child literacy and vocabulary growth is with the help of an activity like adult-child joint book reading. According to Dickinson & Tabors (2001), book reading episodes can provide more opportunities for complex talk with children than other situations. In this sub-section I will discuss the notion of joint book reading as this reading activity is the main context for all interactions among the adults and the target children of this study. Joint book reading is defined in this study as an activity where a parent or a teacher reads books to young children. In addition to reading the book, it includes the adult engaging the children in dialogue about the pictures/illustrations in the book before, during, and/or after the actual story reading (Sarano & Spodek, 2010). According to van Kleeck & Stahl (2003) the way adults conduct joint book reading activity with children or mediate the stories to the children can influence child's interest in books (van Kleeck & Stahl, 2003). It is not necessarily the actual reading that may be beneficial to children, but the way the adults conduct this activity, the way children are read to, may have beneficial effects on children's literacy related abilities (Reese, Cox, Harte, McAnally, 2003). If during joint book reading child hear some words that are beyond a child's comprehension, child most likely will not benefit from such reading activity, but with the help of adult who can provide language support in form of explanations, for

example, this activity can be beneficial for child (Reese et al., 2003). The choice of what to read, how to do it, how much to read (Teale, 2003) as well as child's actual participation during this activity (Dickinson & Tabors, 1991; Sénéchal, 1997; Morrow & Brittain, 2003) are significant factors that have influence on child's literacy, language and comprehension development and are considered to have influence on child's attitude towards reading. That's why it is important that parents/teachers support child's participation in the interactions during joint book reading. As McKeown & Beck (2003) believed, not listening to language, but talking together about the ideas during book reading activities is an valuable experience in terms of future literacy because children benefit in terms of language and comprehension.

According to Panofsky (1994), if we take into account joint book reading situations at home, it can differ significantly from the ones in the school, since relationships and roles differ. At home joint book reading can be associated with a warm, cozy activity between parent and child, where the child's activity is often encouraged (Panofsky, 1994). Purposes and goals of the activity at home are usually constant with the child's experience and appreciated by others (Panofsky, 1994). A child's active participation in joint book reading activities can be an essential factor at home, usually characterized by the child's choice to participate or refuse to participate (Panofsky, 1994). Unlike home, in school, purposes and goals of the activity can be difficult to understand for children and a lack of participation during joint book reading by a single child can easily go unnoticed (Panofsky, 1994). Panofsky (1994) has observed that in all families that participated in her research, children were allowed to choose books to read. The explanation that Panofsky (1994) provides is that if this is not done, the child's authority will be rejected and it may weaken child's desire to participate in joint book reading. A child's request to read was almost never rejected by parents and parents never refused to continue reading with child even if parents did not want to read more (Panofsky, 1994). A child's questions and requests were never considered by parent as interruptions during joint book reading activities, as they would be considered during other activities, but were treated as possibilities for dialogue (Panofsky, 1994). Parents' failure to involve children in joint book reading activities or to read to their children can result in a child's failure to learn to read, states van Kleeck & Stahl (2003). To read aloud to children is not always enough to evoke a child's interest in books and reading activities, the ability to engage children in this activity is the key factor (van Kleeck & Stahl, 2003). A child's commitment to joint book reading activities and learning from them depends on the ability of parents to build the bridge between the child's world and the world the books by using the knowledge that is related to

child's personal experience, familiar settings and the language with which these experiences are associated (van Kleeck & Stahl, 2003). Parents in low income families, as a rule, do not have access or insight to select appropriate books for their children or often have limited literacy skills themselves (Dickinson, McCabe & Anastasopoulos, 2003). Taking into account these factors, it is essential that preschool teachers provide children with extensive engaging opportunities to hear and discuss books (Dickinson, McCabe & Anastasopoulos, 2003). Again, such aspects as how teachers engage children in conversations during joint book reading, what kind of questions they ask, to what extent they read dramatically to hold child's attention, influence children's engagement and may affect children's learning outcomes (Dickinson, McCabe & Anastasopoulos, 2003). Cognitive processes that are reflected in the language of the preschool child develop in social interactions like those which take place during joint book reading (Panofsky, 1994). To give children the opportunity to participate in important social practice, such as book reading, is essential for a child's cognitive development (Panofsky, 1994). When taking into consideration a bilingual child, the child's participation in joint book reading is important as participation in such activities may provide opportunities for young bilinguals to develop and improve their second language and grammar (Ping, 2014).

2.3.1 Low, medium and high cognitive demand talk during joint book reading

As Dickinson, McCabe & Anastasopoulos (2003); Reese, Cox, Harte, McAnally (2003) believed it is not only important that adults read to/with their children, but it is important also how they conduct this activity. In other words, what kind of cognitive demand adults place on the child during this activity is a factor which seems to influence possible childhood learning outcomes. I chose to use Sigel's (1986) classification of distancing strategies (questions addressed to the children by adults). According to Sigel (1986) strategies used by adults during joint book reading can vary in level of cognitive demands placed on the child by adults. While observing parents and teachers who read with their children, Sigel (1986) identified the following levels of distancing strategies that adults use during book reading activity with children: low level strategies that have minimal cognitive demand placed on the child, such as labeling, describing, producing information; medium level strategies, such as comparing, sequencing, finding/describing similarities/differences, and high cognitive demand strategies that require evaluating, inferring, and reasoning from the child. I reduced

my categorization of strategies to two (low and high) instead of 3 (low, medium and high) as my data does not have strategies that could be categorized as medium. It may be due to the fact that I have quite small data-material.

Dickinson & Tabors (2001) were speaking about immediate and non-immediate talk during joint book reading activities. To my mind, it can be compared with Sigel's (1986) classification of low and high strategies placed on the child. Non-immediate talk, according to Dickinson & Tabors (2001) includes more complex language that just labeling, describing and yes/no questioning that is a part of immediate talk. Non-immediate talk can be in line with Sigel's (1986) high cognitive demand strategy that challenges children's cognitive skills through more abstract content. This may include more complexity and requires longer utterances than talk that is triggered by low cognitive demand strategies placed on the child.

Summing up what was said above, I base by research on the theories that assume that children's development is inseparable from the social context (Vygotsky, 1978; Halliday, 1978; Bruner, 1983; Rogoff, 1990; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Linell, 1998). For learning and development to take place, the following vital components are needed: social setting and individuals that could interact, social interaction and collaboration (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The role of adult is essential (Vygotsky, 1978; Halliday, 1978; Bruner, 1983). Children are learning via the process of participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991) or guided participation (Rogoff, 1990), by observation (Halliday, 2003) and imitation (Vygotsky, 1978). In the preschool years especially, learning takes the form of unintentional learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Social experience, social practice and interaction are concluded to be essential factors for child's development (Halliday, 1978; Hasan, 1989; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Language learning is an interactive process because it presupposes the continued exchange of meanings between individuals (Bruner, 1983; Halliday, 2003). The exchange of utterances is discourse that is deeply social and interactional in nature (Linell, 1998). The concept of bilingualism is also essential for this study since the target children are bilingual and acquire L2 and L3 simultaneously and sequentially (Tabors, 2008). To acquire a second language, social setting, speakers and learners are necessary for learning to take place (Fillmore, 1991). Cummins (1984) refers to an underlying cognitive/academic proficiency which is common across languages, and as Cummins (1984) and Baker (2007) state, experience with one language can promote development of the other language. Oller & Jarmulowicz (2007) and Butler (2013) assume that the transfer from L1 to L2 depends on the similarity of the linguistic systems.

They assume that the more similarities that exist between two languages, the easier it is transfer from one language to another. I discuss as well the notion of code-switching (Serratrice, 2013; Malakoff & Hakuta, 1991) in this chapter because both children in my study switch languages. The similarities and differences in acquisition of morpho-syntactic, lexical, receptive skills among bilingual and monolingual children are discussed (Paradis, 2007; Serratrice, 2013).

Children's learning outcomes from joint book reading activities seem to depend on how adults conduct this activity with children (van Kleeck & Stahl, 2003; Reese et al., 2003; Dickinson, McCabe & Anastasopoulos, 2003; Teale, 2003) and on how much the child participates during these activities (Dickinson & Tabors, 1991; Sénéchal, 1997; Morrow & Brittain, 2003). The classification of low, medium and high cognitive demand strategies placed on the child during joint book reading were discussed as well (Sigel, 1986).

3 Literature review

I started working with my thesis by getting acquainted with relevant literature for my study. The studies that were the focus of my attention concerned the way adults read to their children, the importance of child participation during reading activities and impact of adult-child joint book reading on the monolingual versus bilingual child's language and literacy development. *Literacy development* was defined in this study as learning to read, to count, to write, to understand some concepts, meanings of words and ability to use language.

In this chapter I will present the international and Norwegian/Scandinavian research with a main focus on adult-child joint book reading activities with young bilingual preschoolers.

The purpose of this review is to find out what kind of research was done previously, the findings of the studies and what I can contribute with to the field of interest and what I can *"add to the knowledge base"* (Merriam, 2009, p. 76).

This chapter will be divided into 2 parts. In the first part, I will introduce previous studies that discuss parent-child joint book reading and its impact on children's literacy and language development. I will mention those studies that discuss and compare the way parents conduct joint book reading in different cultures. I was actually interested in what factors influence how parents conduct joint book reading with their children. In the other part I will present studies that discuss preschool teachers' book reading activities with children in their classes, approaches to reading that have an impact on children's engagement in reading activities as well influence on children's vocabulary and literacy development. At the end I will summarize this chapter and I will state my contribution to this field of interest.

3.1 Reading at home

Previous research suggests a variety of factors influence the process of book reading at home. The cultural background of the parents, their socioeconomic status, parents' literacy beliefs and home literacy environments just to name a few (Bingham, 2007; Wu & Honig, 2008; Cline & Edwards, 2013; Bus, Leseman & Keultjes , 2000; Scheele, Leseman, & Mayo, 2009; Niklas & Schneider, 2012; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001).

Bus, Leseman & Keultjes (2000) who conducted a large scale study in the Netherland and compared the Surinamese-Dutch (n=19), Turkish-Dutch (n=19), and Dutch (n=19) parent-child dyads found that these ethnic groups differed in the way parents interact with their children while reading a book. Findings showed that the Surinamese-Dutch group of parents tended to be more restrictive and discipline oriented than the Turkish-Dutch or Dutch parents. Researchers concluded that when reading was less important for the parents personally, they were less likely to diverge from the text in order to discuss meaning with children (Bus, Leseman & Keultjes, 2000). Bus and colleagues also found that, when for parents literacy did not serve important personal needs, parents and children were less involved in meaning-related discussions that could make the book more understandable and enjoyable for young children (Bus, Leseman & Keultjes, 2000). Researchers argued that when parents were more responsive and supportive, the conversations accompanying the reading of text went beyond the text and included discussion of relevant background information or children's own experiences related to the story, but when parents were less responsive and supportive, reading sessions generally resulted in low cognitive demand conversations stressing naming and paraphrasing (Bus, Leseman & Keultjes, 2000). Children's experience with book reading might be affected by cultural differences, stated Raikes (2006). Large scale study in the USA that included American, Hispanic and African mothers (n total=2 581) showed that white mothers read more to their children than Hispanic or African American mothers did (Raikes et al., 2006). The study's findings highlighted the positive correlation between maternal book reading and child's vocabulary and pointed to the phase of early and quick language learning as a critical period for targeting book reading to increase children's growing vocabularies (Raikes et al., 2006).

Cline & Edwards (2013) conducted their study to get understanding about the relationship between book reading quality & child learning in the families that were culturally (Latinos and Americans) and linguistically different (use Spanish as the first language and English as a first language). The term reading quality included *instructional* and *emotional* quality of the reading process (Cline & Edwards, 2013). Instructional quality refers to the parents' text and behavior related utterances. Emotional quality refers to the degree of parental supportiveness presence and the child's and even the teacher's enjoyment during book reading. The concept of *extra-textual talk* that went beyond plain reading of the book which engaged parent and child in conversation was discussed (Cline & Edwards, 2013). Cline and Edwards found the Latino and the American parents used different reading styles and behaviors during reading

sessions. Additionally, there was a strong positive correlation between high extra-textual talk and high emotional quality which was related to positive learning in the families that spoke English. For the families who spoke Spanish as their first language, the combination of low extra-textual talk and high emotional quality was positively associated with child learning (Cline & Edwards, 2013).

Previous research in the USA (Bingham, 2007) also showed that literacy beliefs of parents and home literacy environments seemed to play a great role in further child's language and literacy development and influenced the way parents read to their children. Researchers examined the relation between mothers' literacy beliefs, the home literacy environment, and the affective/emotional and instructional quality of mother-child reading interactions (Bingham, 2007). By affective quality Bingham (2007) referred to how engaging and pleasant mothers made reading session for the child. By instructional quality, the notion of reading instructions, such as labeling, questioning, book-focused extensions (Bingham, 2007) were highlighted. Results showed that mother's literacy beliefs were positively and significantly related to the quality of home literacy environments (literacy practices) and the instructional and affective quality of joint book reading sessions. The quality of children's home literacy environments and mother-child joint book reading interactions was related to children's development of early literacy skills (Bingham, 2007). Bingham (2007) underlined that those children who frequently experienced emotionally supportive, responsive, and interesting parent-child book reading situations in their home environments would probably also explore and read books on their own.

Wu & Honig (2008) found that parents' beliefs about literacy played an important role for furthering the child's literacy development. The aim of the study was to find out what were Taiwanese mothers' (n=731) beliefs about reading to their children. Mothers that participated in the study were well-educated, middle-class parents. Results showed that these mothers were concerned about moral and practical knowledge that children would gain from book reading. Mothers' beliefs about reading were significantly correlated with family income and mother's level of education, but not with child's gender or child's age. Mother's level of education was also correlated with number of books at home and their literacy practices (Wu & Honig, 2008). Researchers compared Taiwanese and American mothers and came to conclusion that American parents had more relaxed and fun approach to reading and positive emotions during joint book reading were most important for them than other factors. This

29

study also documented that frequency of book reading and literacy resources at home were less prevalent in Taiwan than in the USA. One of the reasons for that was that bigger part of the Taiwanese mothers could not recall that they were read to when they were small (Wu & Honig, 2008).

The above mentioned studies all focused on mother-child reading dyads due to the assumption that mothers spent most time with their children while children grow up. Research showed that children's (n=20) verbal behaviors during joint book reading were actually influenced by parent's gender and child's age (Barachelli & Lavelli, 2010). Findings showed that children initiated significantly more often talk at the age of 5.2 than when they were 3.8 independently of parent's gender. Older children's language output was characterized by more requests addressed to fathers than to mothers, but children produced crucially more statements with mothers than with fathers and older children's requests were significantly more often followed by father's than mother's reading utterances (Barachelli & Lavelli, 2010).

Research showed that not only cultural background of the family, parent's believes, home literacy environments and parent's gender that influence frequency, possibility and the way reading activities between parents and children were conducted, but also socioeconomic status of the family (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001). According to Niklas & Schneider (2012) socioeconomic status of the family included level of parents' education, their occupation and family income. Dickinson & Tabors (2001) who studied learning opportunities for children from low-income families mentioned that differences in children's literacy and early achievements correlated with parental income levels. Dickinson & Tabors (2001) point out that children from middle-class families have much more opportunities to learn letters, words, learn about making lists, notes, and buy books that those from low income-families. There was much evidence supporting the finding that children in the families with higher socioeconomic status had more opportunities to experience language input that stimulates language development (Scheele, Leseman, & Mayo, 2009). The study with a sample of monolingual native Dutch preschool children (n=58) and bilingual immigrant Moroccan-Dutch preschool children (n=46), speaking Tarifit-Berber, a non-scripted language, and Turkish–Dutch (n=55), speaking Turkish language confirmed this fact. The findings showed that the bilingual Moroccan-Dutch and Turkish-Dutch immigrant children were found to be less proficient in both first and second language compared to monolingual native Dutch children (Scheele, Leseman, & Mayo, 2009). But if compare Moroccan-Dutch and Turkish-

Dutch immigrant children, the later Moroccan-Dutch were more proficient in the second language, that was Dutch. It is due to the fact that Moroccan immigrant group used Tarifit-Berber, a non-scripted language, that meant that they did not have books, TV program in native language, so Moroccan children got much less input of first language than Turkish children, but instead use more second language, that was Dutch. The differences in first and second language skills were related to the amount of first and second language input at home. Researchers found more differences in the amount of language learning activities at home, the Moroccan-Dutch and Turkish-Dutch children received less first and second language input through joint book reading and through a range of oral language interactions (Scheele, Leseman, & Mayo, 2009). Due to immigrant families' lower socio-economic status, children had fewer opportunities for learning activities, including book reading. Results of this study also showed that the frequency of reading and storytelling were correlated moderately strongly with children's receptive vocabulary (Scheele, Leseman, & Mayo, 2009).

Niklas & Schneider (2012) conducted a large-scale longitudinal study in Germany with focus on the role of the home literacy environment played in the development of language competencies of 921 German children. *Home Literacy Environment (HLE)* was defined as the environment the parents provide to the child, to help with his/her reading, spelling and language competences (Niklas & Schneider, 2012). First of all, results highlighted the importance of home literacy environment for the development of language/vocabulary also for German context (Niklas & Schneider, 2012). This study came to conclusion that families with no immigration background and families with a higher socioeconomic status offered a more favorable "home literacy environment". Parents, who were born outside of Germany and have jobs with lower prestige often provided less favorable HLE for their children. The study documented that these families were watching more TV, and were reading seldom or seldom visited library. German children from families with immigrant backgrounds usually did not speak German at home which affected their German vocabulary and letter knowledge. Migrant backgrounds were closely associated with a lower socio-economic status (SES) (Niklas & Schneider, 2012).

It seems that parents use different approaches while reading books with their preschool children (Cline & Edwards, 2013; Wu & Honig, 2008), reading vary from just plain reading the book to extended talk before, during and after reading episodes (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001).

Sandvik & Spurkland (2012) pointed out that there was no reliable evidence that children learnt languages particularly well through strategy such as "What's it called?" while pointing at a picture in a book. Language learning, according to Sandvik & Spurkland (2012) occurred when children and adults explored something through a dialogue, when both contributed equally in relation to furthering the conversation, when they made inferences about some aspects of the book.

Dickinson & Tabors (2001) stated that there were many different approaches that parents could use while reading together with children. One of the aims of Dickinson & Tabors' (2001) study (n=54) was to examine the relationship between parent's type of talk during reading and children's literacy and language development. According to Dickinson & Tabors (2001) book reading episodes could provide more opportunities for complex talk with children than other situations. Results of the study showed that 43-60% of mothers used the kind of questions and comments that were focused on here and now, *immediate talk* and just 11-18% used *non-immediate talk* that researchers believed lead to successful child's literacy and language development (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001). According to Dickinson & Tabors (2001) non-immediate talk was talk that forced recollection of experience from the child's life, questions about general knowledge, inference, making predictions, a more complex language than labeling and yes/no answers. Dickinson & Tabors (2001) considered non-immediate talk as a form of *extended discourse* that was talk that went beyond here and now and that required the use of several utterances to build a linguistic structure. According to Temple & Snow (2003) non-immediate talk helped children to understand and use more advanced vocabulary. This more sophisticated language could be required for making predictions in respect to next episode, discuss characters states. Non-immediate talk was positively correlated with children's later literacy and language development (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001). Children who scored higher than other children on measures of language and early literacy were engaged in talks that went beyond here and now while they read books with their parents (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001). Conversations that engaged children in extended discussion around a topic offered many opportunities for children to hear unusual or rare words, stated Dickinson & Tabors (2001). This study concluded that such factors as quantity of books at home, frequency of reading, types of reading activity were predictive of children's early literacy skills. According to Dickinson & Tabors (2001) the preschool and kindergarten period makes crucial contributions in preparing children for their later literacy achievements.

Parents seemed to differ in the way they built communication with their children during joint book reading. Deckner, Adamson & Bakeman (2006) pointed out that those differences in communication strategies appeared to be related to childhood language development. One of the aims of this study was to determine how literacy practices at home, children's interest in reading, and the amount of mothers' *metalingual utterances* during shared reading at 27 months, predicted children's expressive and receptive language development at 30 and 42 months and their letter knowledge and knowledge of print concepts at 42 months (Deckner et al., 2006). Metalingual utterances were defined by Deckner et al., (2006) as a speech act that directed attention to the language itself. The results from this study supported the view that parents' literacy efforts were making significant and lasting contributions to their children's literal development. Home literacy practices significantly predicted children's receptive and expressive language development. Mothers' inclination to produce metalingual utterances at 27 months of age, were highly correlated with children's expressive language development at 30 and 42 months of age. Furthermore, children's interest in book reading was strongly associated with the size of mothers' metalingual utterances. Home literacy practices, children's interest, and the rate of mothers' metalingual utterances all predicted expressive language. Home literacy practices predicted receptive language development, and children's interest in reading predicted their letter knowledge (Deckner et al., 2006).

Dexter & Stacks (2013) investigated the associations between joint book reading quality and child development outcomes. One of the goals was to examine the relationship between parent-child joint reading quality and child cognitive and language development. The study found that children's receptive language development was significantly, positively correlated with overall shared reading quality, but the additional quantity of joint reading did not result in significant improvements in the prediction of receptive language. Dexter & Stacks (2013) explained their findings by stating that receptive language development was due to interactive reading between parent and child. They referred interactive reading to soliciting or responding to questions about the book and providing or responding to cues about book content.

The importance of engaging children into reading activity, rather than just plain reading to him/her, has been researched by many studies. Whitehurst, Falco, Lonigan, Fischel, DeBaryshe, Valdez-Manchaca, & Caulfield (1988) demonstrated the impact of interactive reading on child's (n=30) verbal development and vocabulary. In this study parents received interactive course in story reading to their two-three year old children. Results showed that

children whose parents used interactive style while reading improved their verbal expression and were several months ahead on the vocabulary test than children in the control group (Whitehurst et al., 1988). Whitehurst et al., (1988) concluded that the way parents choose to read has an influence on the child's language gains. Zevenbergen & Whitehurst (2003) developed reading technique that they called *dialogic reading*. They based this technique on the theory that preschool children develop language skills with the help of adults during joint book reading. The important point about this technique was that it was the child who became the story teller not the adult. The adult's role was to prompt children's participation by asking questions, praising, and expanding the child's language. Adults encouraged the child to say more than child could have said on its own. Adults received training in dialogic reading with 4-5 year old children: to use "Completion prompts", where adults asked to fill-in blank questions, "Recall prompts", where adults asked the child to recall some aspects of the book, "Open-ended prompts", with the help of which adults encouraged the child to respond to the book in his own words, "Wh-prompts", what, where and why questions, and "Distancing prompts", where adults asked child to relate the context of the book to his/her own experience. The study's sample included children from families with different socioeconomic status. In this study researchers evaluated effectiveness of dialogic reading at home and at preschool and found that dialogic reading had positive effects on language development and emergent literacy skills.

In the study by Aram, Fine & Ziv (2013), parents (n=58) who were in the intervention group, were trained to read books interactively to their children. Results showed that systematic training improved the parent–child discourse during joint book reading more than repeated unguided readings. Findings indicated that guiding parents systematically in how to read books to their children was productive, as it increased their references to the book's plot and socio-cognitive themes (discussing character's mental states, intentions) and encouraged participation of their children in the discourse (Aram, Fine & Ziv, 2013).

According to Valvatne & Sandvik (2007), engaging bilingual children in joint book reading is important because books engage children in conversations and provide children who speak minority language with both good opportunities for second language learning, as well as getting to know an important part of children's culture from the country they are from. Books also mean establishing contact with written language that many children need, particularly by the time they start school. According to Valvatne & Sandvik (2007) perhaps the most

important thing one can do is to ensure that children become familiar with books (Valvatne & Sandvik, 2007).

Growing up in a home where parents and children read is valuable for child, states Hennig (2012). Children growing up with parents, who read books, are more likely to read books as well when they are older. An incorporation of book reading culture in a family has significant long-term positive effects on child development in terms of reading skills, social skills and language development, just to name a few. According to Hennig (2012) there is a clear correlation between how often children are read to at a young age and reading skills in elementary school. Children, who hear many stories before they can read, develop an understanding of how language is organized and structured (Hennig, 2012).

3.2 Reading at preschool

Since this study intends to look into joint book reading both at home and in preschool, in this section I will discuss the studies that are related to joint book reading in preschool. Tizard & Hughes (2002) point out that home and preschool are two different worlds for the child. The most distinctive difference is that the child moves from a very small social setting, where he/she is at the center of attention and spends much of his/her time with parents to a big social setting where he/she is just a part of a group (Tizard & Hughes, 2002). At home the child has very close relationship to the parents, where he/she spends a lot of time with mother or father, while at preschool adults have no specific partiality for the child, they know little about the child's past and life outside the school (Tizard & Hughes, 2002). In their study, Tizard & Hughes (2002) compared situations such as play and reading episodes in preschool and at home with the aim of finding out what monolingual children (n=30) learn from their mothers at home and from preschool teachers at school and how children's behavior differed in the two contexts. Findings showed that, in general, the biggest difference between preschool and home was that at preschool there were much less talk between adult and child in comparison to home. If there was a talk between adult and child in the preschool it was related to "here and now", while at home talk was related to child's own experience, past and future. It was observed that children were more likely to answer mothers' than teachers' questions. Tizard & Hughes (2002) pointed out that because of one-to-one situation during reading at home children could ask as many questions he/she wished during reading, but it was not possible in a group reading setting as a teacher had to cope with other children as well. Tizard & Hughes

(2002) concluded that book reading sessions were much better organized at preschool than at home, but children contributed much less. During 9 reading sessions at home, the mothers asked children 61 questions, the children asked mother 78 questions. During 8 book reading sessions at preschool, preschool teachers asked children 63 questions, but children asked teachers questions just 3 times.

Dickinson & Tabors (2001) studied 61 3 year old preschool and 70 4 years olds' participation in such activities as play, meals, and reading episodes in preschool and at home. I will concentrate my attention on just the reading episodes. Researchers concluded that book reading at home and at preschool was different in many ways. The biggest challenge for the teacher was children's varying levels of language development and book reading experience. That's why Dickinson & Tabors (2001) stressed that individual or small group sessions in preschool setting could be more effective and created similar conditions as during parent-child joint book reading sessions. Dickinson & Tabors (2001) differentiated between 3 styles or approaches to book reading at preschool. Teachers in their sample used didactic-interactional approach in 40% of cases that was characterized by *low cognitive demands* and *little reflective conversation* from children. In 20% of time the teachers used a co-constructive approach that was characterized by *high level of cognitive demand*, with discussions before and after reading. There was also a focus on vocabulary and some connection between the children's life and the book. The third approach that was used in 40 % of the cases which was called *performance oriented*. This is characterized by a dramatic reading with some pauses for conversation. Extended talk following the reading session, whereas children were encouraged to make reflections and connect some aspects of the book to their own experience/life. Findings showed that children who were in the performance oriented group had better receptive vocabulary (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001). Researchers found a positive correlation between the use of "Wh" questions and talks that contained *analysis of books* and child's receptive vocabulary (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001). Dickinson & Tabors (2001) concluded that dramatic reading had effects on children's engagement and resulted in more appropriate responses from children. Besides, conversations that required children to think rather than repeating familiar information or labeling engaged children into activity and reduced the need to use time on behavioral issues. Researchers found that teacher's higher level of education was positively correlated with use of analytical questions during book reading sessions. The teacher's style of reading was considered to some extent to be related to racial background/ethic identity of the teacher as well as the language skills of the children in the

group (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001). According to Dickinson & Tabors (2001), book reading activities help to prepare children for school by building their vocabulary, teaching them to take part in group activities that include listening, talking and understanding texts.

Ping (2014) conducted a small scale study where she studied how native German speaking teachers (n=5) read picture books with preschool immigrant children in small groups. Teachers were assigned to use *dialogic book strategy reading* where children were taking on the role of story-teller, while the teacher was taking on the role of facilitator (Ping, 2014). The findings showed that reading sessions differed from each other to large extent, but could provide opportunity for immigrant children to learn German, their second language. According to this study, dialogic reading helped children to expand their vocabulary. Ping (2014) concluded that teachers motivated children to talk mostly by using "Wh" questions, with the help of which children labeled and described illustrations. These types of questions that demanded labeling or describing belonged to low cognitive level responses. Teachers rarely used high cognitive strategies that demanded inference and reflection from child. If they used them they were appropriately answered by the child, with the same level of cognitive demand. Ping (2014) concluded that dialogic reading was not only supporting vocabulary growth for children that learn second language, but also provided an opportunity to learn grammar. Teachers could assist children with grammar learning by correcting and helping to build more complex grammatical patterns (Ping, 2014).

Gerde & Powell (2009) investigated if teachers' use of book- and behavior-focused utterances could help to predict children's (n=60) increase in receptive vocabulary. By *book-focused utterances* Gerde & Powell (2009) refer to utterances that include an explanation of new words, asking questions, response to child's speech (2009). By *behavior-focused utterances* Gerde & Powell (2009) referred to utterances used to keep an attentive environment, such as directing children's behavior, explaining rules. Findings showed that children in the classrooms were teachers used more book-focused utterances had better receptive vocabulary at the end of the preschool year. Gerde & Powell (2009) found that use of book-related utterances were positively correlated with the teacher's level of formal education which meant that the higher level of education teachers had, the more often they used book-related utterances and the more rarely they used behavior-focused utterances.

Zucker, Justice, Piasta & Kaderavek (2010) investigated how interactions during reading session could support the development of children's literal and inferential language skills. By

literal skills, Zucker et al. (2010) referred to skills that required children to describe and label objects in the book. By *inferential skills*, Zucker et al. (2010) referred to skills that required children to use more advanced language, such as to infer, predict or analyze, that preschoolers could benefit from in terms of language outcomes. The study specifically focused on the complexity of the child's abstract thinking requested by teacher's question. Results showed that when teachers read informational narrative text, considered to be cognitively challenging, they used more inferential than literal questions. Findings showed that children produced considerably less inferential than literal utterances. The level of the teacher's questions was positively correlated with level of child's answers, meaning that inferential questions from teachers urged inferential answers from children. Inferential questioning was not associated with children's vocabulary growth in this study which might be due to the fact that it was just four weeks between the beginning of study and testing. Zucker et al. (2010) suggested that preschool teachers could use inferential questions to encourage children to participate in more complex talks during joint book reading session.

There were some studies that stressed the role of children's participation during joint book reading as it plays an important role for child literacy development (Dickinson & Tabors, 1991), vocabulary acquisition (Sénéchal, 1997; McKeown & Beck, 2003), children's comprehension (McKeown & Beck, 2003; Morrow & Brittain, 2003).

Dickinson & Tabors (1991) have found clear evidence that participation of preschool children in talk during book reading played an important role in enhancing children's literacy skills. Dickinson & Tabors (1991) have concluded that some types of talk during joint book reading supported development of literacy-related skills among preschool children. For example, if children participated in explanatory and narrative talk during book reading activities it was concluded to be related to development of language ability such as vocabulary and narrative skills that are in turn anticipated to be related to reading comprehension in the years to come.

The aim of the study of Sénéchal (1997) was to find out how these three approaches as single reading, repeated readings and questioning during joint book reading influenced the acquisition of vocabulary among 3 and 4 years old children (n=30). Findings show that those children who not only listened, but participated in conversations (approach questioning - when children had to answer questions) by using new vocabulary to answer questions learned more words than those children who just listened to readings. Finding show that answering

teacher's questions helped children to acquire expressive vocabulary, not receptive vocabulary.

McKeown & Beck (2003) implemented an approach that they called Text Talk during joint book reading. According to this approach, teachers had to implement talk that went beyond here and now during joint book reading. Text Talk questions were intended to encourage children to talk about the ideas in the story that occurred during the reading (McKeown & Beck, 2003). Two kindergartens and two first grade classrooms, where all children were African-American from low income families participated in this project. The study concluded that talking together about their ideas during the book reading activity was valuable experience for future literacy, children benefited in terms of language and comprehension ability. Children, who participated in such talk, seemed to activate their potential to master language to order to meet complex demands in the upcoming school years (McKeown & Beck, 2003).

The above presented literature review was conducted with the focus on adult-child interactions during joint book reading activity. On the basis of my literature review, some conclusions can be drawn. Many researchers concluded that cultural differences of the families, their socio-economic status, parents' beliefs about literacy had an influence on the way parents read to their children at home (Bus, Leseman & Keultjes, 2000; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Bingham, 2007; Wu & Honig, 2008). In preschool, it seems like preschool teacher's ethnicity or racial background (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001), level of teacher's formal education (Gerde & Powell, 2009) and the level of child's language development and book reading experience (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001) affected the way teachers conducted book reading episodes. The actual activity of book reading, whether it was at home or in the preschool, seemed to help develop children's vocabulary (Raikes et al., 2006; Scheele, Leseman, & Mayo, 2009; Niklas & Schneider, 2012; Whitehurst et al., 1988; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Hennig, 2012; Gerde & Powell, 2009; Zevenbergen & Whitehurst, 2003), and prepare children for emerging literacy (Bingham, 2007; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Tizard & Hughes, 2002; Zevenbergen & Whitehurst, 2003), as well as further success in school (Dickinson & Tabors, 200; Valvatne & Sandvik, 2007, Hennig, 2012), gain moral and practical knowledge (Wu & Honig, 2008), and affect second language development (Ping, 2014; Valvatne & Sandvik, 2007; Sandvik & Spurkland, 2012). Many researchers referred to the preschool period as a critical period that made crucial contribution to the developing

children's first and second language and literacy. Adults play a significant role in reading development (Tizard & Hughes, 2002; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Valvatne & Sandvik, 2007; Hennig, 2012, Ping, 2014). McLachlan et al. (2013) argued that adults played a crucial role in providing access to enriched literacy environments, but the role of children's participation was also essential for language, literacy and comprehension development (Dickinson & Tabors, 1991; Sénéchal, 1997; McKeown & Beck, 2003; Morrow & Brittain, 2003).

My contribution

It seems like most studies focused on either children's first or second language use or development with the help of joint book reading or mainly on interactions between parents and monolingual children rather than on interactions between parents or preschool teachers and bilingual children. My study will focus on the use of two languages during joint book reading activities both at home and in preschool. It seems like there is a lack of studies investigating how bilingual children are invited to participate in book reading activities at home and in preschool. To my knowledge, there are no existing studies investigating how Russian-speaking parents that live in Norway perform joint book reading activity with their bilingual children and how preschool teachers conduct book reading activity in multicultural preschools in Norway. This study attempts to shed some light on the approaches or strategies adults use to engage bilingual children to be active participants during joint book reading. I want to contribute to the general knowledge of how the Russian-speaking families engage their bilingual children in reading activities at home and how Norwegian preschool teachers support bilingual children in active participation during joint book reading sessions at preschool. I want to show how two Russian-Norwegian children participate in conversations during joint book reading conducted in two different worlds for them (Tizard & Hughes, 2002); at home and in the preschool. With the help of my two cases I intend to identify potential strategies with the help of which children can benefit the most in terms of language and literacy development and learning grammar.

4 Methodological framework

In this chapter I will speak about the choices I made while conducting my study as well as describe the methods of research that I have chosen.

To answer the research questions in my thesis, the qualitative method was chosen. I will start my methodological discussion with the characteristics of the qualitative study. I will describe how I selected the sample for my study and methods of data collection. I have chosen to use audio-recordings as a main data source and structured interviews as a supplementary source to my study. In this chapter I will cover how each method was used. My research method is a case study, therefore its attributes will be discussed in detail in this chapter. I will describe in detail the process of my data analysis. The issues of trustworthiness, limitations of the study and ethical considerations are presented also in this part.

The data-material which provides the basis of discussion in this thesis was borrowed from a large-scale randomized intervention study "Teaching for text comprehension: Supporting young second-language learners' text comprehension in urban multiethnic preschools in Norway". During the school year 2014-2015, around 480 bilingual children from a large multicultural city were reading a selection of books with their parents and preschool teachers. Books that were read at home were wordless, while some of the books that were read in preschool were with text.

4.1 Qualitative research method

I chose a qualitative research design in my study to illustrate the phenomenon of how adults engage Russian-Norwegian preschool children in joint book reading activities in two different languages in two different settings. The goal is to see how children participate in different for them settings using two different languages. Qualitative research was chosen because it addresses the issues of meaning and with the help of qualitative research, I will be able to answer my research questions. According to Yin (2011), the motives for doing qualitative research is the ability to study events within their real-world context, including the relevant culture of the people, organization or groups being studied. Patton (2002) illustrates that qualitative methods typically produce a wealth of detailed information about a small number of people and cases and that increase the depth of understanding of cases and situations.

Qualitative researchers are interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed, which is how people make sense of their world and their experiences (Merriam, 2009). According to Merriam (2009), in qualitative research, the focus is on the process, meaning and on the understanding on the phenomenon, where the researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and analysis.

According to Denzin & Lincoln (2013), the word *qualitative* emphases the quality of entities and on the process and meanings, which are not experimentally measured in the terms of quantity, frequency or other attributes. Qualitative researchers stress the socially constructed nature of reality and seek to answer the questions that underscore how social experience is created and given meaning (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013). Thus, the qualitative method has as an aim to capture meanings that cannot be measured. That's why I chose the qualitative approach; to harness some aspects of the phenomenon which cannot be quantified. My research questions are not possible to answer with quantitative approach. The aim of my research was not to seek out the general picture applicable to all parents that raise bilingual children and preschool teachers that work with bilingual children, but to contribute with detailed information to the field of interest with the help of two cases that were chosen for my study. Case study design was chosen in order to best illuminate this phenomenon and with the respect to its appropriateness in my study.

4.2 Sample selection

According to Patton (2002) qualitative inquiry typically focuses in depth on small samples, cases that are selected purposefully. The power of the purposeful sampling lies in the selecting information-rich cases for study in depth and these information-rich cases will illuminate the questions under investigation (Patton, 2002).

My procedure of sampling was the following: first, I chose the Russian-speaking group that took part in the project because I can speak and understand the Russian language myself. Within this case I had to select several entity cases (Merriam, 2009). My initial plan was to analyze the recordings of joint book reading sessions at home. Due to the fact that most of the Russian-speaking children were assigned to controlled condition during the randomization of classrooms, I had to change my initial plan. I had several alternatives to choose between, but the most interesting to me seemed to follow the language usage of the same bilingual children

at home during joint book reading activity in Russian and these same children at preschool in Norwegian. Thus, instead of just analyzing home recordings, I also analyzed recordings of the same children from preschool. There were 3 Russian-speaking families who were assigned to intervention group, 2 of them have delivered recordings of reading sessions at home. Therefore, I ended up having two cases. According to the plan, preschool teachers and parents had to read books with target children, to record the activity and deliver these recordings. Some of the books were read both at home and in preschool. Book reading sessions that were chosen for my data analysis included adult-child readings of the following books: "Frog, where are you?" (Mayer, 2007), "Pancakes for breakfast" (dePaola, 1978), and "Penguin" (Costain, 2012). All classroom recordings where target children were not present were excluded from the analysis. In the end, my data-material constituted of 7 audio-recordings in total, 4 with home reading, 3 with preschool reading.

Both children in my two cases, Alexander and David, are bilingual children who have linguistic competence in 2 and 3 languages: Russian and Norwegian in the first case and Russian, Norwegian and Ukrainian in the second case. Both children were born in Norway with two foreign parents. Parents in both cases are bilingual as well and speak the minority language to their child at home, leaving the child to learn the majority language in preschool. During the interview, both parents in both cases said that children chose appropriate language while speaking with a particular person. While playing with Russian friends, children chose to speak Russian language, with Norwegian friends-Norwegian, with Ukrainian friends-Ukrainian. Both target children are able to differentiate between two/three languages for both understanding and production according to information given by parents during interviews. Sometimes target children use code-switching if they cannot find an appropriate word in their vocabulary.

4.3 Data collection and method selection

In this section I will discuss the main data collection and research method of my study, which are the audio recordings and the supplementary method of my study which are structured interviews.

4.3.1 Audio recordings

Silverman (2005) highlights the benefits of analyzing the recordings. He refers to recording as "naturally occurring data". According to Silverman (2005), naturally occurring data usually gives us a reliable clue about what participants usually do outside the research setting and may show us things we could never imagine.

The parents and preschool teachers received dictaphones that were easy to use to make the recordings. The duration of the recordings from home ranged from 9 to 12 minutes and from 7 to 21 minutes for those from preschool.

Home recordings. In total I had 4 recordings from home, that is 2 recordings with home data from each target child. Both parents and their children read books solely in Russian without a mixture of other languages. In all cases children understood what was said and used language actively.

Preschool recordings. In total I had to analyze 3 audio recordings from kindergartens. There were 2 and 5 children in each group in preschool, this number included my target children. For example, in one preschool, there were 5 children present during the recording, all of them took part in the main project, 1 of these 5 children was the target child. At the other preschool, there were 2 children during the recording; one of them was my target child. The reading style seemed to be different between the preschool teachers in the two kindergartens and between the different book sessions with same preschool teacher. Target children's amount of talk varied during different reading sessions. I have noticed that David, who speaks Ukrainian in addition to Russian and Norwegian, switched to Ukrainian many times during joint book reading in preschool.

The next stage for me was to transcribe the audio recording of parent-child and preschool teacher-children conversations during joint book reading from home and preschool that parents and preschool teachers delivered. These transcripts are the main source of the data for my study. To transcribe the recordings I used the minCHAT transcription system. CHAT provides both basic and advanced formats for transcription and coding. This system is in general use in the fields of child language and discourse analysis.

The total data set consists of 69 minutes of recording conversations.

4.3.2 Structured telephone interviews

Interviews may be used as a main method of gathering data, but can be used as a secondary method to complement other collected research materials (Dalen, 2004). I will use interviews to supplement my main source of data that is audio recordings. This data material will give me opportunity to compare the family situations of my target children and see whether they were similar or different from the rest of the Russian-speaking group that took part in the main project.

Interview data was collected as a part of the main project. To conduct interviews, I used a structured interview guide that belongs to the main project. In such a guide, questions and the order of the questions were formed in advance (Thagaard, 2009) with a limited set of responses predefined, known as closed-ended questions (Yin, 2011). The benefit with this approach is that responses are comparable because all informants have responded on the same topic (Thagaard, 2009). This was important to me because this material gave me the opportunity to compare the family situations of target children in my study and see whether they were different from the rest of the group that took part in the project. Most of the questions from the interview guide revolved around the language use in the family, the mother tongue of the parents, what kind of language the parents use with the child, in what language the child responds, what kind of language the child speaks with sisters/brothers, grandparents, friends. I asked questions about parent's background such as age, education, working situation, and all parents answered them without any hesitations. It was also important to get to know if child was interested in reading the books with adults and the frequency of readings, number of books at home as well as some questions regarding the child's age when he/she entered kindergarten, frequency and duration of attending kindergarten during a usual week and during a usual day.

4.4 Cases

Case studies look at a phenomenon (the "case") in a real world context (Yin, 2011). According to Thagaard (2009), case studies refer to the research of a few objects or cases where researcher analyses a lot of information about those objects or cases that are included in the study.

According to Yin (2012, p.4) case studies as a research method, aim to produce a useful and deep understanding of the case – *that is, an insightful appreciation of the "case(s)"* –

hopefully resulting in new learning about real-world behavior and its meaning". Yin (2012) states that while doing a case study, examining the context and other conditions related to the case being studied are essential to understanding the case.

According to Yin (2012) case studies are relevant and applicable when research addresses a descriptive question "What…" or an explanatory question "How…". My study was selected and designed to contribute to understanding of how adults engage bilingual children in conversations about a book and to gain insight into how two Russian-Norwegian preschoolers participate during this activity in two different settings with two different languages.

I will do an in-depth analysis of my two cases described below. My cases serve as main *unit of analysis* (Yin, 2012) in this case study. My qualitative case study is characterized as a descriptive study and my design was flexible and responsive to changing conditions of the study while in progress. I attempted to make the end product detailed, that could be characterized by richness of analysis.

4.4.1 Case 1

Target child 1, Alexander, entered preschool in Norway when he was 13 months old. He attends preschool 5 days a week and is in preschool a full day. When Alexander comes home from kindergarten, he likes to play, draw, and watch Russian cartoons. Alexander likes to read books with parents. They read books every day. The family has up to 50 books in Russian and up to 10 books in Norwegian for children and up to 50 books in Russian and up to 50 books in Norwegian for adults at home. Both parents' native language is Russian, they use Russian at home, and Norwegian at work. Both parents speak Russian with their child and Alexander responses in Russian, just using some Norwegian words if it is too difficult for him to express himself. Alexander has no grandparents or other relatives that live in Norway. Alexander has an older sister with whom he speaks Russian. When Alexander is playing with other children, he uses Russian with Russian friends and Norwegian with Norwegian friends. Both parents are in their mid 30s, were born abroad. His mother was born in Estonia, his father in Russia, both came to Norway in their 20s. Both have bachelor degrees from their homeland. Both parents have jobs in Norway.

I conducted an interview with Alexander's mother. She mentioned Alexander's good proficiency in Russian. He understands that he has to speak Russian at home and Norwegian in the kindergarten.

4.4.2 Case 2

Target child 2, David, entered preschool in Norway when he was one year old. He attends preschool 5 days a week and is in preschool a full day. When David comes home from kindergarten, he likes to read, cycle, swim, and play with little sister. He reads books with his parents every day. Since his parents speak different languages, David reads books with his mother in Russian, with his father in Ukrainian. The family has up to 10 books in Russian for children and up to 10 books in Russian for adults, up to 10 books for children in Ukrainian and up to 30 books for adults in Ukrainian, they have also up to 10 book for children in Norwegian and up to 10 books for adults in Norwegian.

In terms of language use in the family, 3 languages are is use, Russian, Ukrainian and Norwegian. Since the father comes from Ukraine, he uses Ukrainian and Russian at home, but English and Norwegian at work. When the father addresses David in Ukrainian, he answers in Ukrainian too. The mother speaks Russian at home, and Norwegian at work. She speaks Russian with David and the child responds in Russian. David has a little sister with whom he speaks both Russian and Ukrainian. David has no grandparents or other relatives who live in Norway. When David plays with friends, he uses 3 languages. When he plays with Russian friends he uses Russian, with Ukrainian friends-Ukrainian, in the kindergarten-Norwegian.

Both parents are in their mid 30s, born outside of Norway. They have come to Norway in their 20s. David's mother was born in Russia, father-in Ukraine. Both parents have higher education (the mother-bachelor degree, the father-master degree), both have jobs in Norway.

I conducted an interview with David's father, who reported that David spoke Russian, Ukrainian and Norwegian fluently.

4.4.3 Comparing two cases with the rest of the Russian-speaking group

When compared to other Russian-speaking families participating in the main project, the cases of the two target children presented above seem to be the typically representative cases

of the Russian-speaking parents that took part in the main project. What is typical for this group is that Russian-speaking parents often have higher education and full-time jobs. They typically choose to speak just their native language to their children. The two cases described above share some commonalities with the greater part of the Russian-speaking group that participates in the project. Naturally, there were some notable differences as well. Regarding social-economic status, parents from both families have higher education and jobs in Norway like the rest of the Russian-speaking group. In terms of reading habits, the parents in both cases read to their children every day and speak their native language while reading, just as is the case with the other participants. Regarding the amount of books at home, the number of books differs from family to family, but the parents in my two cases and in the rest of the group have children's books in their native language(s) and in Norwegian. The biggest difference between my two cases and the rest of the group is that David speaks three languages fluently, not two. Both target children began to attend kindergarten when they were 12-13 months and attend kindergarten a full day, all week. Both children speak good Russian and switch to other languages if it is needed with particular persons. Parents in both families were born abroad and speak minority languages at home and teach their children to speak minority language(s).

4.5 Methods of data analysis

In this section I will focus on how I approached and managed my data before and during the analysis. I will describe how I coded and constructed my categories/themes, how I organized and refined them, my step-by-step actions before and during the analysis of my data. I will base this section partly on the guideline by Braun & Clarke (2008) who provide a description of thematic analysis, where I got some inspiration in how to conduct qualitative analysis. This section will be partially based on Merriam's (2009) analysis of qualitative data as well.

In the first phase, I familiarized myself with my data, in depth and breadth of the content (Braun & Clarke, 2008). I heard the audio recordings many times before I began to transcribe them. Braun & Clarke (2008) speaks about "repeated and active reading" to search for meanings and patterns. For me it was repeated and active listening before transcribing my data. I transcribed my data. Some aspects of my transcription are shown in Appendix 1. All my transcribed data was chosen for analysis. As previously said, I had four recordings with data from home reading and three recordings with data with reading from preschool.

Therefore, the next phase was for me to begin the process of categorizing and coding data. According to Merriam (2009) coding is *"assigning of shorthand designation to various aspects of the data"* (p. 173) so that pieces of data can be retrieved if necessary. My designation was in the form of numbers. For example, "3.2" stood for "Mother requests label for object". All my categories and codes are presented in the Appendix 2. According to Merriam (2009) each segment is a unit of data that can give a possible answer or part of answer to the research question. All my coding was performed manually. While coding, I identified segments of data that were *responsive* (Merriam, 2009) to my research question. I assigned a code to each utterance. All utterances had a number. My process of coding consisted of breaking data into bits of information (Merriam, 2009). Those utterances that had *recurring regularities* had the same code (Merriam, 2009) and I assigned category to the coded data. These regularities become the categories (Merriam, 2009). *"Categories are conceptual elements that "cover" or span many individual examples (or bits or units of the data) of the category"* (Merriam, 2009, p.181). I worked with the whole transcript of one reading session and put together codes that seem to go together, thus creating a category (Merriam, 2009). For example, codes such as "labeling" and "counting", were put together in the category 3.2 that is called "Prompting labeling, counting". I did the same with the second transcript. While I coded the second transcript, I found out that I had to add some categories, because they were not present in the first transcript. Some codes were included or merged with the main categories/themes, those that were not relevant, were deleted; some codes were combined again to form an overarching theme or category (Braun & Clarke, 2008). In the process I was making comments and notes for myself. I did the same with transcript three, four, five, six and seven. Since my data consists of recordings from home and school, that are quite different in social settings, I had to add some codes and categories, those, for example, that reading at home did not have or vise versa. So, all 7 reading session transcripts were transcribed and categories were merged into one main list (Appendix 2). In this phase, I reviewed and refined my themes/categories one more time (Braun & Clarke, 2008). First, I reviewed categories at the level of the coded data extracts, afterwards, I did the same, but in the relation to the entire data set. At this point, I considered the validity of individual categories/themes in relation to the data set and whether my individual themes reflected the whole data set (Braun & Clarke, 2008). I read my data one more time. First of all, to be sure that my categories/themes correspond with the whole data set and to code any additional data that I could have missed in the earlier coding stages (Braun & Clarke, 2008). In the

beginning, I had many more categories than are presented in the Appendix 2. All the bits of data that I could put together were merged into one category and then I gave it a name (Merriam, 2009). Some categories were deleted since they were not relevant. At this stage, I "defined and refined" categories one more time. By "defining and refining" Braun & Clarke (2008) refer to identifying the "essence" of what each theme is about and determining what aspect of data each theme captures. I organized categories in the way that seems to be most suitable for me in terms of analyzing, some categories were paraphrased. According to Braun & Clarke (2008), it is vital that I do not just paraphrase my themes, but identify what it is that interests me about them and why. I renamed the categories several times to portray more vividly what this category was about or what kind of data it represented (Merriam, 2009). Names of categories have to give a sense of what the theme is about (Braun & Clarke, 2008). Regarding the names of the categories, they came from the mix of two sources, me as a researcher and literature (Merriam, 2009). I borrowed some names of categories from Maria Teodora Ping's (2014) study. Before borrowing some category names, I made sure that they were compatible with the aim and theory framework of my study (Merriam, 2009). Some other categories were created while I made notes during reading of transcripts before coding. Categories that I created met the following criteria (Merriam, 2009): they are *responsive to the purpose of my research* (Merriam, 2009), that means that with their help, I will be able to answer my research question. All data that to my mind was relevant to my study was coded and categorized. My categories are *mutually exclusive* (Merriam, 2009) that means that I could place only one utterance in a particular category. Categories are *sensitizing* (Merriam, 2009), this means that I tried to name categories in such a way that they could reveal or reflect best what the category was about. In the long run, I ended up with 33 categories, where 17 were created to cover adult's utterances and 16 were created to cover child's speech. I described (Appendix 2, column-*Definition*) what each category/theme was about in a couple of sentences (Braun & Clarke, 2008). In the next phase, I listened to the recordings one more time and compared them with already coded utterances to double check the correctness of the coding. In such a way I revised my themes/categories once again. After I finished with categorizing and coding, my supervisor coded some random chosen pages in each transcript as well to check the inter-rater reliability. My supervisor used my list with categories that are shown in Appendix 2. The value for Cronbach's alpha was 0,932 that indicate a high inter-rater reliability for my scale with this specific sample.

According to Merriam (2009) the fewer the categories the better, it will be easier for researcher to present the findings. *"The categories became the findings of the study"* (Merriam, 2009, p. 193). When I began to analyze my transcriptions, I used highlighters in different colors to mark different categories.

I analyzed all data available to me which was 69 minutes of audio-recordings. With this much data available, I had the possibility to choose the most representative examples in my analysis.

My data material includes seven transcribed adult-child book reading sessions that lasted between 9 and 21 minutes each. In total, adults and all children together produced 1607 utterances during seven book reading sessions. During home book reading sessions, the mother and the child participated in book reading sessions. In preschools, there were different amount of children in each group during joint book reading session. There were 2 participants (David's group) and 5 participants (Alexander's group) during all preschool book reading sessions.

Both my main and supplementary data was collected in Russian and Norwegian languages. In terms of translation issues, I chose the following strategy for translation of my data: my transcripts were prepared in Russian and Norwegian, my data analysis was done in English, I translated my findings into English. As I am bilingual myself, all the translations from and to Russian, Ukrainian, Norwegian and English were made by me personally and double-checked by my supervisor.

4.6 Qualitative research and notions of credibility, consistency and transferability

While quantitative research uses such terms as validity, reliability and generalizability, several qualitative researchers suggest alternative concepts to be used for securing quality when pursuing qualitative research. In qualitative research instead of terms reliability and validity, terms such as credibility, consistency and transferability are used (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

This section addresses the specific concerns in qualitative research with respect to internal validity or credibility, reliability or consistency and external validity or transferability. Here I will mention the strategies that I employ in my study to ensure that my study is trustworthy.

Internal validity deals with the question of how research findings correspond with reality (Merriam, 2009). However, one of the assumption underlying qualitative research is that reality is multidimensional and ever-changing, not a fixed phenomenon waiting to be discovered, observed and measured. That's why "reality" is not an appropriate determinant of validity, according to Merriam (2009). The best known strategy to strengthen the internal validity of a study or to increase the "credibility" of the findings is triangulation that is the use of multiple methods to check the data (Merriam, 2009). Due to time limits, I could not compare and cross-check my data, also I did not have possibility to involve someone else to analyze my data to compare findings. One further strategy one could use to strengthen the internal validity of a study that Merriam (2009) speaks about is labeled as researcher's position or reflexivity – "*the process of reflecting critically on the self as a researcher, the "human as instrument*" (Lincoln & Guba, 2000, p. 183), "*the researcher is the instrument*" (Patton, 2002, p.14). According to Stenbacka (2001), only a reflective researcher can make the process of study visible to him/her and others and without the continuous reflection in each phase of study, the level of understanding will not rise. While writing this thesis, I made reflections in each part of this work. In the process of the study, I wrote down questions, then made decisions while working. In terms of my biases and relation to the study, I am aware of my possible influence on the findings. During the process of conducting my study, I tried to stay as open and neutral as possible. I have no personal relation to anyone that participated in my case study. Audio-recording were made in usual to children and preschool teachers atmosphere, at home and in preschool. They were made independently of me as a researcher as I was not present during recordings. Yet, joint book reading situations in the classrooms and at home were arranged on the request of the researchers and as a part of intervention, so I understand the fact that they may not be completely natural. Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 299) while speaking about objectivity in the research based definition on the notion that "*is possible to allow Nature to "speak" without impact from the values the inquirer or any of his or her cohorts*". Objectivity, according to Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 299), exists when the appropriate methodology is employed that maintains an adequate distance between observer and observed (not disturbing or being disturbed). Despite the fact that the researcher is never

completely free from bias, I had an advantage of being distant from the field and not be able to influence the research objects directly.

Reliability refers to the extent to which research findings can be reproduced (Merriam, 2009) or the basic reliability issues which concerns a measurement method's ability to produce the same research result over and over again (Stenbacka, 2001). Merriam (2009) points out that qualitative research cannot be conducted so that the laws of human behavior can be isolated. Reliability is problematic in social sciences because human behavior is never static; it is changeable, highlights Merriam (2009). Replication of the study will not give the same results, according to Merriam (2009), but it does not discredit the results either, because there can be many interpretations of the same data. According to Stenbacka (2001), the basic distinction that makes reliability irrelevant is the notion of "measurement method", which is not relevant in qualitative research. According to Stenbacka (2001), the concept of reliability is misleading in qualitative research. If a qualitative study is discussed with reliability as a criterion, the consequence is rather that the study is not good (Stenbacka, 2001). Lincoln & Guba (1985) state that replicability in the traditional sense can be determined only within a given framework and that framework is itself a construction, not an inevitable and unchanging part of "reality". To Merriam (2009, p. 221) the most important question is *whether the results are consistent with the data collected"*. Some of the strategies to ensure consistency (triangulation, peer examination, investigator's position I did not have the possibility to do) is audit trail, method suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Audit trail is a method that describes in detail how data was collected, how categories were derived and decisions that were made throughout the study, in other words the detailed account of how the study was conducted. Stenbacka (2001) underlines that a thorough description of the whole process is what indicate good quality in a qualitative method. I attempted to make my study as thorough and transparent as possible in this respect.

External validity is concerned with the extent to which the findings of one study can be applied to other situations, that is how generalizable are the results of the research study. My study is a case study with a small sample that is selected because I wanted to understand my particular case, but not to find what is generally true of the many and I will not be able to generalize in the statistical sense. Merriam (2009) suggests thinking of generalizability in ways appropriate to the philosophical support of the qualitative research. Lincoln and Guba (1985) move from the question of generalizability and suggest the notion of transferability

and speak about *sufficient descriptive data* to make transferability possible (Lincoln and Guba (1985). Merriam (2009) also speaks about strategy in terms of rich, thick description of the study, so that the results of the qualitative study could be "transferred" to other settings. I think it is one of the strengths of qualitative research that with the help of qualitative method make it is possible to transfer results to other settings. However, it has to be a highly descriptive, detailed presentation of the settings and findings of the study. Lincoln and Guba (1985) state, that the best way to ensure transferability is to create a *thick description* of the context and the case study is ideal for providing this thick description for enabling transferability judgments (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). This thick description must specify everything that the reader may need to know in order to understand the findings of the study.

Methodological appropriateness is a primary criterion for judging methodological quality, recognizing that different methods are appropriate for different situations (Patton, 2002). In this chapter I provided the explanation of why chosen methods were appropriate for my study.

Analysts have an obligation to monitor and report their own analytical procedures and processes as fully and truthfully as possible (Patton, 2002). I reported my step-by-step procedures while conducting my study.

4.7 Limitations

While writing this chapter it is also important to mention limitations of my study. The main limitation of my study is that data is audio-recorded, but not video-recorded. Unfortunately, I did not have the capacity to have video recordings. With my data, I am able to hear the conversations, but I am not able to capture non-verbal communication or responses, such as head nods, pointing at each other or pointing to particular pictures in the book during interaction, nor could I say something about positions, location of the child. I could not tell when some pages were omitted during the reading sessions and whether they went to the last page.

My data is derived from just two cases. Due of the limited number of children (cases) and recordings in this research, the results from my research cannot be generalized to all bilingual children with Russian as the first language living in Norway, but my study can contribute to gaining an understanding about how adults can engage bilingual preschoolers in

conversations during joint book reading in two different languages in two different settings, home and preschool.

4.8   Ethical considerations

In this section, I will reflect on my ethical views and attitudes. My study was part of a bigger project and consent from Norwegian Social Science Data Service[2] (NSD) was received by leaders of the main project. In terms of issues concerning this research, society and ethics, I have consented to confidentiality, since I was a part of the project and had access to the confidential material. In my methodological chapter I justified for my method selection and stated that it was not prejudiced and that methods were chosen deliberately. I was as neutral as possible during the whole process of writing this work. In terms of issues concerning protection of individuals, participants in the main study were informed about the goal of the study; that is, how parents and preschool teachers could help bilingual children to develop both languages before school start. Parents agreed voluntary to participate in the project and gave their consent on behalf of their children. All the information about the participants of my study were treated confidentially. The individuals mentioned in my study cannot be identified, the names of the target children are fictive and the names of the preschools are not mentioned here and no information that makes possible to identify those people is mentioned. The research material was anonymized and the data has been anonymized in transcription as well.

Thagaard (2009) believes that it is important that researcher shows respect for informant's boundaries and an informant does not have to be pressed to give information he/she might regret afterwards. In the interview guide that I used, there were some questions about background of the families that were voluntary to answer. Parents had choice whether or not to answer the questions if they thought them too personal or sensitive they could decline to answer.

In terms of storage of material, all data and information about identifiable individuals is carefully and securely stored by the leaders of the project. In terms of issues concerning research community, I have stated sources while using publications and other research

---

[2]   NSD is one of the largest archives for research data of its kind and data to researchers and students in Norway and abroad. Additionally, NSD is a resource centre, which assists researchers with regard to data provides gathering, data analysis, and issues of methodology, privacy and research ethics. http://www.nsd.uib.no/nsd/english/index.html

materials. In terms of issues concerning community interests and research, I hope that my study will contribute to gaining insight into how Russian-Norwegian preschoolers are engaged in joint book reading at home and in preschool as well as to gaining knowledge about what kind of joint book reading activities conducted in two different languages bilinguals can experience.

5 Analysis

5.1 Direct and indirect strategies used by adults to engage target children in conversations about the book

This chapter has two parts. In the first part, I will present and discuss examples of conversations during book reading episodes conducted at home and in preschools to illustrate how adults engage bilingual children directly and indirectly to actively participate in conversations about the book. I will illustrate that adults' reading can lead to spontaneous participation on the part of the child and provides many learning opportunities. In the other part, I will illustrate and compare the target-children's participation in conversations during joint book reading sessions in two different settings, home and preschool, in two different languages.

5.1.1 Adults' strategies and children's behaviors

Low cognitive demand strategies

The examples presented below are meant to illustrate that the adult's strategy during joint book reading seem to influence the type of answer the target children provide. The most frequently used strategy by both Russian-speaking parents involves strategy that prompts recalling. A typical example of how the Russian-speaking parents use questions that prompt recalling are discussed further bellow as well to what degree they are effective at engaging children actively participate in conversation. Two Russian-speaking parents asked their children to recall some aspects of the book 103 times during 4 book reading sessions. This type of invitation is prevalent among both parents.

Excerpt 1. In this excerpt Alexander's mother invites her child to actively participate in book reading session by asking him recall questions. This excerpt is taken from a book reading session when the mother and the child read the book "Frog, where are you?". This is a narrative book about a boy who is looking for his frog and finally finds it. This situation takes place in the beginning of the reading session.

1.Alexander's mother:	*что дальше было?*
	what happened next?
2. Alexander:	*лягушку зовет.*
	calls froggy.
3. Alexander's mother:	*тогда мальчик начал что делать?*
	and then the boy began to do what?
4. Alexander:	*в сапоги перевернул еще.*
	in the boots turned as well.

In the first line of this excerpt Alexander's mother asks Alexander to recall information by asking him what happens next. Alexander replies that the boy calls the froggy (line 2). In the next line Alexander's mother continues asking the other recall question where she wonders what the boy began to do next (line 3). Alexander explains what the boy is doing while he is looking for the froggy (line 4).

This excerpt of conversation illustrates that the mother asks the child to recall some aspects of the book two times during this short excerpt. It is mother who initiates and leads this conversation by asking the child to recall some aspects of the book. After asking the first recalling question, the mother gives Alexander time to answer the question. After getting the answer, the mother asks question that prompts further recall which leads to child's answer. The pattern of this interaction is a question-answer pattern where the mother asks question to get the answer from the child. According to Linell (1998) sequential utterances in dialogue are used to get the answer from interlocutor or test his/her understanding and interlocutor, in turn can demonstrate knowledge. The mother's utterance is used here to get the answer from the child. She wants to test child's understanding of the book, while the child uses his utterances to demonstrate to his mother how he interprets what is going on. It seems like the mother is successful with her strategy as both questions lead to the child answering. It is interesting to note that both recalling questions prompt the child to recall. This example illustrates how Alexander's mother invites the child to recall information from the book in Russian by asking recalling questions, the type of questions that are predominate in all four home book reading sessions. Most of the time the type of utterance from the child is consistent with the parent's utterance that elicited it, 63 out of 103 times children recalled information about the book as a response on the question that demands recalling. Another interesting feature was that the mothers gave answers to their own recalling questions that were addressed to children just 7 out of 103 times. During the other 23 occasions, the mothers tried to engage the children in book reading conversations by paraphrasing the recalling questions, substituting recalling questions with questions that demand completion, labeling or

try to connect the story of the book with child's life. Below I will provide short examples to illustrate what the mothers are doing to help their children answer the questions.

Excerpt 2. The mother tries to engage Alexander in a book reading conversations by *paraphrasing the recalling questions.* This excerpt is taken from a book reading session when the mother and the child read the book "Pancakes for breakfast". This is a fact-based book where children can learn what ingredients one needs to make a dish.

1. Alexander's mother:	*а дальше что произошло?* (1)
	what happened next?
2. Alexander's mother:	*что она унюхала?* (1)
	what did she smell?
3. Alexander:	*унюхала блинчики от соседей.*
	smelled pancakes from the neighbors.
4. Alexander's mother:	*блинчики от соседей, да!*
	pancakes from the neighbors, yes!

In the first line of this excerpt the mother asks Alexander to recall what happened next. In the next line she is not only reformulating the question into another recalling question because the child does not answer the first question, but she is making her question more specific (line 2). Alexander recalls information (line 3) that is followed by the mother's confirmation (line 4).

In this excerpt mother invites the child to talk by asking the question that elicits recalling. After a short waiting pause, mother paraphrases her question into another one of the same type, as she understands that child is not able to answer. Perhaps because the mother makes the question more specific, Alexander gives the answer. It appears to be a successful strategy as child produces the utterance.

Excerpt 3. This excerpt is an example of how Alexander's mother substitutes recalling questions with *questions that demand completion.* They are reading the same book.

1. Alexander's mother:	*так, теперь, что она делает, посмотри-ка?* (2)
	now, what is she doing, look?
2. Alexander's mother:	*молоко_____.* (1.5)
	milk_____.
3. Alexander:	*молоко размешивает.*
	milk mixes.
4. Alexander's mother:	*да, мешает она его, взбивает.*
	yes, mixes it, whips.

The mother asks Alexander to recall what granny was doing (line 1). The mother does not get an answer, so she pauses to invite the child to talk (line 2). Alexander fills in the blank by naming what granny is doing (line 3). The mother confirms and expands the child's answer.

As we see, in this excerpt the mother fails to engage the child in conversation by asking him to recall some information. After giving the child time to think and understanding that the child cannot answer, she, instead of answering her own question, implements the pausing strategy. It seems like this strategy was successful as she gets the child's answer. The mother gives her confirmative "yes" and expands the child's speech.

Excerpt 4. This excerpt illustrates how David's mother helps him to answer the question by substituting recalling questions with a *question that demands labeling*. They are reading the book "Frog, where are you?"

1.David's mother:	*ну то, с кем он еще жил?* (1.5)
	he lives with whom?
2. David's mother:	*кто это?* (1)
	who is this?
3. David:	*собака.*
	a dog.
4. David's mother:	*да собака, да?*
	yes, a dog, huh?

The mother initiates this conversation by asking the child to recall whom the boy is living with (line 1). She does not get the answer from the child, so she substitutes recalling with labeling strategy, by asking "who is this?" and most likely pointing at the picture (line 2). Alexander labels the animal (line 3). Mother seems to be satisfied with Alexander's answer as she confirms and repeats his words.

This excerpt illustrates that the mother assists the child in answering the question by substituting one strategy with another. After asking him to recall and not getting the answer, the mother switches to labeling strategy. It seems like this strategy is successful in this case as mother receives the answer.

Excerpt 5. This excerpt will illustrate how the mother tries to help the child to answer the question by substituting the question that demands recalling *by question that connects the story of the book with child's life.* Alexander and his mother are reading the book "Pancakes for breakfast".

1.Alexander's mother:	*ну это не масло, а что она делает?* (1)
	but it is not butter, what is she doing?
2. Alexander's mother:	*что мы делаем когда блинчики печем?* (2)

	what are we doing when we are baking pancakes?
3. Alexander:	*еее яйцо.*
	eee egg.
4. Alexander's mother:	*тесто делают сначала.*
	made the dough first.

The mother asks the child to recall what granny is doing when she bakes pancakes (line 1). As she does not get the answer from the child, she attempts to connect the story in the book with the child's life and asks him what they do when they make pancakes (line 2). The child gives the answer (line 3). In the next line, the mother gives her explanation.

This excerpt illustrates that the mother assists the child in answering the question by substituting the recalling strategy with a strategy that connects events of the story with child's life. As we can see, this strategy is successful as the child contributes to the conversation with the answer.

Excerpts 2, 3, 4 and 5 illustrate how the mothers help their children to answer the questions. First, instead of answering their own questions, the mothers substitute one strategy for another, which has been successful in all these cases. Secondly, the mothers assist their children with answering the questions, but do not provide answers themselves. Thirdly, in excerpts 2, 3, 4 and 5 we can trace that the type of child's utterance is consistent with the parent's utterance that elicits it.

Taking into consideration the strategy that elicits recalling, most of the time the cognitive level of the strategy corresponds to the same cognitive level of response produced by children. Recalling strategy can be categorized as strategy that requires low cognitive demand on the child (Sigel, 1986; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001). In most cases it is responded to appropriately by the child as such strategy makes little demand for reflective thoughts. It only requires recalling and describing.

Unlike the parents, both preschool teachers seldom use the strategy of prompting recall, just 15 times (as mentioned above, parents use this strategy 103 times) during 3 classroom reading sessions. 2 of 15 recall questions are directed towards the target children (Alexander & David); 13 times towards other children in the group. With the example below I will show how the preschool teacher invite bilingual children to participate in conversations by asking questions that prompt recalling.

Excerpt 6. In my data material there is the only one instance of Alexander being invited to answer a recall question by his teacher. In this excerpt a preschool teacher and 5 bilingual preschoolers Sunita (4 years, who speaks Urdu), Ali (5 years, who speaks Dari), Mohammed (4 years, who speaks Urdu), Abhira (5 years, who speaks Tamil) and Alexander are reading a narrative book "Frog, where are you?" together. Alexander is the first child in the group who is asked by the teacher to read.

1.Alexander:	**xxx finner han der og sånn der.**
	xxx he finds there and like there.
2. Alexander's teacher:	**hva gjør han?**
	what is he doing?
3. Alexander:	**finner frosken inni der.**
	finds frog in there.
4. Alexander's teacher:	**han leter etter frosken.**
	he is looking for the frog.
5. Alexander:	**ja.**
	yes.

After being asked by the teacher to read, Alexander starts to tell the story in the book. He explains that the boy finds the frog and most likely points to the place where the frog is found (line 1). The child uses word "finds" instead of "looks for", but at the beginning of this book, the boy is looking for the frog, not finding it. Alexander's teacher prompts further recall by asking what the boy is doing (line 2). Alexander recalls that the boy finds frog "in there" probably pointing at the picture again (line 3). Alexander's teacher seems to understand what the child is trying to say, corrects him by saying that the boy is looking for the frog. In the next line Alexander confirms the teacher's suggestion by saying "yes".

This example illustrates how the teacher is building on the child's utterance to prompt him to describe the situation. After being asked, Alexander narrates the story in the book. Alexander seems to struggle to verbalize what is going on in the book. The teacher helps him by prompting him to describe the situation. Alexander attempts to describe what is happening in the story. We see how the teacher's recall question elicits the child's answer, even though Alexander uses an incorrect word. The teacher corrects Alexander by reformulation of his utterance. This example supports Vygotsky's (1978) assertion, that the child's participation is dependent on adult assistance. The same pattern that I trace from the home data about consistency of the adult's strategy and the child's verbal behavior, I observe in data from preschool. As I mentioned above, the teachers use this type of question only 15 times. However, in 13 of 15 times, the type response from the child coincides with the type request

from the teacher. In 2 other instances, I am not able to hear the answer or the child reasoned his/her answer. There is not a one time that this type of question is not answered at preschool. This example is used to illustrate how preschool teacher invites bilingual children to talk by asking recalling questions, in addition how Alexander responds on the same type of questions about the same book, but this time in Norwegian.

It is interesting to observe that both parents' and teachers' strategies that prompt recalling are responded to appropriately by the child most of the time. The other pattern that I observed was how persistent both parents and teachers were to invite children to participate in conversations. Data shows that adults answer their own recalling questions just few times, other times seems like they try to reformulate the recalling questions or substitute this strategy with other strategies to assist child with a response.

The other strategy that is more popular among parents than teachers and where I trace consistency of adults' invitation and child's behavior is the pausing strategy. The excerpts below serve to illustrate how adults invite children to actively participate in the joint book reading session by pausing. With this strategy, adults take intentional pauses during reading/telling the story so that child can complete the word or sentence. This strategy prompts inserting words by filling in the blank spots. I find that there is a significant difference in the quantity of completion prompts used by mothers and teachers. Mothers use this type of strategy 59 times during 4 reading sessions, while teachers use this strategy 12 times during 3 book reading sessions. The examples below will illustrate the strategy that is used by parents and teachers.

Excerpt 7. In this excerpt David and his mother are reading the book "Frog, where are you?". This situation takes place in the middle of the reading session.

1. David's mother:	*залез на такой огромный камень.*
	climbed on the huge stone.
2. David's mother:	*а за камнем прятался_____.*
	and behind the rock was hiding_____.
3. David:	*олень.*
	deer.
4. David's mother:	*да.*
	yes.

In the first line of this excerpt, David's mother reads the story. In the next line she continues to read and pauses so that David can fill in the blank by naming the animal. David fills in the

blank by saying word "deer" (line 3), that is followed by mother's confirmation in the next line.

This example shows how David's mother uses the strategy that prompts completion from the child. After reading mother stops intentionally to engage the child in the joint reading process. Most likely she has a predefined answer on this question when she uses this strategy and she expects child to answer in a defined way. It seems like the mother's strategy is successful as David completes sentence. It seems as if David's mother accepts his answer as satisfactory. In this example, the strategy that prompts the child's verbal participation is a pausing strategy and it leads to one-word utterance.

In comparison, preschool teachers use this strategy relatively rarely. Examples below will help me to illustrate this strategy used in preschool settings.

Excerpt 8. In the example below the teacher and children read book "Penguin" which is a fact-based book about the life of penguins. By reading this book children learn facts about penguins. This part of conversation occurred in the middle of the reading session. A preschool teacher and 5 bilingual children Sunita, Ali, Mohammed, Abhira and Alexander are present during this book reading activity. The teacher asks an open question about where the penguins are going. The children struggle to answer and the teacher gives them a prompt.

1.Alexander's teacher: **An_____.**(1.5)
An_____.
2. Alexander's teacher: **Anta_____.**(1)
Anta_____.
3. Children together: **Antarktis.**
Antarctica.

Teacher names the first two letters in the word and pauses (line 1) so that children can continue, but it seems like no one can give the answer. Therefore, in the next line instead of giving answer, the teacher adds two letters more to make it easier for children to complete. The children give the correct answer all together (line 3).

The example above depicts how the preschool teacher implements the pausing strategy to engage children in reading conversations. It is notable to observe that the teacher does not give the answer to the children after naming the two first letters of the word. She waits and adds two more letters before reacting, and as Wells (1999) said she assists the children with that they are not able to do themselves to promote their thinking. Likewise, she is not in a hurry to give them the answer. With the teacher's assistance, the children manage to find the

correct answer on their own. It seems like all children could recall this word because they answer all together. Teacher supports children's participation by giving them prompt that makes the task easier for them, so that they can find the answer themselves.

With the excerpts 7 and 8, I present the way adults use the completion prompt to invite children to actively participate in joint book reading. Additionally, in this strategy, children's answers are consistent with adult's request. Adults use this strategy 71 times in total during 7 book reading sessions and 53 of 71 times children's answer correspond with adults' strategy, that is, children fill in the gap as a response to adult's pausing strategy. In other cases, adults have to use other strategies or in some very few cases divulge the answer themselves. As a rule, this strategy seems to be successful, as it is eliciting answers from children. Mostly this strategy leads to one-word child's answers, rather than longer 2-3 word utterances. In most cases, adults do not provide the answer themselves; they assist children in their attempts to answer the question. Only 2 times out of 71 in total did adults complete their own completion requests themselves, as it is illustrated in the example below.

Excerpt 9. In this excerpt, David's preschool teacher is using the same type of strategy as Alexander's teacher in the excerpt 8. This is the only example of completion prompt used by David's teacher. In this excerpt a preschool teacher and 2 bilingual preschoolers, David and Adrian (5 years old, who speaks Ukrainian) are reading a book together. Adrian is David's best friend in the kindergarten; they both speak Ukrainian at home and often speak Ukrainian to each other in the kindergarten. They are reading the same book as in previous excerpt. This conversation occurs at the beginning of the reading session.

1.David's teacher:	**hvor kommer fisken fra?**
	where comes fish from?
2. Adrian:	**fra mammaen.**
	from mother.
3. David's teacher:	**fra mammaen sin m_____.**(1.5)
	from mother's s_____.
4. David & Adrian:	**m.**
	s.
5. David's teacher:	**mage og munn.**
	stomach and mouth.
6. David's teacher:	**mammaen sin mage og munn.**
	mother's stomach and mouth.

This excerpt starts when David's teacher wonders where the fish comes from by asking a recall question. Adrian provides the information in the next line. The teacher seems to expand

Adrian's answer by repeating Adrian's words, adding first letter from the second word. The teacher pauses so that the children could complete the word (line 3). Both children repeat this letter without saying the whole word (line 4). In the next two lines the teacher gives answer to her question and expands her own answer (line 6).

The teacher's question in the first line prompts Adrian's recalling. Most likely the teacher has predefined answer and is not satisfied with Adrian's answer, so she gives the children another prompt, building on Adrian's utterance and adding the first letter in the word and pauses (line 2). Both children repeat the same letter without any completion (line 3). Unlike Alexander's teacher (excerpt 4) David's teacher gives then the answer to her own question, instead of, for example, trying to assist more and not solving the task herself. In this case the teacher's completion prompt does not elicit a meaningful answer from children and the teacher answers her own question herself in order to manage the flow of their conversation.

The same patterns that I trace in recalling and pausing strategies, I observed in the strategy that prompts children's labeling and counting during joint book reading. This strategy is not used often by adults. The strategy that prompted labeling or counting among children is used 14 times by parents during 4 book reading sessions and 11 times by teachers during 3 book reading session.

Excerpt 10. The example below is a typical example question among both parents and both teachers that prompts labeling. This excerpt is taken from the reading session when David and his mother read book "Frog, where are you?". This conversation occurs at the beginning of the reading session.

1.David's mother: *это что?*
                       what is this?
2. David: *банка.*
                       a jar.

In the beginning of the excerpt David's mother asks him to label the object in the picture, asking "what is this?" possibly pointing at the picture. In the next line, David labels the object by saying "a jar".

The example above indicates how David's mother used a labeling prompt to invite her child to participate in conversation and to identify the object depicted in the book. As we see this strategy is successful as the child is prompted to talk, but his talk results in one-word utterance (line 2).

It seems like children are motivated to speak when adults invite them to talk by using strategies that prompts labeling/counting. As expected, this strategy in most cases leads to one-word answer. Again, adults, except for one time, are not giving answer to their own question. They assist children by reformulating the questions if the children are not providing answers straight away. There is consistency between the strategy adults' use and the answer they get from the child.

The other strategy that in most cases leads to one-word utterance and that parents and teachers use to invite participation in conversations about the book is asking yes/no questions. I registered that parents use 29 yes/no questions during 4 book reading sessions at home, teachers use 27 yes/no questions during 3 book reading sessions at preschool.

Excerpt 11. In the example below David is reading the book "Frog, where are you?" with his mother. They are in the middle of the reading session.

1.David's mother:	*а озеро было глубокое?*
	was the lake deep?
2. David:	*нет.*
	no.
3. David's mother:	*нет, да?*
	no, huh?
4. David's mother:	*совсем не глубокое.*
	not deep at all.

In the first line, David's mother asks the child the type of question that elicits only yes/no answer. In the next line, David gives the answer "no". The mother, getting a short response from child, confirms it by repeating child's answer. She continues to expand child's answer by paraphrasing it in the next line.

The example above is a typical example of how Russian-speaking parents invite their children to participate in book discussions by asking questions that elicit yes/no answers. The mother was successful in engaging child to speak, but his contribution is a one-word utterance. His answer is consistent with mother's question, which requires a yes/no answer. This example serves to illustrate that child's responses are generally dependent on the type of adults' request. My data shows that parents receive yes/no answer most of the time as a response to yes/no strategy used by parents. A few other times parents did not get an answer to this type of question. Regarding use of yes/no prompts in preschool, children's responses are usually based on the teachers' strategy as well. In some few cases, teachers did not receive the answer or received extended answer.

Recalling, pausing, labeling/counting, yes-no question strategies are categorized as strategies that put low cognitive demand on the child's response (Sigel, 1986; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001). As I document above, in my data material, low cognitive demand strategies that are employed by both teachers and parents most often lead to low cognitive demand child answers.

High cognitive demand strategies

Adults invite children to actively participate in conversations about the book by asking inferential questions as well. The strategy that elicits children's inferring, that is considered to be high cognitive demand strategy (Sigel, 1986; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001) is used more often by preschool teachers than parents. Although, in general, this practice is not employed often. It was used 8 times by parents and 10 times by teachers, so there is not a significant difference between parents and teachers in using this strategy.

 Excerpt 12. The excerpt below exemplifies the typical example of how Russian-speaking mothers encourage their bilingual children to speak by asking questions that elicit inferring. Alexander and his mother are reading "Frog, where are you?". This conversation occurs at the beginning of the reading session.

1.Alexander's mother:	*зачем она вылезает, как ты думаешь?*
	why is it going out from there, what do you think?((talking about the frog))
2.Alexander:	*потому она хочет гулять немножко.*
	because it wants go for a walk a little bit.

In the beginning of this excerpt Alexander's mother asks his opinion as to why the frog is coming out of the jar. Alexander gives his suggestion in the form of expanded utterance (line 2).

In this conversation mother asks the child to reason why something happens in the story. It seems like this type of question not only requires the child to reflect, but also to find the right words in order to convey his/her thinking verbally to his interlocutor. This type of questions demands not only attention, but also analyzing the information available and interpreting information which goes beyond the immediately available. As we can see, Alexander's mother uses a high level cognitive strategy and the child responds properly by producing full, expanded utterance. This is the case in 7 of 8 instances in home settings.

Excerpt 13. In this excerpt the preschool teacher uses strategy that elicits inferring during joint book reading. In this excerpt a preschool teacher and 5 bilingual preschoolers, among them Sunita, Ali, Mohammed, Abhira and Alexander are reading a book together. They read a fact-based book "Penguin" and begin to discuss the pictures. The teacher directs this question at all children in the group and it is Abhira who takes the initiative and answers the question.

1.Alexander's teacher:	**ja hvorfor kan ikke egget bare ligge på isen?** yes but why cannot the egg just lie on the ice?
2. Abhira:	**nei da blir den knekt.** no it can be broken.

The preschool teacher asks the children to reason why the penguin's egg cannot lie on the ice (line 1). Abhira, one of the girls in the group shares her opinion (line 2).

In this example the teacher engages the children in conversation by asking inferential question (line 1). It is interesting to note that the teacher builds the question in such a way that it is not really possible to answer it just looking on the pictures. Children have to come with their suggestions and justify their thinking. Again, the children have to exercise their thinking skills, to interpret beyond what is illustrated in the story. They must also exercise verbalization of their suggestion clearly to other participants in the group to convey what they think. Abhira gives her suggestion in form of expanded answer (line 2). Again, the teacher uses high level cognitive strategy and the child responds it properly. This is the case 8 of 9 times at preschool.

The other high cognitive demand strategy that adults use to engage bilingual children in conversation about a book is asking them to explain something or provide definition. David's teacher and Alexander's mother do not use this strategy in my data-material. David's mother uses this strategy just one time and Alexander's teacher asks children to explain words 16 times during 2 book reading sessions, but she has to repeat some questions several times. With the examples below I will illustrate how adults invite children to participate in conversation by asking them to explain something or give definition of words.

Excerpt 14. In this excerpt David and his mother are reading a narrative book "Frog, where are you?". Conversation occurs at the beginning of the reading session.

1. David's mother:	*а когда много пчел и они так летят, как это называется?* (2) but when there are many bees and they fly together, how do we call it?

2. David:	*ммм.*
	mmm.
3. David's mother:	*рой пчел.*
	swarm of bees.
4. David:	*рой пчел.*
	swarm of bees.

The mother asks David to give a definition of the action that she describes (line 1). David gives a non-meaningful answer (line 2). Then mother provides an answer to her own question (line 3). David seems to confirm the mother's answer by repeating his mother's words. Although this strategy is used just once, this example depicts that David's mother uses strategy of asking the child to provide a definition of the word or explain the word. In this example the strategy is not really successful, as the mother does not get the answer from the child. It may be due to the fact that Alexander either does not know the answer or forgot it. However, such conversation gives great learning opportunity for the child to pickup new words. The mother introduces a word that is new to the child "swarm of bees" and the child repeats the words. In such a way, he becomes acquainted with new word(s). As Bruner (1983) stated language acquired in the process of mother-child interactions when they construct reality together. Yet, the child cannot acquire language without set of language learning capacities. The example above supports Bruner's (1983) statement that for these capacities to function, the child needs adult to provide language acquisition support.

Excerpt 15. The strategy of engaging children to participate in conversation by asking them to explain something or give a definition of words is used at preschool as well. The example below will illustrate this. In this excerpt a preschool teacher and 5 bilingual preschoolers Sunita, Ali, Mohammed, Abhira and Alexander are reading a fact-based book "Penguin" together and are almost at the end of the reading session. The teacher is asking children to explain some words.

1.Teacher 1:	**dyrebar, hva er dyrebar?**
	precious, what is precious?
2. Abhira:	**en ødelagt ting.**
	a broken thing.
3. Alexander's teacher:	**nei.**
	no.
4. Alexander's teacher:	**dyrebar er noe_____.**
	presious is something_____.
5. Abhira:	**som man ønsker seg.**
	that one wants.

The teacher names the word "precious" and asks for its explanation, asking what this word means (line 1). Abhira, one of the girls in the group, explains what she thinks precious means (line 2). The teacher rejects her answer by saying "no" in the next line. Teacher uses the pausing strategy to get the answer from children. Abhira completes the sentence.

The example shows how preschool teacher prompts child's participation by asking for explanation of some words while discussing the book. It seems like the teacher checks their knowledge of the words; she tests the children's understanding of various words. This supports Linell's (1998) statement that communication serves to develop shared and mutual understandings, to test other's understandings of various topics and this testing is inherent in dialogue itself. I assume that the children and the teacher read this book before, and the words were explained and that teacher tested the children to see if they remembered or know the words. Abhira gives her suggestion, though it was not correct. The teacher is not in a hurry to give children the right answer, the teacher corrects the answer by saying "no". This strategy is successful as child gives her opinion though it is not correct. As I said, this type of question refers to high cognitive demands from children, and leads to high cognitive response. It is interesting to observe that the teacher is not giving answer on her own questions while using this strategy. She assists children by using another strategy or repeating the question to give the children more time to think. In addition, the teacher is using high level cognitive demand strategy that is responded appropriately by the child most of the time.

Adults tried to connect the context of the book to child's life to encourage children to participate in conversation. This strategy is also considered to be high cognitive demand strategy (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001).

Excerpt 16. This is a representative example of how the Russian-speaking parents invite their children to talk by connecting the context of the book to the child's life. David and his mother are reading the book "Pancakes for breakfast". This conversation occurs in the middle of the reading session.

1.David's mother:	*и тут она заметила, что у нее кончился сироп кленовый, а она очень любит поливать блинчики клиновым сиропом.* and suddenly she has noticed that she had run out of maple syrup and she loves to pour pancakes with maple syrup.
2. David's mother:	*ты любишь блинчики есть с чем?* what do you like to eat pancakes with?
3. David:	*с медом и с сиропом.*

with honey and syrup.

In the first line of this excerpt, David's mother reads about granny who likes to eat pancakes with maple syrup. In the next line (line 2) David's mother connects the story of the book to child's life and asks David what he likes on his pancakes. David answers saying "with honey and syrup" (line 3).

This strategy is used by both mothers but just one time each. This example shows how Russian-speaking parents prompt the child's verbal participation during joint book reading by asking questions that are related to child's life with the help of the plot in the book (Zevenbergen & Whitehurst, 2003). The mother is using high level cognitive demand strategy. As we can see in the excerpt, the child gives high cognitive level response to this type of question.

Excerpt 17. In this excerpt the preschool teacher invites Alexander to talk by asking questions that are related to child's life. The preschool teacher and 5 bilingual preschoolers Sunita, Ali, Mohammed, Abhira and Alexander are reading the fact-based book "Penguin" together. The teacher asks the children to give definitions of words that are related to the book. The teacher asks what the word "precious" means, the children provide various suggestions with a high degree of creativity, but not close to the actual meaning of the word. The teacher is not in a hurry to give a correct answer, but instead of reformulates the question by asking if children are precious for someone. It seems like the children are not giving meaningful answers from teacher's point of view, so the teacher attempts one more time to connect child's life to the context of the book.

1.Teacher:	**husker ikke hva dyrebar var for noe?** (2)
	do not remember what precious mean?
2. Teacher:	**hva er mamma og pappa da?** (3)
	what is mommy and daddy then?
3. Abhira:	**mamma og pappa er dyrebar.**
	mommy and daddy are precious.
4. Teacher:	**er de dyrebare for dere?** (2)
	are they precious for you?
5. Teacher:	**er dere dyrebare for noen?** (2)
	are you precious for someone?
	((teacher asks other children and now it is Alexander's turn))
6. Teacher:	**hvem er du dyrebar for, Alexander?**
	who are you precious for, Alexander?
7. Alexander:	**pingvin.**
	penguin. ((all children are laughing))

In the beginning of this excerpt the teacher seems to understand that children do not remember what the word "precious" means. In the next line she tries to connect the question to children's life. Abhira gives the answer that is relevant to her life (line 3). In the line 4, 5 teacher attempts again to connect the questions to child's lives. It seems like the children are not giving meaningful answers, so she begins to ask each child whom he/she is precious to. Now it was Alexander's turn to answer. Alexander answers that he is precious to penguin (line 7). All children begin to laugh as they hear Alexander's response.

This example serves to illustrate how preschool teacher attempts to invite children to take part in conversation by connecting some aspects of discussion that are relevant to the book with children's lives. It is interesting that the teacher is not giving the children the answer although she understands that the children do not know/remember this word. She challenges the children to exercise their brains by reformulating the question and connecting it to children's lives. In the line 3 Abhira attempts to answer the question, but the tone of her voice sounds doubtful. It seems like she is not sure if her answer is correct. The teacher keeps on asking questions that are related to children's lives. The teacher is still not giving the answer to what "precious" means, but instead gives another scaffolding prompt, she asks each child who they are precious to. Alexander gives his interpretation of the answer saying that he is precious to penguin. The teacher uses many attempts to engage the children in participation and the most successful way to do it seems to be referring the question to the child while saying his/her name.

The pattern in using this strategy is the same as the other that I mentioned above. Again, children's answers are based on the teacher's strategy. 11 of 14 times the teacher gets answers that correspond with strategy, other 3 times the teacher has to repeat the same question. Notably, neither mothers nor teachers give answer on their own questions.

It seems like the strategy that helps to connect text to child's life is a good strategy to invite all children in the group to actively participate in conversations. Alexander's teacher sets a good example (excerpt 17). As we see she invites Alexander to speak by asking a question that is relevant to his life that is followed by his name. After getting an answer from Alexander, she does the same with all other children in the group. She presents the name and asks the question. In such a way, *all* children in the group have possibility to participate.

Inferring, providing definition/explanation, and connecting the story to child's life are categorized as strategies that place high cognitive demand on the child (Sigel, 1986;

Dickinson & Tabors, 2001). These strategies are seldom used, but in most cases they are responded to appropriately by the child. High cognitive demand strategies lead to high cognitive demand responses in most cases.

Besides the strategy that helps to connect the story in the book to child's life, I observed that it was successful to invite *all* children into conversation. This can be done by asking children to narrate the story and is the other successful strategy used in preschool to engage *everyone* in reading activities.

Excerpt 18. In this excerpt a preschool teacher and 5 bilingual preschoolers, Ali, Mohammed, Abhira and Alexander are reading a book together. They are reading a narrative book "Frog where are you?". This conversation occurs at the beginning of the reading session. Alexander is the first child who was asked to read by the teacher.

1.Alexander's teacher:	**da skal Alexander lese litt for oss.**
	so Alexander will read for us.
2.Alexander's teacher:	**da kan du lese!**
	so you can read!
3. Ina:	**etter Alexander da er det meg.**
	after Alexander it is me.
4. Alexander:	**da blir det xxx frosken.**
	so becomes xxx frog.

In the beginning of this excerpt the teacher asks Alexander to narrate the story. The teacher repeats her request (line 2). Abhira interrupts the teacher, saying that it is she who will read after Alexander (line 3). Alexander begins to read about frog (line 4).

The excerpt below illustrates that strategy of asking children to narrate, engages children to actively participate in the book reading session. Teacher addresses the child by name and he/she presents to all that he/she will read now (line 1). The teacher provides direction of activities. It supports Rogoff's (1990) statement that adult's role is to organize and directs children's activities. The child, in turn, follows the adult's direction and begins to read (line 4). There are 5 children present during this book reading session and teacher invites each child to read one time by calling the child's name. It seems like children are used to this strategy as they obey and begin to read immediately after getting the book.

The mothers attempt to use this strategy as well (just few times) but it does not result in desired answer. It seems like children are more used to the discussion of the book with their parents but not reading the book to their parents after being asked. Yet, it seems like in

preschool this strategy is successful as all children in the group get opportunity to participate in reading session.

The strategy that is used least by adults is the strategy that encourages children to speak by praising. The strategy is used just 1 time among adults to invite children to participate in conversations during joint book reading. For the whole 7 book reading sessions, just David's mother uses it and only once. Data shows that the mother fails to invite child to talk by praising strategy. It may be due to the fact that she does not give him enough time to think or recollect information in Russian. But instead she uses other strategies.

Excerpt 19. David and his mother discuss illustrations in the book "Frog, where are you?" and come to the picture (somewhere in the middle of the book) where there are many frogs.

1. David's mother:	*ну как, много их, давай посчитай.* (3)
	there are a lot of them, let's count.
2. David:	*ххх.*
	xxx.
3. David's mother:	*да умеешь ты, давай.* (1)
	you can, let's count.
4. David's mother:	*раз_____.*
	one_____.
5. David:	*два три четыре пять шесть семь.*
	two three four five sex seven.

In the beginning of this excerpt David's mother asks the child to count how many frogs there are in the picture. David gives the answer that I am not able to hear (line 2). The mother praises David saying the he can do it and asks him to count again (line 3). As mother does not get the answer, she uses the completion prompt (line 4) by counting the first frog. It seems like the completion prompt functions better as David continues to count the frogs (line 5).

This example depicts how persistent the Russian-speaking mother is in inviting the child to count. After 3 unsuccessful attempts to invite David to count, the mother switches the tactic and praises child to invite him to participate (line 2). As David is not giving the answer, she implements the completion prompt (line 3). Obviously, David can count, because he counts in the line 8, and most likely that mother knows it, but it seems that counting is triggered by the other strategy than praising. The mother fails to invite the child to talk by employing the praising strategy. It may be due to the fact that the child cannot recollect numbers in Russian.

My data shows that adults use strategies that require low cognitive demand more often (recalling, pausing, labeling, yes/no) as compared to strategies that require high cognitive

75

demand (inferring, explaining and distancing strategy) that were used less often. It seems like the type of child's response coincides with the type of teacher's request (includes recalling, pausing, labeling, yes/no, inferring, explaining and distancing strategy).

I have observed that pausing, labeling and yes/no prompts lead to one-word answer more often than not. The strategy that elicits inferring seems to be the strategy that leads to expanded answer most of the time.

Strategies that prompts explanation/providing definition seems to be educational for children.

Distancing prompt (connecting context of the book to child's life) and asking the child to narrate prompts seem to be good strategies to engage *everyone* to participate in conversations in the preschool.

I have noticed that the praising prompt is the strategy used the least in my data.

It seems like both parents and adults choose to substitute one strategy with another if they do not get the answer from the child they desire and avoid answering the question themselves.

It was observed that parents use solely Russian language during joint book reading with their children.

5.1.2 Children's spontaneous participation as a reaction on adult's speech/reading

I have observed that not only adult's direct invitations which lead to child's participation in conversations, but adult's reading results in child's utterance production as well. First of all, there is a big difference in how parents and teachers conduct book reading sessions. During 4 joint book reading sessions parents read more often than teachers. Parents produce 116 reading utterances during 4 book reading sessions, while teachers produce 15 reading utterances during 3 book reading sessions. Parental reading in the most cases is not commented on by the child. However, in some instances reading leads to the following spontaneous children's language production: children's confirmation, repetition of the [last] words, questions and adding information to what was said. Teacher's reading (just 15 utterances) is not commented on by the child in the most cases either, but in some instances, children spontaneously confirm or add some information to the teacher's speech. With the

examples below, I will show how adults' reading leads to the child's spontaneous participation in conversations about the book (although not often).

Excerpt 20. In this excerpt, David participates in conversation by confirming the information that is said by the teacher. The preschool teacher and 2 bilingual preschoolers, David and Adrian are reading a book together. They are reading the fact-based book "Penguin". They are in the beginning of the reading session.

1.David's teacher:	**alle små pingvinene vil ut og bade i det kalde vannet.**
	All small penguins will go out and swim in the cold water.
2. David:	**ja da.**
	yes.

David's teacher reads/tells the story (line 1). This reading utterance is followed by David's confirmation in the next line.

This example shows that adult's reading can lead to the child's spontaneous speech production. David confirms her utterance with "yes". It seems like the teacher's reading prompts child's spontaneous utterance production, though it is short.

Excerpt 21. Below is the example of how David mother's reading leads to the child's repetition of the last word. David and his mother read the book "Pancakes for breakfast" and are somewhere in the middle of the reading session.

1.David's mother:	*очень долго взбивать, она его взбивала, наверно, целый час и так устала, но зато у нее получилось масло.*
	to whip long time, she whipped it, probably for the whole hour and was so tired, but it turned out to butter.
2. David:	*масло.*
	butter.

David's mother tells the story (line 1). In the next line, David repeats the last word said by his mother.

This example shows that book reading sessions are good learning arena for preschool children. Child repeats and learns words that can be new for him. It supports Vygotsky's (1978) statement that a child learns by imitating.

Excerpt 22. The next example is an example about how the child adds information while mother is reading the book "Pancakes for breakfast". They are at the beginning of the reading session.

1.David's mother:	*и там были написаны, какие нужны для этого ингредиенты.*
	and there was written what ingredients are needed for this.
2. David:	*яйца.*
	eggs.

David's mother reads the book (line 1). The child adds spontaneously a word in the next line. This is a good example of how the child comments spontaneously without any invitation.

Excerpt 23. In this excerpt Alexander's mother's reading leads to question produced by the child. They are reading the book "Frog, where are you?". There have already read half of the book.

1.Alexander's mother:	*пчелиный рой целый вылетел, да?*
	a swarm of bees flew out, huh?
2. Alexander:	*мама, а вдруг там xxx, а вдруг там сова?*
	mom, and maybe there xxx, and maybe there is an owl?

Alexander's mother reads the book (line 1). Alexander in response to her reading asks her a question that interested him (line 2).

This example shows that mother's reading is exciting to him, he is interested about the plot of the story and asks a question about the topic. He is making a spontaneous inference here, he speculates about the reason why the bees flew out. In such a way, he participates in conversation.

It seems that children are active participants in conversations about the book without being directly invited by adults. Target children confirm adults' reading utterances, repeat some words after them, add information to what is said and ask questions.

5.1.3 Book reading as a possible context for acquiring new words, new knowledge and grammar learning

The examples below are chosen to illustrate that book reading can be a good learning arena for bilingual children in terms of learning words (difficult words in Russian and Norwegian), acquiring new information, learning grammar. It is of particular interest to note that children are active participants during such conversations. The examples below will illustrate this.

Excerpt 24. Below is an example of how the teacher provides explanation of some unknown information to the children. In this excerpt the preschool teacher and 5 bilingual preschoolers, Sunita, Ali, Mohammed, Abhira and Alexander are reading a book together. They are reading

the fact-based book "Penguins". This situation takes place in the middle of the reading session.

1.Alexander's teacher:	**Antarktis, hva var det?**
	Antarctica, what is it?
2. Abhira:	**land som er veldig kald.**
	country that is very cold.
3. Alexander's teacher:	**et sted som er veldig kaldt.**
	a place that is very cold.
4. Alexander's teacher:	**og det er masse sol og varme der med masse gress og sånn?**
	and there is plenty of sun and warm with much grass and stuff like this?
5. Abhira:	**nei snø og is.**
	no snow and ice.
6. Alexander's teacher:	**nei snø og is.**
	no snow and ice..
7. Abhira:	**hvor pingviner er alle pingviner**.
	where penguins all penguins.
8. Mohammed:	**og noen seler.**
	and some seals.

In the beginning of this excerpt the teacher asks the children to define Antarctica. Abhira takes initiative and begins to explain (line 2). Teacher corrects the child by explaining that Antarctica is not a country, but is a place (line 3). In the next line the teacher tests the children's knowledge and asks if there is a sun and grass in Antarctica. Abhira shares her knowledge by saying that there is snow and ice (line 5). Teacher seems to agree with the child by repeating child's words (line 6). Abhira and Mohammed share their knowledge by saying who lives in Antarctica (line 7 & 8).

This example depicts joint book reading sessions as great opportunities for children to acquire some knowledge about unknown things and at the same time become active participants in conversation. First, the teacher asks the children to explain what Antarctica is. She allows the children to demonstrate their knowledge and provides immediate feedback by correcting the child's utterance. In the line 4, the teacher is making an untrue statement to provoke the children to offer a correct answer. With fact-based book like "Penguin" and this short conversation, children get to know that there is a place in the world that called Antarctica and it is a place, not a country. It is not sunny or grassy there, rather it is composed of only snow and ice and that penguins and seals are among its inhabitance. This is also a good example to show how other children in the group can share understandings and to contribute to common knowledge. Children in the group contribute to conversation with his/her own knowledge of

the subject. The cognitive level of the teacher's questions and the children's utterances can be considered as high.

Excerpt 25. This excerpt is example of how children acquire new words in the home settings and how adult's correction and explanation can lead to the child's language production. Alexander and his mother are reading book "Frog, where are you?". They are in the middle of the reading session.

1.Alexander's mother:	*что это такое?* (1)
	what is this?
2. Alexander's mother:	*я тебе говорила.*
	I have told you.
3. Alexander:	*дыра.*
	hole.
4. Alexander's mother:	*это не дыра, а дупло.*
	it is not a hole, it is hollow.
5. Alexander:	*дупло.*
	hollow.

In the beginning of this excerpt Alexander's mother asks Alexander to label object (line 1), possibly pointing at the picture. She says that she has explained this before (line 2), maybe during the previous reading. Alexander gives a label to the object calling it "hole" (line 3). In the next line, the mother corrects Alexander's answer and explains that it is not a hole, but hollow (line 4). Alexander repeats the correct word (line 5).

The excerpt above exemplifies that book reading session can be a perfect arena for explaining to children unknown information in the home settings. The child not only gets to know what the hole in the tree is called, but actively participates in conversation by repeating the newly learnt word. The example above is a good means to illustrate that knowledge is transmitted in social contexts, through relationships, like those of parents or child (Halliday, 1989).

Excerpt 26. The next example is designed to illustrate that book reading can be a good place to learn grammar for bilingual children, like in the Russian language, where words have different declensions. Alexander and his mother read the book "Frog, where are you?". This conversation occurs at the end of the reading session.

1.Alexander:	*мама, они похожи маленькие, мама, и обратно бежит к него.*
	mom, they look alike small, and the mother runs back to his.
2. Alexander's mother:	*к нему.*
	to him.
3. Alexander:	*да, к нему.*
	yes, to him.

Alexander comments that all small frogs are alike and that mother-frog runs to her baby-frog. Instead of saying to him, that is correct grammatically, Alexander is saying "to his" (line 1). In the next line Alexander's mother corrects his grammar by saying the correct version of the declension that is "to him". Alexander agrees with her and repeats the correct variant of the word (line 3).

It seems like child becomes an active participant during book reading session by repeating (line 3) the adult's correct version of the declension and simultaneously he learns it. This example illustrates that book reading seems to be good setting that promotes child's learning of grammar. Ping (2014) had a similar example in her study of German bilinguals as she came to the same conclusion that book reading seems to be a good context where adults can give grammar instructions to bilingual children.

Book reading activities give great learning opportunities for bilingual children in terms of learning new words (difficult words in Russian and Norwegian), new information, and acquiring grammar. All three examples depict that children were active participants in these conversations.

The analysis of 7 audio-recordings of joint book reading at home and in preschool shows that adults are using low cognitive demand strategies more often than high cognitive demand strategies. The type of response from the child seems to match the type expectant of adult's request. Adults seem to be eager to involve children in reading activity by using different strategies, but hold back on answering their own questions themselves. The strategies that prompt recalling, completion, labeling, asking yes/no questions, asking inferential questions, asking for explanation/definition, asking to recollect something from child's personal experience or asking to narrate are successfully implemented to engage children in active participation during book reading sessions and prompted child's language production. The only strategy that adults do not use to encourage children to speak was praising. In respect to child's language, adults evaluate/correct, confirm and expand child's language. Joint book reading is a meaningful context for vocabulary and grammar acquisition, as it is also documented by Raikes et al. (2006); Scheele, Leseman, & Mayo (2009); Niklas & Schneider (2012); Whitehurst et al. (1988); Dickinson & Tabors (2001); Hennig, 2012; Gerde & Powell (2009); Zevenbergen & Whitehurst (2003); Ping (2014). Children acquire general knowledge about things and learn the grammar of their native language. Data shows that adults produced

around 100 explanative utterances during 7 book reading conversations. I have observed that in some cases adults' reading and explanations led to child's spontaneous participation.

5.2 Participation of target children at home and preschool with two different languages

In this section I intend to illustrate the participation of two Russian-Norwegian preschool children, Alexander and David during book reading activity in two different settings, home and school whilst using two different languages, Russian and Norwegian. I also intend to compare their participation.

5.2.1 Participation of Alexander

In this section, I will illustrate how the participation of the bilingual children varies in two different settings, home and preschool. It seems like there is a significant difference between his engagement in the process of book reading at home versus preschool. Alexander produces 204 utterances at home during 2 book reading sessions in Russian and 24 utterances at preschool during 2 reading sessions in Norwegian. I discovered that Alexander reads, comments or adds spontaneous information related to the book during joint book reading without any direction 48 times in the home settings, and not a single time at the preschool.

The two excerpts below are representative examples of how Alexander reads/comments/adds information or asks questions in a home setting.

Excerpt 27. The following excerpt is taken from the conversation about the book "Frog, where are you?" and will serve to show interaction between Alexander and his mother. This conversation occurs almost at the end of the reading session.

1.Alexander's mother:	*потому что, он что-то там услышал, наверное.*
	because he (boy) heard something, maybe.
2. Alexander:	*там лягушка.*
	there is a frog.
3. Alexander's mother:	*там лягушки.*
	there is a frog.
4. Alexander's mother:	*ну-ка посмотрим, что.*
	let's see what.
5. Alexander:	*а вот она.*
	here it (frog) is.

In the beginning of this excerpt the mother explains to Alexander why the boy is showing the dog a sign to be silent, because the boy hears something (line 1). In the next line Alexander guesses that there is a frog there without seeing the next picture. The mother confirms Alexander's answer by repeating the same words (line 3), and most likely turning the page to see if it is right. In the next line, Alexander, looking at the next picture, most likely sees the frog and comments on it, probably pointing as well.

The above mentioned example illustrates Alexander's active participation in joint book reading at home. I have observed the sequential interaction between mother and child when they discuss the picture. We see that in line 1 that the mother reads the story. In the second line, Alexander adds information without it being asked of him. In the line 4, the mother comments while most likely turning the page. Alexander comments again without being asked (line 5). This is 1 out of 48 examples which illustrates that Alexander seems to be actively engaged in book reading by following attentively the development of the story, adding and commenting illustrations without a directive from his mother.

Excerpt 28. The example below is a typical example taken to show that the mother manages to engage Alexander in the process of book reading at home as the child is asking questions. Alexander and his mother are reading the book "Frog, where are you?". This situation took place at the beginning of the reading session.

1.Alexander's mother:	*мальчик по этому спит, потому что ночь на дворе.* that's why the boy is sleeping, because it is night outside.
2. Alexander:	*а почему а почему лягушка?* but why but why frog?
3. Alexander's mother:	*что лягушка?* what about frog?
4. Alexander:	*лягушка не спит?* frog is not sleeping?

In this example in the first line, Alexander's mother explains to Alexander that in the book, it is night outside and that's why the boy is sleeping. In his turn, Alexander wonders about something about the frog (line 2). The mother seems to not understand what the child is asking, asks the question in return to Alexander's question to make it clear what he meant (line 3). Alexander reformulates his question (line 4).

This example illustrates that child is engaged in this common book reading activity by asking questions, it seems like Alexander is curious as to why thing are as they are. He builds his

question on his mother's previous utterance. I think that this excerpt serves as a good example to show how the mother asks the child to reformulate his thoughts and that the child manages to do so.

With the examples below, I will illustrate Alexander's participation in conversations about the book at preschool. First, I will present his participation during first book reading session when the children and the preschool teacher read the book "Frog, where are you?"(Excerpts 18 & 29). Afterwards, I will present his participation during the second book reading session when the book "Penguin" is read at preschool (Excerpts 30 & 31).

During the first book reading session Alexander is the first one in the group who is directed to read by the teacher. His reading and participation is discussed in Excerpt 18. The other time when Alexander participates I will present in **Excerpt 29.** A preschool teacher and 5 bilingual children were present during this reading activity, Sunita, Ali, Mohammed, Abhira and Alexander. They are reading the book "Frog, where are you?". This part of the conversation occurs at the very end of the book reading session.

1.Alexander's teacher:	**har dere lest den boka hjemme også?**
	have you read this book at home as well?
2. Children together:	**ja ja.**
	yes yes.
3. Alexander:	**og mamma leste også.**
	and mommy read as well.
4. Alexander's teacher:	**ja ja.**
	yes yes.
5. Ali:	**jeg også leste.**
	I read as well.
6. Mohammed:	**mammaen min leste ikke jeg leste selv.**
	my mother did not read I read by myself.
7. Alexander's teacher:	**du leste selv?**
	did you read by yourself?
8. Abhira:	**jeg også.**
	me as well.
9. Alexander:	**og jeg leste ikke selv.**
	I was not reading by my own.
10. Alexander:	**mamma leste selv.**
	mamma read herself.

In the beginning of this part of conversation the teacher asks the children if they read this book at home. It seems like children are actively engaged in this conversation and give the answer "yes" all together (line 2). Alexander responds that his mother read this book also (line 3). In the next line, the teacher gives confirmative "yes" as a response to Alexander's

answer. Other children in the group tell that they read it at home also (line 5, 6). The teacher asks someone in the group if he/she reads the book themselves (line 7), possibly looking or pointing at someone. Abhira confirms that she also reads the book (line 8). Alexander adds that he is not reading it by himself as it is his mother who reads (line 9, 10).

It seems like the type of question that is related to Alexander's life is engaging the child as he begins to take part in conversation. In line 3, we see that he adds that his mother read this book as well. In the line 9 and 10, Alexander shares information again. The reason why Alexander responds to those questions at the very end of the session may be due to the fact that those particular questions are engaging for him.

Excerpt 30 was chosen to present Alexander's participation during the second book reading activity. The preschool teacher and 5 bilingual children, Sunita, Ali, Mohammed, Abhira and Alexander are present during this reading activity. They are reading the fact-based book "Penguin". During this book reading session the teacher and children together produce 339 utterances. Almost the whole book is read and at the end the teacher keeps on asking questions that are related to difficult words used during this book reading session. Alexander is absolutely silent during reading process up to utterance 264 where he addresses the following question to the teacher:

1.Alexander: **hvor lenge til vi skal gå ut der?**
how long until we go out?

This example shows that Alexander is not engaged in the book reading at preschool. He does not add any information himself, he does not comment either. The teacher does not seem to succeed in involving him in this book discussion. The other four children take initiative to read the story. By asking this question in the line 264, it seems like Alexander wants to go out which can be explained as his lack of interest in the current activity.

Excerpt 31. Here is the other example of Alexander's participation in conversation during the second book reading session. The teacher asks the other children in the group the question that is presented below and now it was Alexander's turn to answer. Again, this conversation takes place at the very end of the reading session.

1.Alexander's teacher: **Alexander, hvem er du veldig veldig glad i?**
Alexander, whom do you love very very much?
2. Alexander: **pingvin.**
penguin. ((all children laugh))
3. Alexander's teacher: **pingvin, ja.**

85

	penguin, yes. ((all children laugh))
4. Alexander's teacher:	**hvem er du veldig glad i, Alexander?**
	whom do you love very much, Alexander?
5. Alexander:	**mamma.**
	mommy
6. Alexander's teacher:	**og_____.**
	and _____.
7. Alexander:	**pappa.**
	pappa.

In the beginning of this excerpt the teacher asks Alexander whom he loves very much. Alexander answers that he loves penguin (line 2). All children begin to laugh when hearing his answer. The teacher seems to confirm his answer by repeating what Alexander said, laughing a bit as well (line 3). Other children in the group continue to laugh. The teacher repeats her question (line 4) that results in child's answer (line 5). The teacher adds "and" and pauses so that Alexander could continue (line 6). Alexander adds the word.

This excerpt is the only example of Alexander's active participation during the second book reading sessions at preschool. Alexander produces just these 3 utterances (line 2, 5, 7) after being asked. In total 339 utterances were produced during the second book reading session. It seems like Alexander is not engaged in the conversation during the reading session. However, questions that are related to child's life seem to be engaging for him. In line 1, the teacher says Alexander's name before asking the question. This may be another reason why Alexander is engaged. It supports Vygotsky's (1978) statement that the role of adult and the role of guidance is significant in activities with children.

I tracked a significant difference in Alexander's utterance production at home and at preschool during book reading activities. He was a very active participant at home, but almost unheard at preschool. I have observed that Alexander produces utterances at preschool on just 3 occasions:

- *when he reads a book because he is asked to narrate by the teacher* (direction is followed by the child's name) (discussed in Excerpt 18)

- *when he most likely is bored and wonders when they (children) will go out* (discussed in Excerpt 29)

- *when he gives answer to teacher's questions that are related to child's life* (in most cases such questions are used with the child's name) (Excerpt 29 & 31).

As we can see Alexander's participation at home and at preschool differs significantly from that of the school, presumably since relationships and roles differ. As Panofsky (1994) said that at home, joint book reading can be associated with a warm, close activity between parent and child. In the home environment the child's activity is often encouraged, while at school, the lack of child involvement can be easy unnoticed. Participation of Alexander is good example of this statement. It seems like Alexander can be an active participant in the preschool settings, but only with the help of an adult. This confirms Rogoff's (1990) statement that adults provide direction and organization of child's activities that lead to the child's cognitive development as adults transfer to child the obligation of managing problem solving. When the teacher transfers to Alexander the responsibility of language production, he does it, on other occasions he is absolutely silent.

5.2.2 Participation of David

In this section, I will illustrate how the other target child participated in conversations about the book at home and preschool. David produces 148 utterances during two home book reading sessions in Russian and 43 utterances during one book reading session at preschool in Norwegian. Like Alexander, David is an active book reading participant at home, but also a rather active participant in preschool setting.

Excerpt 32. Below is an example of David's active participation in the book reading conversations in Russian at home. David and his mother read the book "Pancakes for breakfast". This conversation occurs somewhere in the middle of the reading session.

1.David's mother:	*она собрала яички в корзинку и довольная пошла домой.* she collected eggs in the basket and went home satisfied.
2. David's mother:	*теперь у нее были яйца.* now she had eggs.
3. David:	*ну а не было молока.* but there was no milk.
4. David's mother:	*кончилось молоко.* ran out of milk.

David's mother reads the book (line 1). The mother keeps on reading (line 2). David adds information spontaneously in the next line. David's mother extends the child's utterance by paraphrasing what David said (line 4).

This example serves to show David's representative behavior and how engaged David is in the book reading process with his mother. David builds on his mother's reading utterance and

adds information spontaneously without being invited to do so (line 3). It seems like he follows the story carefully and adds information as the story goes along.

Excerpts below will exemplify that David is an active participant in conversations about the book at preschool in Norwegian as well.

Excerpt 33. A preschool teacher and 2 bilingual children David and Adrian are present during this reading activity. The teacher and the children are reading the book "Penguins". They are in the middle of the reading session when this dialogue occurs.

1.Adrian:	**også den kan hoppe på.**
	and they can jump on.
2. David's teacher:	**ja selen den kan svømme veldig godt i vannet.**
	yes the seal can swim very good in the water.
3. David:	**eller hoppe.**
	or jump.
4. David's teacher:	**delfinen kan hoppe høyt i vannet, men jeg vet ikke om selen kan hoppe.**
	The dolphin can jump high in the water, but I do not know if the seal can jump.
5. David:	**jo han klarer xxx.**
	yes he manages xxx.
6. David's teacher:	**synes du det?**
	do you think so?
7. David:	**han klarer å hoppe i vannet.**
	he manages to jump in the water.
8. David's teacher:	**den svømmer opp og ned i vannet, men kan hoppe kanskje ikke opp i lufta.**
	it swims up and down in the water, but maybe cannot jump in the air.
9. David:	**nei.**
	no.
10. David's teacher:	**men det greier delfinen.**
	but it manages the dolphin.
11. David:	**men de kan litt sånn.**
	but they can a bit like this.

In the beginning of this excerpt Adrian adds to the teacher's previous utterance that the seal can jump (line 1). Teacher confirms Adrian's answer and extends it (line 2). David shares his knowledge that the seal can jump (line 3). The teacher in turn, explains that dolphins can jump high in the water, but she does not know if the seal can jump (line 4). In the next line, David confirms that the seal manages it. The teacher seems to be surprised by David's confirmation, asks him if he thinks that is true (line 6). David gives a determined answer (line 7). In the next line (line 8) the teacher explains again that the seal swims up and down in the

88

water, but the seal cannot jump in the air. David confirms her answer (line 9). Teacher continues to tell the story (line 10). David changes the focus to penguins and most likely shows what he is telling (line 11). They continue to speak about penguins afterwards.

It seems like this conversation is engaging for David. We can trace his active participation by seeing at the utterances in the example above. The conversation goes in turn, looks like sequential interaction: Teacher (line 2) – David (line 3) – Teacher (line 4) – David (line 5) – Teacher (line 6) – David (line 7) – Teacher (line 8) – David (line 9) – Teacher (line 10) – David (line 11). It is interesting to notice that teacher's utterance is always followed by David's utterance in this excerpt. It seems like this kind of interaction is in the form of dialogue where interlocutors complete each other's actions and mutually influence each other (Linell, 1998). During this episode David produced utterances 6 times. He builds on teacher's utterance and adds information (line 3), he confirms the teacher's utterance (line 5), shares his knowledge (line 7), agrees with the teacher (line 9) and again shares his knowledge (line 11). It is interesting to notice that David takes initiative to speak himself. He adds and shares information spontaneously without being asked to do so.

David seems to be an active participant in conversations at home in Russian and at preschool in Norwegian. David produces many utterances at home and preschool. In both settings he reads, adds spontaneously information and shares his knowledge. It seems like both the mother and preschool teacher manage to engage him in conversations about the book.

5.2.3 Use of bilingual resources by Alexander & David in different settings

With the experts below I will illustrate how two preschool Russian-Norwegian children, Alexander and David use their bilingual recourses during joint book reading sessions at home and in preschool.

Excerpt 34. A preschool teacher and 2 bilingual children are present during this reading activity, David and Adrian. Both children speak Ukrainian at home and Adrian is David's best friend. The teacher and the children discuss the book "Penguin". It seems like David is so engaged in the story that he begins to share what he knows about penguins.

1.David: **kan gå og sånn gjøre, sånn kan de gjøre.**
                     can go and do like this, like this can they do.

2.David's teacher:	**ja bare går også vinker med vingene sine.**
	yes just go and wave with their wings.
3. David's teacher:	**kan de ikke fly?**
	can't they flight?
4. David:	*ти знаєш, вони так роблять, коли вони так роблять, вони збираються летіти, ні, вони збираються йти так.*((speaks Ukrainian))
	do you know, they do like this, when they do like this, so they are going to flight, no, they are going to go like this.
5. David's teacher:	**skal vi se på neste side?**
	shall we look at the next page?

David infers about the way penguins go and most likely showing it to the others in the group (line 1). It seems like it influences the way he says "can go and do like this, like this can they do" instead of naming the action with more descriptive words. The teacher confirms and expands on the child's answer by describing the action that David showed just a moment ago (line 2). In the next line, the teacher's expanding is followed by a question to the children (line 3). David gives quite long explanation in Ukrainian (line 4) most likely he shows what he explains. He corrects himself in the same sentence, again most probably showing. The teacher suggests going to the next page in the next line (line 5).

This example depicts how David used his bilingual resources at preschool. In the first line we see that David speaks Norwegian. David's utterance is followed by the teacher's utterance that extends upon David's (line 2) and question (line 3). David switches suddenly to Ukrainian and produces quite a long utterance in Ukrainian (line 4). May be because the teacher cannot understand Ukrainian, she chooses not to continue conversation about this subject and goes to the next page (line 5).

Excerpt 35. Here is one more example of David's code-switching. It occurs during the same book reading session as described in excerpt 34.

1.David's teacher:	**kan de støtte seg litt på halen kanskje?**
	can they support themselves with a tail maybe?
2. David:	**vet du hva, vet du hva.**
	do you know what, do you know what.
3. David:	**sånn sånn og sånn og etterpå sånn.**
	like this like this like this and afterwards like this.
4. David:	*спробуй піти!*((speaks Ukrainian))
	try to go!

During the discussion of how penguins can go, the teacher asks the child if penguins can support themselves with a tail while they walk (line 1). David uses introductory "do you

know" before he begins to explain (line 2). David, most likely, shows how they walk with verbal explanation "like this like this and afterwards like this" (line 3). In the next line right after the explanation in Norwegian, the child switches to Ukrainian, with a suggestion to his friend Adrian to try to walk like he did (line 4).

We see that in the line 2, David speaks Norwegian. In the line 3 David continues to speak Norwegian at the same time as he demonstrates what he is saying. In the next line David switches to Ukrainian with a suggestion to follow his lead. I suppose that David is speaking to his Ukrainian friend while suggesting it. This example supports Serratrice (2013) uttering that important factor that differentiates bilingual from monolingual children is the constant switching, both in language comprehension and in language production between two languages.

These two examples above are the representative examples of how David, a bilingual child is switching to the other language during book reading discussions. These examples illustrate how bilingual child use his bilingual recourses in the same setting.

The example below will serve to illustrate how Alexander used his bilingual recourses during book reading session at home.

Excerpt 36. This is the only example of Alexander's code-switching. It occurs during joint book reading sessions in Russian at home. The mother and the child are reading book "Pancakes for breakfast" and they are on the final stage of reading. They are discussing how the expressive form of the mouth changes when people become sad.

1.Alexander: *люди тоже такие делают.*
people do like this as well.
2. Alexander's mother: *да, если кому то грустно.*
yes, if someone is sad.
3. Alexander: *да, если кому то грустно, то собака и кошка лезут на стол и ххх* **så hva skjedde***?*
yes, if someone is sad, so the dog and the cat climb on the table and xxx what happened?
4. Alexander's mother: *ты будешь слушать?*
will you listen?
5. Alexander: *я слушаю.*
I listen.

Alexander comments that people wry their mouths as well, if they are sad, probably showing this action himself or pointing at the picture (line 1). In the next line, Alexander's mother confirms his answer and expands Alexander's utterance (line 2). In the next line seems like

Alexander blends the last utterance from his mother and a part of the story while adding a question in Norwegian. Alexander's mother asks the child if he wants to listen to the story. In the next line Alexander confirms in Russian that he is listening (line 5).

The above presented example shows the code-switching by Alexander in the home settings. In the beginning of this excerpt Alexander speaks solely in Russian. Alexander's mother confirms and expands child's utterance in Russian. The next utterance Alexander begins by speaking Russian, but ends with speaking Norwegian. Alexander's mother asks the child if he wants to listen to the story, maybe considering his answer irrelevant or wrong, implying that he needs to listen to the story in order to know the right answer. Alexander switches to Russian again. Malakoff & Hakuta (1991) believe that code-switching is used to enhance and supplement the speech of bilinguals. Maybe in such a way Alexander tried to supplement his speech.

Alexander switched to Norwegian in the home setting (where mother uses solely Russian) just once. He does not switch to any other language than Norwegian in the preschool.

David does not switch to any other language in home setting. David and his mother use Russian solely. However, he does switch to Ukrainian, in the preschool setting. He code-switches 7 times during one book reading session at preschool.

Summary: In my analysis, I wanted to find out how two Russian-Norwegian preschoolers participate in conversations during book reading sessions in two different settings, home and preschool, using two different languages. I found that both children seem to be active listeners, readers and story-tellers in the home settings with Russian as the language of communication. Alexander produces many more utterances and asks more questions at home than in preschool. For example, Alexander produces 204 utterances in Russian during 2 home book reading sessions. In the kindergarten, he produces 24 utterances in Norwegian over 2 book reading sessions. It can be assumed that Alexander needs adult's encouragement/invitation to talk to be an active participant, otherwise he does not take the initiative himself. It seems like he has many more possibilities to participate actively in conversation about the book at home than even in small groups in preschool. David, unlike Alexander, is active participant in conversations about the book both in Russian, Norwegian and in Ukrainian, both at home and in preschool. David produces 148 utterances at home during 2 book reading sessions and 43 utterances at preschool during 1 reading session and also several times provides information spontaneously without invitation from adult in both

settings. It seems like David does not need as much encouragement as Alexander to participate in conversations about the book during joint book reading at preschool. It seems like adults in both settings manage to encourage his active participation. Both target children switch to other language other than is the main language of communication.

6   Discussion and Conclusions:

This study examined how adults engaged two Russian-Norwegian preschool children to actively participate in conversations about picture books and how bilingual children participated in joint book reading activities in two different settings, home and preschool with two different languages. With the help of 7 audio-recordings from the home and preschool settings, I studied adults' and children's interaction during joint book reading and attempted to find answers to my research questions. In my study, I employed socio-cultural theories, which stress the inseparability of children's learning, social setting, supportive presence of adults and the role of peers (Vygotsky, 1978; Rogoff, 1990; Lave & Wenger, 1991 Wells, 1999). I based my work on the theory of dialogue as well (Linell, 1998). I hope that my study will contribute to the existing literature about identifying the potential strategies with the help of which children can be supported in their language and literacy development, vocabulary and grammar learning.

I will present my findings in this chapter. This part will have two sections: discussion and conclusion. In the discussion section I will have two sub-sections that correspond with the number of my research questions.

6.1 Discussion

My study found confirmation in the theories of Vygotsky (1978), Wells (1981), Bruner (1983), Rogoff (1990), John-Steiner, Panofsky & Smith (1994) who assumed that social interaction like parent-child or teacher-child or child-child are crucial for children's literacy and language development. As Lave & Wenger (1991) stressed, learning takes place while participating and it is not a one-person act, it requires social interaction and collaboration. As my study showed it would not be possible for a child to actively participate in conversations during joint book reading without the help of adults. I have found the confirmation of Vygotsky's (1978), Woods' et al. (1976) and Wells (1999) words that parents and teachers play an essential role in child's cognitive development by assisting and supporting children in what children could not do themselves. My study supported Hasan's (1989) and Halliday's (1978, 2003) statements that children learnt to speak the language by speaking the language and they need social experience to develop language skills. Data from this study seemed to show that children's participation in joint book reading activity was depended on how parents

94

or preschool teachers built on or organized the reading process, as Rogoff (1990) stating that adult's organization and guidance of activities were crucial in the process of children's learning. It seems like adults in my study tried to do their best to organize children's activities and support children in the process of cognition and thinking. Child learnt language in the interactive process and that process demanded the exchange of meanings between the child and others, stated Halliday (2003). My data showed that joint book reading activity is a good interactive activity that required the exchange of utterances and meanings from both children and adults for learning process to occur. It seems like adults' utterances were used to get the answer from children, adults used questioning utterances to expose or test children's understanding of various topics. In response, children seemed to use their utterances to demonstrate their knowledge to parents or teachers and perhaps to interpret what was going on in most cases. It supports Linell's (1998) statement that during dialogue, communication serves to develop shared and mutual understandings and mechanism for exposing one's own and testing to other's understandings is inherent in dialogue itself.

It seems like joint book reading activity was a meaningful context for learning a second language. All three components, learners (children), speakers (parents and teachers) and social setting (home and preschool), as Fillmore (1991) mentioned, were present, making language learning possible.

It seems that David and Alexander have acquired new words and phrases in both languages and have managed to build their own sentences during joint book reading activity and as Tabors (2008) stated, children used their first and second language productively. Russian and Norwegian languages belong to different language families (Russian belongs to East Slavic language family and Norwegian to North Germanic), but they seem to share some phonological elements, letters of alphabet, words. I assume that there might be some positive interaction between these languages (Oller & Jarmulowich, 2007; Butler, 2013). I suppose that it is possible to also speak about the transfer of concepts or ideas from one language to another (Cummins, 1984; Baker, 2007).

6.1.1 Adults' questions and children's responses

After analyzing audio-recordings from the home and preschool settings I am concluding that I did not observe plain book reading among adults, neither parents nor preschool teachers read book all by themselves without giving children the opportunity to actively contribute to the

reading. Both parents and teachers engaged children into the reading activity, but there was a significant difference in the way parents and teachers conducted actual book reading sessions. It seemed like teachers more often gave the child the floor, it was a child who was often "the teller" of the story in preschool, while the teacher was often a "listener" most of the time, who directed the child to read, corrected, added information if it was needed, evaluated or confirmed child's answer. It seems that in the home settings, the parents took the role of both narrator and listener. Both teachers produced 15 reading utterances together during three book reading sessions as compared to parents who produced 116 reading utterances during 4 book reading sessions. Both children produced 352 utterances in the home setting during 4 book reading sessions and 67 utterances in preschool setting during 3 book reading sessions. Both children and parents produced more utterances in the home setting than in preschool setting. May be it was due to the fact that it was one-to-one conversation. As Tizard & Hughes (2002) pointed out, one had more possibilities to express oneself in one-to-one conversations, than even in small settings where more than two persons took part in the conversation. Just few adults' utterances were related to management issues like directing the child's behavior both at home and in preschool. I observed only minor behavior-focused utterances (Gerde & Powell, 2009) to maintain an attentive environment.

The results of this study points to variability in strategy-use intended to invite children to talk among parents and preschool teachers. I found that some strategies were used more often by parents than preschool teachers, while others were used more often by preschool teachers than parents. The strategy that prompted recalling information was used more often by parents than by preschool teachers. I observed a big difference in relation to strategy that prompted completion from children among the various actors. It was more prevalent among parents than between teachers. Such strategies as labeling/counting and strategies that elicited yes/no answer or strategies that elicited inferring were used relatively in the same proportions among parents and teachers. I found out that parents minimally practiced the strategy of asking children to explain the words, unlike one of the teachers who asked children the meaning of the words that were relevant to the book at the end of each reading session. Both times it was almost at the end of the reading session when she brought up a conversation about what the words that were relevant to the book meant. Such strategies as asking to narrate the story and asking questions about child's own experience were used more often by teachers. I have observed that there was limited praising during book reading sessions on the part of all parties. In fact, the strategy that adults used the least to elicit talking was praising the child.

I am concluding my study with 5 major findings. The first finding in my study was that the type of response on the part of the child was found to match the type of adults' request. It seems that my finding confirmed the findings of Zucker et al. (2010) and Ping (2014) who also found that the cognitive level of adults' questions placed on the child was positively correlated with cognitive level of children's answers during joint book reading. In this study, recalling, pausing, labeling/counting, yes-no question strategies were categorized as strategies that required low cognitive demand on the child (Sigel, 1986; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001). My data showed that in most cases they were responded to appropriately by the child, low cognitive demand strategies led to low cognitive demand responses. Inferring, providing definition/explanation, connecting story to child's life were categorized as strategies that required high cognitive demand on the child (Sigel, 1986; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001). My data showed that they were responded to appropriately by the child, high cognitive demand strategies led to high cognitive demand responses in most cases. This study suggests using high cognitive demand strategies during reading sessions that were confirmed (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001) to lead to successful child literacy and language development.

The second finding was that adults used strategies that placed low cognitive demand on the child more often. High cognitive demand strategies were seldom used. I have observed that adults used strategies that required low cognitive demand answers from the child 269 times and strategies that required high cognitive demand answers from the child just 60 times during 7 joint book reading sessions. So, low cognitive demand strategies were used by adults more than 4 times as often than high cognitive demand strategies. My finding is in line with Ping's (2014) finding which has also documented that teachers in her study rarely used high cognitive demand strategies, but relied on low cognitive demand strategies placed on the child more frequently.

The third finding was regarding the pattern of the child's answer. I have observed that pausing, labeling/counting and yes/no strategies led to one-word answer in the most cases. It seems like these strategies gave children less opportunity to express themselves. Children contributed minimally when they gave answers to these types of questions. The strategy that elicited inferring was found to be the strategy that led to the highest frequency of expanded answers. In 15 of 17 times this strategy led to expanded answer provided by children. My findings are that this type of adult question coincided with the type of child's response, suggested the importance of using strategies that demanded high cognitive response from the

children. Questions that elicited inferring were almost always answered and seemed to stimulate the child's thinking, resulting in extended answers in most cases. These findings confirmed Temple & Snow's (2003) finding that non-immediate talk that prompted inferring, reasoning helped children to use more advanced vocabulary. As Dickinson & Tabors (2001) stated while inferring and reasoning, children used more complex language than labeling and yes/no answers. My finding confirmed this statement.

I have found that such strategies as asking the child directly to read and asking questions that connected plot of the book with the child's life were two successful strategies used in preschool that were observed to engage every child in conversation about the picture book. These strategies were followed by addressing the child by name quite often. This study suggests that use of these strategies in a preschool setting gives everyone possibility to participate, this discovery constituted my fourth finding. To my knowledge, there are no studies that made such conclusion before, so I cannot neither confirm nor contradict this finding based on other studies.

My fifth major finding was that both parents and adults chose to substitute one strategy with another if they did not get the answer from the child they desired. I have traced just few cases where adults gave answers on their own questions. During 7 joint book reading sessions adults engaged children in conversations 329 times using recalling, pausing, labeling/counting, yes/no questions, inferring, providing explanation/definition and connecting plot of the story to child's life strategies. This figure excluded such strategy as asking child to narrate. Just 10 out of 329 times adults gave answer on their own questions. In those cases when a child did not give answers adults changed up their strategy. As an example, in the excerpt 2, the mother substituted the recalling strategy with another recalling one, in excerpt 3, she substituted recalling strategy with one that requires completion. In excerpt 4, the mother used the labeling strategy as she did not get the expectant answer on her recalling question. In the excerpt 5, the mother connected the plot of the book to child's life as a substitution to a strategy eliciting recall which proved unsuccessful at that moment. To my mind, this finding is consistent with Dickinson & Tabors' (2001); Bus' (2003) findings that confirm that the child's learning outcomes from joint book reading activity are dependent on how the adult guides the participation of the child during this activity, how the adult organizes this activity, involves child and supports his/her activities.

I found out that adult's reading led to child's spontaneous language production. It seemed like children were engaged in adults' reading and this engagement resulted in children's active participation by spontaneously adding some information, repeating, confirming or questioning. Children, especially Alexander, produced utterances spontaneously much more often at home than in preschool settings. It may be because of the one-to-one situation during reading at home where the child could comment, asked as many questions he wished during reading, but it was not always possible in a group reading as a the teacher had to cope with other children as well (Tizard & Hughes, 2002). In line with Panofsky's (1994) findings, my findings seemed to show also that the child's questions and requests were not considered by the parent as interruptions during joint book reading activity at home, but were treated as possibilities for dialogue. I have observed that children's questions or comments related to the book in both settings were answered by adults or commented on by other children and it did not seem like they were treated as interruptions by adults. It looks like child's active participation in joint book reading activities was an essential factor at home. Unlike home, in preschool purposes and goals of this activity can be difficult to understand for a child and the lack of a single child's activity during joint book reading can be easy unnoticed (Panofsky, 1994). This was the case with Alexander. He was an active participant at home during reading session and almost invisible at times in preschool.

I observed that book reading session seems to be a good learning environment for preschool children and are a meaningful context for language acquisition (learning new words and expanding child's vocabulary) and literacy development. I found that parents and preschool teachers together provided explanation/definition to children approximately 100 times during 7 book reading sessions. The results of this study are consistent with previous studies that concluded that book reading activities may help to develop children's language or vocabulary (Raikes et al., 2006; Scheele, Leseman, & Mayo, 2009; Niklas & Schneider, 2012; Whitehurst et al., 1988; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Hennig, 2012; Gerde & Powell, 2009; Zevenbergen & Whitehurst, 2003). My findings are in line with the findings of others (Bingham, 2007; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Tizard & Hughes, 2002; Zevenbergen & Whitehurst, 2003) who suggested that book reading activities offered great possibilities for children in terms of acquiring literacy. As Halliday (1978) said, one explanation of an unknown concept to the child would not make a big difference for that child's development, but an accumulation of such experience might be significant for a child's learning outcomes. It seems that both parents and teachers did their best for the children to accumulate such experiences.

In the interviews the Russian-speaking parents provided information that they were using solely Russian with their children, in everyday conversation and during book reading activities at home. My data supported this fact. Parents spoke solely Russian during all 4 reading sessions with their children. It seems like children were used to it as they answered solely in Russian.

6.1.2 Target children: Alexander and David

The second goal of my study was to examine the participation of the target children during joint book reading sessions at home in Russian and in preschool in Norwegian. I found that there was a significant difference in Alexander's verbal participation at home versus preschool. I found that Alexander produced 204 utterances during two book reading sessions in Russian in the home settings, while in the preschool setting, Alexander produced just 24 utterances during 2 book reading sessions. Joint book reading activities seemed to be well-organized in preschool, but Alexander contributed to this activity much less at preschool than at home. I have also found that there was a significant difference in quantity of the questions asked by the child at home versus in preschool. During 2 home book reading sessions, Alexander asked his mother questions related to the book 15 times, while during reading at preschool just one time, and that particular question was not related to the book (Excerpt 30). This finding is consistent with Tizard & Hughes (2002) who observed the same pattern in her research; that children asked questions more often at home than in the preschool settings. During the two reading sessions, the teacher seemed to manage to engage Alexander in active verbal participation during book reading sessions on just 2 occasions; when she directly asked him to narrate the story or asked questions that were related to child's life. In both cases, the adult's requests were followed by the child's name. During 2 joint book reading sessions that I based my analysis on, Alexander was not an active participant and needed an invitation from the teacher to talk more than the other children in this group. It seems like Alexander had more opportunities to participate in one-to-one conversations at home than in the small group in preschool (there were 5 children in total in Alexander's group). I have observed that there was much less talk between the teacher and Alexander at preschool than between Alexander and his mother at home. My finding is in line with the findings of Tizard & Hughes' (2002) study who observed the same pattern in their study; that children contributed less to conversation in preschool than at home. The teacher failed to engage Alexander in most of the conversations during second book reading sessions that I have in my data. This may be due to

the fact that the book reading activity was quite challenging for the teacher as the children in the group had different levels of language development and book reading experience (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001).

Unlike Alexander, David was an active participant during reading conversations both at home and in preschool. He used Russian actively during book reading sessions at home and Norwegian and Ukrainian actively in preschool. In both settings, he was engaged in conversation, he narrated, commented, added information, inferred. He was always actively contributing to conversation. During 1 joint book reading session David produced 43 utterances, as compared to the teacher who produced 72 utterances. This may be explained by the fact that there were just 2 children (unlike the 5 in Alexander's group) in the group during reading sessions and David had more opportunities to express himself, this could be due to the fact that the other boy was a friend of his and they spoke the same language, Ukrainian, yet out of 130 utterances that the teacher and 2 children produced together, 43 of them were produced David. Pellegrini & Galda (2003) stressed the role of peers during joint book reading, as close relationships like friendship might support the child's cognitive engagement around the text or discussion of the text. Thus, the presence of his peer during the activity may have been the other reason for David's active participation. David was an active participant at home and at preschool, as Wells (1981) stated the child benefits most from those conversations when not only the adult, but the child contributed to constructing and negotiating meanings through talk.

I found that both children switched from one language to another during book reading sessions, but in different settings and a different quantity of times. During one reading session at preschool, David switched to the Ukrainian language 7 times. This may be explained by the presence of his Ukrainian-speaking friend, Adrian, during the reading situation, with whom David usually speaking Ukrainian in preschool. The teacher did not react verbally to the language switching, she chose to wait until children finished talking or went to the next page and began to read or ask them about other pictures, perhaps to change the focus of discussion from Ukrainian to Norwegian or because she simply did not understand what children were saying. It is interesting to note that during home reading sessions that were in Russian, David never switched to another language. Alexander, unlike David, did not switch to other languages in preschool, and just one time at home, where he used a part of utterance in Norwegian, instead of Russian. My observation supports Malakoff & Hakuta (1991) uttering

that code-switching is considered to be the skill of bilingual children and as Serratrice (2013) mentioned is an important factor that differentiates bilingual from monolingual children. The constant switching, both in language comprehension and in language production between two languages is expectant among bilingual children (Serratrice, 2013).

6.2 Concluding remarks

This study provided an analysis of how joint book reading might look at home and in preschool for two Russian-Norwegian preschoolers. I examined adult's strategies that engaged children in active participation in conversations and the patterns of adults' questioning behaviors as well as children's participation with the help of books with different genres, narrative and informational. My study along with other studies underlines the importance of joint book reading activities since this activity may offer great developmental opportunities for preschool children. Children get experience which is a prerequisite for further success in school as Dickinson and Tabors (2001) suggest. Parental dedication and engagement in book reading activities with children seems to result in significant and lasting outcomes in their children's literal development (Dickinson and Tabors, 2001; Tizard & Hughes, 2002; Zevenbergen & Whitehurst, 2003; Bingham, 2007). It is through participation in informal conversation like during book reading, children's learning of and through language takes place, especially in the early years (Wells, 1999). Dickinson & Tabors (2001) come to conclusion that the preschool period makes crucial contributions in preparing children for their later literacy achievements. Looking at books and reading books with children comes highly recommended as it contributes to child's school readiness and as a preparation for reading development (Temple & Snow, 2003). Joint book reading activities help children to develop knowledge that is an essential aspect of becoming literate and is an essential instructional activity for children in the preschool years (Teale, 2003). Reading books with and to children seems to improve children's language skills (Raikes et al., 2006; Scheele, Leseman, & Mayo, 2009; Niklas & Schneider, 2012; Whitehurst et al., 1988; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Hennig, 2012; Gerde & Powell, 2009; Zevenbergen & Whitehurst, 2003), but book reading activities are not a panacea for children's literacy development, according to Stahl (2003, p.379) and should be considered as a *"part of the total instructional program that also includes direct instruction in print-related skills"*.

This study makes some theoretical and empirical contributions to the study of how adults promote bilingual child's active participation during joint book reading. These include: a) documenting no plain reading among Russian-speaking parents and Norwegian-speaking preschool teachers during joint book readings, but giving children opportunity to contribute to reading; b) revealing the variability of strategy-use among Russian-speaking parents and Norwegian-speaking preschool teachers to invite children to talk during reading sessions; c) documenting adults' persistence in their attempts to involve bilingual children in the conversation by changing strategies that can engage children in conversation when children seem disengaged; d) demonstrating that child's responses are consistent with adult's invitation to talk: strategies that place low cognitive demand on the child are responded by children with low cognitive demand answers, respectively high cognitive demand strategies are responded with high cognitive demand answers in the most cases; e) documenting that adults used more often strategies that placed low cognitive demand on the child; f) revealing strategies that are successful in inviting every child to contribute to conversation in preschool setting; g) documenting that strategy that elicits inferring led to highest frequency of expanded answers; h) demonstrating that book reading is a good learning environment for bilingual preschool children and seems to be a meaningful context for first and second language acquisition and literacy development.

The target group for reading this thesis is parents and teachers, who have preschool children or work with preschool children and who can gain some understanding of what is the best way to conduct book reading activities and what strategies are more useful in terms of inviting bilingual children to talk that lead to improved children's language and literacy outcomes in different settings. I hope that this thesis will be useful for educators or researchers and that my study can provide a basis for bigger studies which aim to find out how adults engage bilingual children to actively participate in conversations about the book in larger contexts.

Literature list

Aram, D., Fine Y. & Ziv M. (2013). Enhancing parent–child shared book reading interactions: Promoting references to the book's plot and socio-cognitive themes. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 28,* p. 111-122. Retrieved October 30, 2014, from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S088520061200035X

Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2007). *A parents' and teachers' guide to bilingualism.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Barachelli, C. & Lavelli, M. (2010). Preschoolers' communicative functions during shared book reading with mothers and fathers. *Early Education and Development, 21*(4)*,* p. 595-613. Retrieved October 30, 2014, from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10409280903150336

Barrera, R.B. & Bauer, E.B. (2003). Storybook reading to young bilingual children: A review of the literature. In A. van Kleek, S.A. Stahl, & A. B. Bauer (Eds.), *On reading to children: Parents and teachers.* (p. 253-270). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Bingham, G.E. (2007). Maternal literacy beliefs and the quality of mother–child book-reading interactions: Associations with children's early literacy development. *Early Education and Development, 18*(1), p. 23-49. Retrieved October 10, 2014, from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10409280701274428

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2008). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), p.77-101. Retrieved January 15, 2015, from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa#.VMDc9XbKx9M

Bruner, J. (1983). *Child's talk. Learning to use language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bus, A. G. (2003). Social-emotional requisites for learning to read. In A. van Kleek, S.A. Stahl, & A. B. Bauer (Eds.), *On reading to children: Parents and teachers.* (p. 177-200). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Bus, A.G., Leseman, P.P.M. & Keultjes, P. (2000). Joint book reading across cultures: A comparison of Surinamese-Dutch, Turkish-Dutch, and Dutch parent-child dyads. *Journal of Literacy Research, 32,* p. 53-76. Retrieved October 09, 2014, from http://jlr.sagepub.com/content/32/1/53

Butler, Y.G. (2013). Bilingualism/multilingualism and second-language acquisition. In Bhatia T.K. & Ritchie W.C. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism.* (p.102-104). Chichester: Wiley- Blackwell.

Cline, K.D. & Edwards, C.P. (2013). The instructional and emotional quality of parent–child book reading and early Head Start children's learning outcomes. *Early Education and Development, 24*(8), p.1214-1231. Retrieved December 11, 2014, from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10409289.2012.697431

Costain, M. (2012). Pingvin. Oslo: Norsk fakta forl.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: issues in assessment and pedagogy.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dalen, M. (2004). *Intervju som forskningsmetode: en kvalitativ tilnærming.* Oslo: Universitetsforl.

Deckner, D.F, Adamson, L.B. & Bakeman, R. (2006). Child and maternal contributions to shared reading: Effects on language and literacy development. *Applied Developmental Psychology, 27,* p. 31-41. Retrieved October 30, 2014, from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0193397305001073

dePaola, T. (1978). Pancakes for breakfast. China: South China Printing Co. Ltd.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2013). *Strategies of qualitative inquiry.* Singapore: Sage.

Dexter, C. & Stacks, A.M. (2013). A preliminary investigation of the relationship between parenting, parent-child shared reading practices, and child development in low-income families. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, *28*, p. 394-410. Retrieved October 30, 2014, from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02568543.2014.913278

Dickinson, D.K. & Tabors, P.O. (1991). Early literacy: Linkage between home, school, and literacy achievement at age five. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 6,* p. 30-46.

Dickinson, D.K. & Tabors, P.O. (2001). *Beginning literacy with language.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Dickinson, D.K., McCabe, A., & Anastasopoulos, L. (2003). A framework for examining book reading in early childhood classrooms. In A. van Kleek, S.A. Stahl, & A. B. Bauer (Eds.), *On reading to children: Parents and teachers.* (p. 95-113). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Fillmore, L.W. (1991). Second-language learning in children: a model of language learning in social context. In: E. Bialyatok (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children.* (p. 49-69). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gerde, H.K. & Powell, D. R. (2009). Teacher's education, book-reading practices, and children's language growth across one year of Head Start. *Early Education and Development, 20*(2), p. 211-237. Retrieved November 10, 2014 from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10409280802595417#.VOsymSzbbPc

Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: the social interpretation of language and meaning.* London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1989). Context of situation. In: M.A.K. Halliday, & R.Hasan (Ed.), *Language, context, and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective.* (p.3-14). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (2003). *The language of early childhood*. London: Continuum.

Harris, R.J. & Nelson, E.M.M. (1992). Bilingualism: Not the exception any more. In: R.J. Harris (Ed.), *Cognitive processing in bilinguals.* (p.3-14). Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Hasan, R. (1989). The Structure of a text and learning through text in context. In: M.A.K. Halliday & R.Hasan (Ed.), *Language, context, and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective.* (p.3-14). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hennig, Å. (2012). *Effektive lesere snakker sammen. Innføring i litterære samtaler.* Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forslag AS.

Hoffmann, C. (1991). *An introduction to bilingualism*. London: Longman.

John-Steiner, V., & Panofsky, C.P., & Smith, L.W. (1994). *Sociocultural approaches to language and literacy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* (p.163-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Linell, P. (1998). *Approaching dialogue: talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspective.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Malakoff, M. & Hakuta, K. (1991). Translation skill and metalinguistic awareness in bilinguals. In: E. Bialystok (Eds.), *Language processing in bilingual children.* (p. 141-166). Cambridge: University Press.

Mayer, M. (2007). Frog, where are you? New York: Dial Books for Young Readers.

McKenna, M.C., Walpole, S. & Conradi, K. (2010). Promoting early reading. Research, recourses, and best practices. Edited by New York: The Guilford Press.

McKeown, M.G. & Beck, I.L. (2003). Taking advantage of read aloud to help children make sense of decontextualized language. In A. van Kleek, S.A. Stahl, & A. B. Bauer (Eds.), *On reading to children: Parents and teachers.* (p. 159-176). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

McLachlan, C., Nicholson, T., Fielding-Barnsley, R., Mercer, L., & Ohi S. (2013). *Literacy in early childhood and primary education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Merriam, S.B. (2009). *Qualitative research: a guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.

Morrow, L.M. & Brittain, R. (2003). The nature of storybook reading in the elementary school: Current practices. In A. van Kleek, S.A. Stahl, & A. B. Bauer (Eds.), *On reading to children: Parents and teachers.* (p. 140-158). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Neuman, S.B. (1996). Children engaging in storybook reading: The influence of access to print resources, opportunity, and parental interaction. *Early Childhood Research* Quarterly*, 11*, p. 495-513. Retrieved October 30, 2014, from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0885200696900198

Niklas, F. & Schneider, W. (2012). Home literacy environment and the beginning of reading and spelling. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 38*, p. 40–50. Retrieved October 30, 2014, from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0361476X12000501

Oller, D.K. & Jarmulovicz, L. (2007). Language and literacy in bilingual children in the early school years. In E. Hoff, & M. Shatz (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Language Development.* (p. 368-386). Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

Panofsky, C.P. (1994). Developing the representational functions of language: The role of parent-child book-reading activity. In: V. John-Steiner, C.P. Panofsky & L.W. Smith (Ed.), *Sociocultural approaches to language and literacy.* (p. 223-242). Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Paradis, J. (2007). Second language acquisition in childhood. In E. Hoff, & M. Shatz (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Language Development.* (p.387-406). Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

Patton, M.Q. (2002*). Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Pellegrini, A.D., & Galda, L. (2003). Joint reading as a context: Explicating the ways context is created by participants. In A. van Kleek, S.A. Stahl, & A. B. Bauer (Eds.), *On*

reading to children: Parents and teachers. (p. 321-335).   Mahwah,   NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Ping, M.T. (2014). Group interactions in dialogic book reading activities as a language learning context in preschool. *Learning, Culture and social interaction, 3,* p. 146-158.   Retrieved   February   21,   2015   from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2210656114000312

Raikes, H., Pan B.A., Luze, G., Tamis-LeMonda, C.S., Brooks-Gunn, J., Constantine, J., Banks Tarullo, L., Raikes, H.A. & Rodriguez, E.T. (2006). Mother–child bookreading in   low-   income families: Correlates and outcomes during the first three years of life. *Child   Development, 77*(4)*,* p. 924-953. Retrieved October

10, 2014 from   http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-
        8624.2006.00911.x/abstract

Reese, E., Cox, A., Harte, D. & McAnally, H. (2003). Diversity in adults' styles of reading books to children. In A. van Kleek, S.A. Stahl, & A. B. Bauer (Eds.), *On reading to children: Parents and teachers.* (p. 37-57). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: cognitive development in social context*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sandvik, M. & Spurkland, M. (2012). *Lær meg norsk før skolestart!*: språkstimulering og kartlegging i den flerkulturelle barnehagen. Oslo: Cappelen Damm akademisk.

Sarano, O.N., & Spodek, B. (2010). Parents and children engaging in story book reading. *Early Child Development and Care, 180*(10), p. 1379-89. Retrieved January 30, 2014 from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03004430903135605

Scheele, A.F., Leseman, P.P.M. & Mayo, A.Y. (2009). The home language environment of monolingual and bilingual children and their language proficiency. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 31*(1), p. 117-140. Retrieved October 10, 2014, from http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=6878432 &f   ulltextType=RA&fileId=S0142716409990191

Sénéchal, M. (1997) The differential effect of storybook reading on preschoolers' acquisition of expressive and receptive vocabulary. *Journal of Child Language , 24,* p. 123-138. Retrieved May, 20, 2015, from http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=36795&fileId=S0305000996003005

Serratrice, L. (2013). The bilingual child. In Bhatia T.K. & Ritchie W.C. (Eds.), *The Handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism.* (p.102-104). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Sigel, I.E. (1986). Early social experience and the development of representational competence. In W. Fowler (Ed.), *Early experience and the development of competence: New directions for child development,* p.49-65. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Retrieved April 16, 2015, from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/cd.23219863205/pdf

Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research.* London: Sage.

Simpson, J. & Wigglesworth, G. (2008). *Children's language and multilingualism: indigenous language use at home and school.* London: Continuum.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1981). *Bilingualism or not. The education of minorities*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

SSB (2007). *Fakta om 18 innvandregrupper i Norge. Rapport 2007/29.* Retrieved on February 10, 2015 from http://www.ssb.no/a/publikasjoner/pdf/rapp_200729/rapp_200729.pdf

SSB (2015). *Nøkkeltall for innvandring og innvandrere.* Retrieved on February 10, 2015 from

https://ssb.no/innvandring-og-innvandrere/nokkeltall/innvandring-og-innvandrere

Stahl, S.A. (2003). What do we expect storybook reading to do? How storybook reading impacts word recognition. In A. van Kleek, S.A. Stahl, & A. B. Bauer (Eds.), *On reading to children: Parents and teachers.* (p. 363-384). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Stenbacka, C. (2001). Qualitative research requires quality concepts of its own. *Management Decision*, *39*(7), p. 551-555. Retrieved January 15, 2015, from http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/full/10.1108/EUM0000000005801

Tabors, P.O. (2008). One child, two languages: A guide for early childhood educators of children learning English as a second language. Baltimore, Md.: Paul H. Brookes Pub. Co.

Teale, W.H. (2003). Reading aloud to young children as a classroom instructional activity: Insights from research and practice. In A. van Kleek, S.A. Stahl, & A. B. Bauer (Eds.), *On reading to children: Parents and teachers.* (p. 114-139). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Temple, J.D., & Snow, C.E. (2003). Learning words from books. In A. van Kleek, S.A. Stahl, & A. B. Bauer (Eds.), *On reading to children: Parents and teachers.* (p. 16-36). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Thagaard, T. (2009). *Systematikk og innlevelse: en innføring i kvalitativ metode.* Bergen: Fagbokforl.

Tizard, B. & Hughes, M. (2002). *Young children learning.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Valvatne, H. & Sandvik, M. (2007). *Barn, språk og kultur: språkutvikling fram til sjuårsalderen*. Oslo: Cappelen akademisk forlag

van Kleeck, A., & Stahl, S.A. (2003). Preface. In A. van Kleek, S.A. Stahl, & A. B. Bauer (Eds.), *On reading to children: Parents and teachers.* (p. vii-xiii). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Wasik, B.A., Bond, M.A., & Hindman, A. (2006). The effects of a language and literacy intervention on Head Start children and teachers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*(1), p. 63-74. Retrieved November 17, 2014, from http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/2006-02666-005

Wells, G. (1981). *Learning through interaction: the study of language development.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Whitehurst, G.J., Falco, F.L., Lonigan, C.J., Fischel, J.E., DeBaryshe, B.D., Valdez-Manchaca, M.C., & Caulfield, M. (1988). Accelerating language development through picture book reading. *Developmental Psychology, 24*(4), p. 552-559. Retrieved November 04, 2014, from http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/dev/24/4/552.html

Winch, G., Johnston, R.R., Holliday, M., Ljungdahl, L. & March, P. (2001). *Literacy: reading, writing, and children's literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Child Psychiatry , 17*, p. 89-100. Retrieved May 04, 2015, from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x/abstract

Wu, C., & Honig, A.S. (2008). Taiwanese mother's beliefs about reading aloud with preschoolers: findings from the parent reading belief inventory. *Early Child Development and Care, 180*(5), p. 647-669. Retrieved October 30, 2014, from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03004430802221449

Yin, R.K. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to finish.* New York: Guilford Press.

Yin, R.K. (2012). *Applications of case study research.* Los Angeles: Sage.

Zevenbergen, A.A., & Whitehurst, G.J. (2003). Dialogic reading: A shared picture book reading intervention for preschoolers. In A. van Kleek, S.A. Stahl, & A. B. Bauer (Eds.), *On reading to children: Parents and teachers.* (p. 177-200). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Zucker, T.A., Justice, L.M., Piasta, S.B., & Kaderavek, J.N. (2010). Preschool teacher's literal and inferential questions and children's responses during whole-class shared reading. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 25,* p.65-83. Retrieved November 10, 2015, from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ864538

Appendix 1

Some aspects of transcription:

Russian – utterances in Russian

Norwegian – utterances in Norwegian

Ukrainian – utterances in Ukrainian

English – translation into English from Russian, Norwegian or Ukrainian

xxx – I used xxx, when I did not understand or it was unintelligible what child says

_____ – I used _____ when adult pauses with a purpose, so that child can complete the word or sentence

((…)) – my comments

(2) – pause in seconds

? – question

. – full stop

Appendix 2

Coding Categories and Definitions for PARENTS AND PRESCHOOL TEACHERS

	Category	*Code*	*Definition*	*Example*
	Utterance types			
Reads		1	Mother/teacher reads the text	Mother: "The cat was sleeping with her in the bed, but the dog was sleeping on the carpet, on the floor" Teacher: "All little penguins will get out and swim in the cold water"
Provides info/explanation/definition		2	Teacher/mother provides information, explanation, definitions of unknown to the child terms/meanings	Child: "Why do not we have such a barrel?" Mother: "Such barrels are at the plants,…"
Prompts child to say smth about the book		3	All types of strategies during book reading that prompts child to say smth about the book	
	Yes/no questions	3.1	Mother/teacher asks questions related to the book and child's experience which can be answered just yes/no or mother asks child's opinion, but child doesn't have the opportunity not to give full answer but just yes/no.	Mother: "Does it (frog) want to go out?" Child: "Yes" Teacher: "Do they use tail when they go as well?" Child: "Yes" Mother: "Do you think that child got angry?" Child: "Yes" Teacher: "Did you read this book before?" Child: "Yes"
	Prompts labeling, counting	3.2	Mother/teacher requests label for an object, possibly pointing at the picture usually with words "here", "there". Asks the name of a color, asks to count	Mother: "What's there?" Child: "Rat" Teacher: "What is coming here?" Child: "Fish"
	Prompts recall	3.3	Mother asks child to recall info/some aspects from the book, describe pictures/illustrations	Mother: What happened in this book? Child: He was looking after frog"; Mother: "What happened then?" Child: "Calls frog"
	Prompts completion or	3.4	Mother/teacher pauses while reading so that child can complete the word or sentence. Directs to repeat after her	Mother: "There was a boy and he had___?" Child: "Frog" Teacher: "An__" Teacher: "Anta__" Children together:

	repetition			"Antarctic" Mother: "It calls swarm. Say this!" Child: "Swarm" Mother: "Yes"
	Elicits inferring	3.5	Mother/teacher asks child to infer/conclude looking at picture/illustration	Mother: "Why does it (frog) get out from there, what do you think?" Child: "Because it (frog) want to go out for a while" Mother: "Is it day or night, what do you think?" Child: "Night"
	Prompts explanation	3.6	Teacher says the words and asks for its explanation; mother/teacher asks to provide definition	Teacher: "What is swarm?" Other child: "Where bees there" Mother: "When there many bees and they fly together, how do we call it? Child: "mmm"
	Distancing prompt /Connects plot of the story to child's life	3.7	Mother/teacher asks questions during book reading for a child to recollect something from personal experience. Prompts connection of the context of the book to a child's life).	(Read book about pancakes) Mother: "What do you like to eat pancakes with?" Child: "With honey and syrup" Teacher: "Who is protecting you?" Other child: "Mommy daddy and sister" Other child: "And those that work at preschool"
	Asks to narrate the story	3.8	Teacher gives floor to the child to speak freely about the text usually by addressing the child by name	Teacher: "So now Alexander will read for us" Child: "Then it becomes xxx frog"
	Encourages by praising	3.9	Mother encourages the child to speak by praising	Mother: "Count them" Child: "Nei" Mother: "Count them, I know you can!"
	Responds to child language			
Evaluates/corrects		4	Mother/teacher evaluates; corrects the child's pronunciation, grammar or general knowledge	Child: "To his" Mother: "To him" Teacher: "What is precious?" Other child: "Broken ting" Teacher: "No"
Confirms		5	Mother/teacher confirms/repeats/acknowledges the child's statement or question with "yes", says "right" or repeats the same words	Other child: "Now daddy must go fishing and mommy has to take care of children" Teacher: "Yes" Child: "Because he was looking for the frog" Mother: "Correct" Other child: "He cannot hold anything" Teacher: "Cannot hold anything"
Expands		6	Mother/teacher expands child's response by	Child: "Pancakes" Mother: "Pancakes with butter"

			repeating/paraphrasing followed by adding information to it	Child: "With honey and syrup" Mother: "With honey, syrup and butter"; Child: "There were no eggs" Mother: "Empty"
Behavioral utterances		7	Behavior-focused utterances, like directing child's behavior or language in response to the child's activity or comment/question. Praises for god job.	Mother: "Do not touch this door!" Other child: "Teacher, when I lost my toy… Teacher: "No, it is not about that we are talking now!" Teacher/Mother: "God job!"
Other		8	Other utterances that are not related to the book and phrases like: "Let's", "Let's see", "Let's see what happens here/next" possibly while turning the page	Mother: "It records us" Mother: "I told you" Teacher: "Did you read both pages?" Mother: "Did you find book about mole?" Mother: "Let's see what happens next"

Coding Categories and Definitions for CHILD'S BEHAVIORS at Home and in Preschool

Category		*Code*	*Definition*	*Example*
Language production				
Child narrates after being asked to do it	9		Child reads/narrates after teacher says his name and asked him to read	Teacher: "Next page is Alexander, please Alexander, now you will read" Alex: "The boy…."
Child narrates/comments/adds spontaneously info without being directed	10		Child reads without any invitation from mother/teacher or adds some words, sequence of words, comments while mother/teacher reads	Child: "Suddenly the boy is sleeping with dogs and frog came out of the jar" Mother: "And the boy landed on the top (of the deer)" Child: "On the head"
Non meaningful utterance	11		Non-word, unintelligible	Mother: "Do you remember what happened?" Child: "mmm"
Yes/No, one-word answer (non-meaningful utterance)	12		Child answers yes/no on mother's/teacher's question, agrees with mother/teacher giving yes/no answer, replies "I do not know", "I cannot" "Nothing" "Cannot say" on the asked question or "here", "there" instead for naming the object; non- understandable chunks of a sentence; child initiates sounds	Mother: "Was the lake deep? Child: "No" Mother: "While the boy was looking for the frog in the burrow, the dog began to bark on the bees" Child: "Yes" Mother: "Which?" Child: "I do not know" Mother: "Where is the dog sleeping?" Child: "Here" Child: "I cannot" Mother: "What did she do?" Child: "She"; Child: "I forgot"

Repeats	13	Child repeats word or sequences of words after mother/teacher upon and without mother's/teacher's request or after other children in the group	Mother: "It calls swarm. Say this!" Child: "Swarm" Mother: "Yes" Mother: "It is not hole, it is hollow" Child: "Hollow" Mother: "This house is called henhouse" Child: "Henhouse" Teacher: "Swarm of wasps" Other child: Swarm of wsps"
Labels/describes	14	Child names the object/ gives label to the object/counts/names color	Mother: "Who is this?" Child: "Dog" Mother: "Here we can count they one more time" Child: "one two three four…."
Recalls	15	Child recalls information about the book	Mother: "Why did he turn around the shoes?" Child: "He was looking after a frog"; Teacher: "What do they do here?" Child: "Seal will eat a small penguin"
Completes	16	Child completes word or sentence as mother/teacher pauses.	Mother: "And behind the rock was a___?" Child: "Deer"
Explains	17	Child provides/attempts to provide explanation of the word/words or concept to the action	Teacher: "What is precious?" Other child: "Broken thing"
Infers	18	Child infers/reflects or analyze after being asked/without being asked	Mother: "Why do you think she has gone?" Child: "xxx she does not like night" Child: That's why it (frog) that's why it that's why it wants sun"
Speaks about things that are related to his life or general knowledge	19	Child shares information from his experience/life or general knowledge about discussed subject.	Teacher: "Who is protecting you?" Other child: "Mommy daddy and sister" Other child: "And those that work at preschool"
Child gives answer on other children's questions or extends other's answers	20	Child gives answer on other children's questions or extends other children's answer	Teacher: "Protects kids" Other child 1: "Why?" Other child 2: "They protect kinds so no one could take them" Other child: "Because he wanted to go home" Other child: "To the family"
Speaks L2	21	Child speaks Norwegian, his second l-ge	Speaks Russian and suddenly… så hva skjedde?
Speaks L3	22	Child speaks Ukrainian, his third language	Teacher: "Cannot they fly?" Child: (speaks Ukrainian)
Asks questions	23	Child asks questions during reading session	Child: "Why frogs are not green?" Mother: "Everything is not green here" ;Child: "Is it the boy's house"?" Mother: "Yes, maybe it is boy's house"
Child other	24	Child produces utterances that are not	Child: "Mom, I can press here"

		related to the text/book. Comments from other children in the preschool that are related to book reading session but not to the book itself, as well as calling each other by names	Child: "Read to me" Child: "Mom, look!" Other child: "After him, it is my turn to read" Other child: "How long will we record?"