



## ORBIT - Online Repository of Birkbeck Institutional Theses

---

Enabling Open Access to Birkbeck's Research Degree output

### Accomplishing multilingual lessons: code-switching in South African rural classrooms

<https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/40208/>

Version: Full Version

**Citation: Ramadiro, Brian (2017) Accomplishing multilingual lessons: code-switching in South African rural classrooms. [Thesis] (Unpublished)**

© 2020 The Author(s)

---

All material available through ORBIT is protected by intellectual property law, including copyright law.

Any use made of the contents should comply with the relevant law.

---

[Deposit Guide](#)  
Contact: [email](#)

ACCOMPLISHING MULTILINGUAL LESSONS:  
CODE-SWITCHING IN SOUTH AFRICAN RURAL  
CLASSROOMS

Brian Ramadiro

Doctor of Philosophy

2017

Birkbeck College, University of London

## Abstract

This study examines code-switching (CS) practices in South African rural classrooms. In particular, it studies isiXhosa, isiMpondo and English CS in Mpondoland. Its central question investigates whether or not a Conversation Analytic (CA) approach to bi/multilingual talk is a viable methodological and theoretical framework with which to explain classroom multilingualism in whole-class formats of interaction.

The study examines CS practices in English Second Language (L2) and English L2-medium content lessons in two secondary schools. It draws primarily on close analysis of transcripts, but also on ethnographic knowledge of the setting, participant observation, teacher interviews, and quantitative techniques to explore the following questions: How is CS used to accomplish lessons? Can a CA approach explain observed CS practices? How is classroom bi/multilingual talk similar to and different from ordinary conversation? To what extent can observed practices be explained in terms of classroom type, viz., English-language vs. English L2-medium Social Science vs. English L2-medium Technology classroom? To what extent can patterns of CS be explained in terms of individual differences in teachers' communicative styles and attitudes to CS?

The study finds that lessons are accomplished in five patterns of language use, viz., separate/divergent bilingualism, convergent bilingualism, mixed/flexible multilingualism, isiXhosa-isiMpondo-only, and English-only. It concludes that although CA is a powerful approach for discovering how participants orient to different varieties used in classrooms and therefore for establishing what counts as language and CS in interaction, it is not, on its own, an adequate methodological and theoretical framework with which to explain what goes in multilingual classrooms. This is because the multilingual practices of classroom participants cannot be satisfactorily interpreted without reference to extra-sequential factors such as institutional goals, the roles of participants, and the broader sociolinguistic context in which their practices are embedded.

## Declaration

I hereby declare that, except where explicit attribution is made, the work presented in this thesis is entirely my own.

---

Signature of Candidate

---

Date

Word count (exclusive of appendices and list of references): 97 220

## Acknowledgements

I am deeply grateful to the following people. To the teachers, students and parents of the Bizana schools for letting me into their classrooms. To my supervisor Penelope Gardner-Chloros for her guidance, support, and close but sympathetic reading of everything I have ever put before her. To the Nelson Mandela Institute for Education and Rural Education at the University of Fort Hare for a fellowship grant that made this study possible. To Nobuntu Mazeka and her family for allowing me to squat in their home during fieldwork. To Kim Porteus for being a friend, colleague and the coolest boss in the world, and in particular for periodically kicking the can down the road so that I could complete this thesis. To my friends and readers for careful reading of drafts and stimulating discussions: Nobuntu Mazeka, Bamba Nkwentsha, Elize Koch, Liz Botha, Sivuyile Tshikila and Khanyisile Ngalo. To George Moyo for securing a quiet writing space for me at the University of Fort Hare's Faculty of Education. Finally, to my people: Siv, Nkosazana and Zinde, thank you so much for your patience and support; I will make it up to you.

“A language is best thought of as a game in which all the speakers can covertly propose and try out rules, and all the listeners are umpires.” (Le Page, 1997, quoted in Gardner-Chloros, 2009:32)

“The great linguistic paradox of our time is that societies which dedicate enormous resources to language teaching and learning have been unable - or unwilling - to remove the powerful linguistic barriers to full participation in the major institutions of modern society.” (Tollefson 1991:7, quoted in Alexander, 2005:6)

# Table of Contents

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Declaration.....	3
Acknowledgements .....	4
Table of Contents.....	6
List of Tables .....	11
List of Excerpts .....	12
Abbreviations.....	14
Key Terms .....	15
1. Introduction .....	16
1.1 Background .....	16
1.2 A Note on Terminology.....	18
1.3 Rationale for the Study .....	18
1.4 Aims and Scope.....	20
1.5 Overview of the Study .....	22
1.6 Significance of the Study.....	24
2. Literature Review.....	25
2.1 Introduction .....	25
2.2 The language situation in South Africa .....	25
2.2.1 An overview .....	26
2.2.2 The South African language debate.....	32
2.2.3 Language-in-education policy.....	43
2.3 Theoretical Approaches to Code-switching in Interaction .....	50
2.3.1 Gumperz: situational vs. metaphorical CS.....	50
2.3.2 Myers-Scotton: Markedness Model and Rational Choice .....	52
2.3.3 Conversation Analytic Approach.....	55
2.3.4 Post-structuralist approaches.....	60
2.4 Code-switching in the Classroom.....	62
2.4.1 Strands of classroom-based CS studies .....	62
2.4.2 Conceptions of CS in classroom research .....	66
2.4.3 Methodological issues .....	67
2.4.4 Findings .....	68
2.5 Conclusion.....	71

3.	Research Methodology.....	73
3.1	Introduction .....	73
3.2	The Site .....	73
3.3	Conversation analysis as Research Methodology.....	77
3.3.1	Ethnomethodological basis of CA.....	77
3.3.2	Principles of Conversation Analysis .....	79
3.3.3	Four types of mechanisms for organizing talk.....	80
3.4	Specificities of Institutional Talk .....	85
3.4.1	Characteristics of institutional talk.....	85
3.4.2	On quantification of institutional talk.....	87
3.5	Data Collection and Analysis.....	88
3.5.1	Data collection and production .....	88
3.5.2	Analytic Strategies .....	92
3.6	Validity and Generalizability .....	94
3.7	Limitations .....	95
3.8	Ethical considerations.....	95
4.	'Codes' in Code-switching.....	97
4.1	Introduction .....	97
4.2	Overview of Corpus.....	97
4.3	The 'Codes' of Code-switching.....	100
4.3.1	English .....	100
4.3.2	IsiXhosa and isiMpondo .....	101
4.3.3	Multilingual variety .....	106
4.3.4	Classroom formulaic language.....	108
4.4	Findings and Conclusions.....	110
5.	Patterns of Language Use in Multilingual Classrooms.....	113
5.1	Introduction .....	113
5.2	Separate/divergent bi/multilingualism.....	114
5.2.1	Type 1A: Divergent bi/multilingualism as a medium of interaction.....	115
5.2.2	Type 1B: Divergent bilingualism as strategic language use.....	118
5.2.3	Type 1C: Divergent flexible bi/multilingualism.....	120
5.2.4	Findings .....	130
5.3	Convergent multilingualism.....	132
5.3.1	Type 2 (a): Teacher-led language convergence .....	133
5.3.2	Type 2 (b): Learner participant-related language convergence .....	138

5.3.3	Type 2 (c): Learner-to-learner discourse- and participant-related convergence.....	140
5.3.4	Findings .....	142
5.4	Mixed/flexible multilingualism .....	145
5.4.1	Introduction .....	145
5.4.2	Multilingualism with some-to-no sequential meaning.....	145
5.4.3	Findings .....	151
5.5	Summary findings and conclusions.....	152
5.5.1	Findings .....	152
5.5.2	Theoretical implications.....	155
6.	Code-switching and Classroom Turn-taking .....	159
6.1	Introduction .....	159
6.2	An overview: Turn-taking in ordinary conversation vs turn-taking in classroom talk	159
6.3	Turn-taking Types and Code-switching.....	161
6.3.1	Type 1: Teacher Elicitation and Learner Bids.....	162
6.3.2	Type 2: Teacher Elicitation-Learner Choral Response .....	171
6.3.3	Type 3: Co-production/ turn-sharing .....	177
6.3.4	Type 4: Turn allocation without bids .....	181
6.3.5	Type 5: Learner self-selection (speaking out of turn).....	187
6.4	Conclusions .....	192
7.	Code-switching and Classroom Repair .....	197
7.1	Overview of Classroom Repair.....	197
7.2	Repair Types and Code-switching.....	199
7.2.1	Teacher: self-initiation and self-repair (Type 1) .....	199
7.2.2	Teacher: other-initiation and self-repair (Type 2) .....	202
7.2.3	Teacher: Self-initiation and other-repair (Type 3).....	204
7.2.4	Teacher: other-initiation other-repair (Type 4) .....	205
7.2.5	Learner self-initiation and self-repair (Type 5) .....	205
7.2.6	Learner other-initiation and self-repair (Type 6).....	206
7.2.7	Learner self-initiation and other-repair (Type 7).....	219
7.2.8	Learner other-initiation and other-repair (Type 8).....	222
7.3	Findings and Conclusions.....	230
8.	Teachers' Patterns of Language Use.....	234
8.1	Patterns of Language Use .....	234
8.1.1	Language of Turn Constructional Units (TCUs).....	234

8.1.2	English Lessons.....	235
8.1.3	Social Science Lessons.....	240
8.1.4	Technology Lessons .....	245
8.1.5	Discussion .....	247
8.2	Language of Turn .....	252
8.2.1	English Lessons.....	252
8.2.2	Social Science Lessons.....	254
8.2.3	Technology Lessons .....	256
8.2.4	Discussion .....	257
8.3	Language of Episodes.....	263
8.3.1	Introduction .....	263
8.3.2	English Lessons.....	264
8.3.3	Social Science .....	268
8.3.4	Technology.....	269
8.3.5	Discussion .....	270
8.4	Language and Classroom Contexts .....	274
8.4.1	English Lessons.....	275
8.4.2	Social Science Lessons.....	278
8.4.3	Technology Lessons .....	279
8.4.4	Discussion .....	281
8.5	Summary of Individual Teacher Practices and Views .....	283
8.5.1	Sindi.....	283
8.5.2	Anele .....	288
8.5.3	Thami .....	292
8.5.4	Bamba .....	294
8.5.5	Nande.....	296
8.5.6	Discussion .....	299
8.6	Conclusions .....	303
9.	Conclusion.....	306
9.1	Summary Findings and Conclusions.....	306
9.1.1	Patterns of language use in multilingual classrooms.....	306
9.1.2	Patterns of language use: classroom types and individual differences...	311
9.2	Implications.....	313
9.2.1	Implications for a CA-based Approach to Multilingual Classroom Interaction.....	313
9.2.2	Implications for Education .....	314

9.3 Issues for Further Research .....	316
References .....	318
Appendix A: Transcription Conventions .....	342
Appendix B: Teacher Interview Guide .....	343
Appendix C: Information Sheet (English).....	344
Appendix D: Information Sheet (isiXhosa).....	345
Appendix E: Caregiver Consent Form .....	346
Appendix F: Teacher Consent Form.....	347
Appendix G: Learner Consent Form.....	348
Appendix H: Ethics Clearance .....	349
Appendix I: TCUs by Language by Teacher .....	350
Appendix J: Turns by Language by Teacher .....	351
Appendix K: Sequence by Language by Teacher .....	352

## List of Tables

Table 1: Home Language Trends 1996-2011 .....	29
Table 2: 2014 Annual National Assessment Test Scores for English .....	76
Table 3: Summary of Lesson Audio Recordings .....	90
Table 4: Turn Construction Unit by Language/Code.....	99
Table 5: Rules of 'Ordinary' Conversation Compared to Classroom Talk.....	160
Table 6: Turn-taking Types.....	162
Table 7: Types of Classroom Repair .....	197
Table 8: Frequency of Repair Types.....	199
Table 9: English Total TCUs by Teacher (Count and %) .....	236
Table 10: Social Science Total TCUs by Teacher (Count and %) .....	240
Table 11: Technology Total TCUs by Teacher (Count and %) .....	245
Table 12: English Analysis by Turn (Count and %) .....	253
Table 13: Social Science Analysis by Turn (Count and %) .....	255
Table 14: Technology Analysis by Turn (Count and %).....	256
Table 15: English Language of Sequence by Teacher (Count and %) .....	264
Table 16: Social Science Language of Sequence by Teacher (Count and %) .....	268
Table 17: Technology Language of Sequence by Teacher (Count and %) .....	269
Table 18: English - Language of Classroom Context (Count and %) .....	276
Table 19: Social Science - Language of Classroom Context (Count and %) .....	278
Table 20: Technology - Language of Classroom Context (Count and %) .....	280

## List of Excerpts

Excerpt 1: 'Ordinary' English (Lesson 8).....	100
Excerpt 2: 'Safetalk' English (Lesson 2).....	101
Excerpt 3: IsiMpondo to mark a shift in conversational footing (Lesson 1) .....	104
Excerpt 4: Arguing in stylised isiMpondo (Lesson 2) .....	105
Excerpt 5: English insertions in isiXhosa-isiMpondo-dominant TCUs (Lesson 5) .....	106
Excerpt 6: IsiXhosa-isiMpondo insertions in English-dominant TCUs (Lesson 5) .....	107
Excerpt 7: Mixed TCUs with no clear language dominance (Lesson 5) .....	108
Excerpt 8: Divergent language use as the norm (Lesson 3).....	116
Excerpt 9: Strategic divergent language use (Lesson 7) .....	119
Excerpt 10: Discourse-related transfer (Lesson 12).....	121
Excerpt 11: Discourse-related code-switching (Lesson 10) .....	123
Excerpt 12: English-dominant sequence and brief alternational switches to isiXhosa-isiMpondo (Lesson 1).....	125
Excerpt 13: Other- and Self-facilitative participant-related transfer (Lesson 8) .....	127
Excerpt 14: Between discourse and participant-related (Lesson 2).....	128
Excerpt 15: Participant-related CS (Lesson 3).....	134
Excerpt 16: Discourse-related switching (Lesson 1) .....	137
Excerpt 17: Learner participant-related language convergence (Lesson 7) .....	139
Excerpt 18: IsiXhosa-isiMpondo-dominant sequence with English insertions (Lesson 12) ..	141
Excerpt 19: Frequent insertions with some to no sequential meaning (Lesson 5) .....	146
Excerpt 20: isiXhosa-isiMpondo insertions/transfers in an otherwise English turn.....	148
Excerpt 21: Multilingual variety without sequential or local meaning (Lesson 6) .....	149
Excerpt 22: Divergent pattern - doing reading and managing reading (Lesson 3).....	163
Excerpt 23: Convergent language use - Inspecting an answer and rejecting it (Lesson 7).....	165
Excerpt 24: IsiXhosa-isiMpondo only to encourage learner participation (Lesson 6) .....	168
Excerpt 25: Monolingual English to do 'easy' work (Lesson 9).....	169
Excerpt 26: Multilingual variety - doing checking/confirming listening (Lesson 9).....	172
Excerpt 27: isiXhosa-isiMpondo - building on prior knowledge (Lesson 7).....	173
Excerpt 28: English, to divergent pattern, and to English - choral response as a defensive strategy (Lesson 2) .....	175
Excerpt 29: English, to isiXhosa-isiMpondo, and to convergent pattern - collaboratively closing an activity (Lesson 2) .....	178
Excerpt 30: from isiXhosa-isiMpondo/ English divergence to English/English convergence - re-cohorting (Lesson 2).....	179
Excerpt 31: Frequent switching between isiXhosa-isiMpondo and a multilingual variety - 'face-threatening' turn-taking (Lesson 7) .....	181
Excerpt 32: Mixed language use - restoring safetalk (Lesson 2).....	184
Excerpt 33: IsiXhosa-isiMpondo for maintaining classroom order - 'off-stage' group self-selection (Lesson 1).....	188
Excerpt 34: From divergent language to isiXhosa-isiMpondo - learner self-selection, noticeable but perhaps not sanctionable (Lesson 11).....	189
Excerpt 35: English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo, noticeable and mildly sanctionable (Lesson 1) .....	190
Excerpt 36: Frequency of repair types.....	200
Excerpt 37: Participant-related switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo (Lesson 8) .....	201

Excerpt 38: Discourse-related switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo (Lesson 2) .....	203
Excerpt 39: Disfluent reading in English (Lesson 4) .....	205
Excerpt 40: Disfluent reading in English (Lesson 3) .....	205
Excerpt 41: isiXhosa-isiMpondo discourse marker 'Hhe' (Lesson 1) .....	207
Excerpt 42: Failed self-repair and other-repair by another learner (Lesson 1) .....	208
Excerpt 43: Failed self-repair and other-repair by another learner (Lesson 7) .....	210
Excerpt 44: Weak choral response (Lesson 2) .....	214
Excerpt 45: Different and competing choral responses (Lesson 2) .....	216
Excerpt 46: Use of isiMpondo to reinstate Type 1 turn-taking (Lesson 2) .....	218
Excerpt 47: Teacher-facilitated but learner-accomplished other-repair (Lesson 1) .....	220
Excerpt 48: Reading problems (Lesson 3) .....	222
Excerpt 49: Repairing a minor omission (Lesson 2) .....	223
Excerpt 50: Repair of grammar (Lesson 2) .....	225
Excerpt 51: Repair of pronunciation (Lesson 4) .....	227
Excerpt 52: Pre-emptive repair of isiMpondo pronunciation (Lesson 7) .....	229
Excerpt 53: Syntactic assimilation of English nouns .....	237
Excerpt 54: Syntactic-plus-phonological and lexical assimilation of English verbs .....	238
Excerpt 55: English Discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions .....	239
Excerpt 56: English Discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions .....	239
Excerpt 57: English Discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions .....	239
Excerpt 58: isiXhosa-isiMpondo discourse marker in English constructions .....	239
Excerpt 59: English discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions .....	241
Excerpt 60: Two-part TCU - from isiXhosa-isiMpondo to English .....	242
Excerpt 61: Two-part TCU - from English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo .....	243
Excerpt 62: Two-part TCU - from isiXhosa-isiMpondo to English .....	243
Excerpt 63: Three-part TCU - from English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo to English .....	244
Excerpt 64: Three-part TCU - from isiXhosa-isiMpondo to English to isiXhosa- isiMpondo .....	244
Excerpt 65: English discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions .....	246
Excerpt 66: Linguistically neutral insertions .....	265
Excerpt 67: Anele's divergent language pattern .....	265
Excerpt 68: Sindi's divergent language patterns .....	266
Excerpt 69: Anele's divergent language patterns .....	267
Excerpt 70: Sindi's mixed language patterns .....	267
Excerpt 71: Thami's English turns .....	268
Excerpt 72: Bamba's English turns .....	268
Excerpt 73: Teachers and learners need to use more English .....	285
Excerpt 74: 'They are teaching using Home Language' .....	286
Excerpt 75: 'I try to switch a little bit but not the whole lesson.' .....	286
Excerpt 76: IsiMpondo - 'No. we are changing it here at school' .....	287
Excerpt 77: Problems with learner English - reading, spelling and writing .....	290
Excerpt 78: Learner English language strengths - listening .....	290
Excerpt 79: 'They really get it' .....	292
Excerpt 80: The children have great difficulties with English .....	293
Excerpt 81: '...their isiXhosa is mixed' .....	294
Excerpt 82: 'I think our learners they are lazy to to speak' .....	297
Excerpt 83: 'The problem thina (us) we are sympathising with learners' .....	298
Excerpt 84: 'if you look at my face you can understand what I'm saying' .....	298

## Abbreviations

CA	Conversation Analysis
CS	Code-switching
HL	Home Language
LM	Language Mixing
MM	Markedness Model
RC	Rational Choice
TCU	Turn Constructional Unit
TRP	Transitional Relevant Place

## Key Terms

Alternational CS	Switches that occur between sentences or TCUs (also inter-sentential CS)
Code-switching (CS)	use of more than one variety in conversation (also <i>language alternation</i> )
Conversation Analysis	Turn by turn analysis of the development and meaning of talk in interaction (also <i>sequential analysis</i> )
Preference	Refers to structural designs of turns rather than to psychological motives of speakers. Preferred actions tend to occur without delay and in unmarked formats and dispreferred ones with delays and in marked formats.
Insertional CS	Switches that occur within a sentence or TCU (also <i>intra-sentential CS</i> )
Inter-sentential CS	Switches that occur between sentences or TCUs (also <i>alternational CS</i> )
Intra-sentential CS	Switches that occur within a sentence or TCU (also <i>insertional CS</i> )
Language alternation	use of more than one variety in conversation (also <i>code-switching</i> )
Sequential analysis	Turn by turn analysis of the development and meaning of talk in interaction (also <i>Conversation Analysis</i> )
Repair	Troubles in the course of interaction and actions participants take to resolve it
Repairable	A source of troubles in talk in interaction
Turn Constructional	
Unit (TCU)	Is a grammatical sentence, phrase, word, paralinguistic, or non-linguistic item

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Background

Language is a domain of social tension and conflict in South Africa. Conflict over language intersects with and is often a proxy for tension and conflict over identity, social and cultural inclusion, and upward social mobility, in a divided and unequal society (Alexander, 2014; 1989). Tensions around language go back to Dutch and British colonial periods in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, respectively, and more recently to the apartheid era (Alexander, 1989). Language conflict in post-apartheid South Africa centres on education. As an example, at the time of writing, following public demonstrations and protests, some of which turned violent (ENCA, 2016; Radio 702, 2016), two historically Afrikaans-medium universities were forced to drop Afrikaans as a primary medium of teaching and learning in favour of English, or the use of Afrikaans alongside English.

Until recently, the language question in the domain of education in South Africa was often posed as a choice between Afrikaans or English monolingualism, or Afrikaans-English bilingualism, despite the fact that combined, these two languages are used as home languages by less than a quarter of the population. The question has now been broadened to involve the role and use of all eleven South African official languages in teaching and learning. Consequently, a number of small scale but significant initiatives have been started across a number of South African universities, promoting African languages in particular, alongside English or Afrikaans, as media of teaching and learning (for recent examples, see Hibbert and van der Walt, 2014).

Against a background of these initiatives in higher education, the schooling system, on the contrary, remains deeply English assimilationist (Heugh, 2003; 1995). This, even though official language policy (DoE, 1997) favours an additive bi/multilingual (Baker, 2011) education system, i.e., the use and development of home languages (HLs) which provide a basis for the acquisition of additional languages (ALs). In practice, this policy is stymied by curriculum, educational planning and provisioning and a teacher education system that make it possible

for English-only to be the medium of teaching and learning after the first four years of school in the overwhelming majority of schools. This, despite growing evidence that in many poor, African-language-dominant urban and rural schools, teachers and learners do not have a command of English which is adequate to effectively teach or learn through it (e.g., Macdonald, 1990; NCCRD, 2000; Nel and Muller, 2010). Thus the language factor partially accounts for the wide and deep education crisis currently facing South Africa (Fleisch, 2008; Wright, 2012). African-language speaking learners in particular perform poorly in national and international tests of literacy and numeracy skills. For instance, in one round of national testing, Grade 6 learners obtained mean scores of 35% for English, 27% for Mathematics and 41% for Natural Science (Fleisch, 2008:7).

In order to cope with teaching and learning through English, a relatively unfamiliar language, teachers and learners engage in code-switching (CS) practices, i.e., they use more than one variety to communicate. South African studies about the use of an unfamiliar language in the classroom have yielded important findings. They have found that learning and teaching through a relatively unfamiliar language contributes to stress and depression among children and teachers (e.g., Probyn, 2001). It presents teachers with multiple and multi-dimensional dilemmas about language use (e.g., Adler, 2001; Setati and Adler, 2000): whether, when and how much to use learners' HLs or first languages (L1's) in order to enable them to access the concepts of a discipline; whether and how to use informal varieties of a second language (L2) to help them acquire the formal L2-medium academic registers of disciplines such as Social Science or Mathematics, or whether to immerse children directly in unmediated L2-medium disciplinary discourses. Teachers often experience a mixture of guilt, shame, fear and anger at having to 'smuggle' the vernacular into an L2 or into an L2-medium classroom (Probyn, 2009). Teachers and learners produce time-wasting and pedagogically deficient practices such as 'safetalk' (Chick, 1996) in order to conceal, from themselves and others, that little learning takes place through an L2 medium. Finally, research has shown that there is some functional specialisation in the varieties used in bi/multilingual classrooms (e.g., Adendorff, 1993; Uys and

van Dulm, 2011). Particular varieties are used, for instance, to transmit and construct knowledge, for classroom management, and to manage interpersonal relationships. These findings corroborate observations made in directly comparable, post-colonial settings (e.g., Chimbutane, 2011; McGlynn and Martin, 2009; Ngwaru, 2011) as well as the Global North (e.g., many studies in the following reviews, Ferguson, 2009; 2003; Martin-Jones, 2000; 1995; Lin, 2013; 2008).

## 1.2 A Note on Terminology

In this study, the terms ‘code-switching’, ‘language alternation’ and ‘bi/multilingualism’ are used interchangeably as cover terms for bi/multilingual language use in conversation. For analytical reasons, in a Conversation Analysis (CA) approach to bi/multilingual talk (Auer, 1984:24) a distinction is made between ‘code-switching (CS)’ and ‘transfer’. The former refers to sequentially meaningful CS and the latter to CS that does not generate interactional/local meanings. A CA-based approach is adopted in this study and therefore attention is drawn to this distinction when it becomes relevant in analysis. However, both forms of switches are collectively referred to as CS.

## 1.3 Rationale for the Study

The present study investigates classroom CS practices in rural secondary classrooms in the Eastern Cape, South Africa. Specifically it investigates CS between isiMpondo, isiXhosa and English in classroom interaction. IsiMpondo is a local, non-standard variety of isiXhosa and has no official written standard. IsiXhosa and English are two of the eleven official languages of South Africa and both varieties are taught as subjects from kindergarten through to university. However, English is unique in that it is the single most prestigious and dominant language in South Africa and is the most common official medium of instruction beyond the fourth year of school (Alexander, 2014).

Even though some well-known studies of classroom CS have been conducted in South Africa, there are certain gaps in South African research. Firstly, much of this research has historically focused on urban Black township schools (e.g., Adendorff, 1993) and this bias persists in recent research (e.g., Canagarajah,

2015; Evans and Cleghorn, 2012). This is also the case in provinces such as the Eastern Cape, where 65% of the population still lives in rural areas (StatsSA, 2011). Notable exceptions include Probyn (2012, 2009) and Setati and Adler (2001).

A second point, related to the one above, is that South African studies of classroom CS, perhaps reflecting international trends (e.g., Greer, 2007 in Japan; Rampton, 2006; 1995, in the UK; or Jørgensen, 2006, in Denmark), have gradually shifted focus from investigating CS in relation to how it is involved in teaching and learning processes to questions about how CS is involved in doing identity work in interaction (e.g., McKinney, 2014; Simango, 2015).

Thirdly, there are only a few studies of isiXhosa-English classroom CS that either focus on or include rural classrooms (e.g., Probyn, 2012; 2009). Furthermore, there are no published studies that have examined isiXhosa, isiMpondo, and English CS in classroom interaction, either in a rural or an urban context.

Fourthly, this study goes beyond investigating bilingual CS to considering trilingual CS between isiMpondo, isiXhosa and English. Because isiMpondo is a minority language and an unofficial variety, it rarely attracts the attention of researchers. Nomlomo's (1993) and Spofana's (2011) studies, the former carried out in an isiXhosa-language classroom and the latter in an English-language one, are among the few studies in which isiMpondo is at least included, albeit not as a major component.

Finally, the present study seeks to use a CA-based approach to bi/multilingual talk in interaction. I am not aware of published South African studies which employ this approach as both a method and a theoretical framework in an investigation of bi/multilingual classroom interaction. Elsewhere there are studies that use a CA approach to investigate CS in teaching and learning processes (e.g., Ünstel and Seedhouse, 2005) but often these studies are not comprehensive, focusing on one aspect of conversation organization such as turn-taking, repair, or preference organization. In contrast, the present study is comprehensive,

examining all of these dimensions of conversation organization and their reflexive relationship to classroom CS.

From an international perspective, the study takes up Ferguson's (2009) and Lin's (2013) three recommendations for further research in the sub-field of the classroom. First, Lin (2013:213) calls for more studies that combine close analysis of classroom interaction with analysis of the larger social and educational context in which it occurs. This study investigates classroom CS through a CA-based approach and seeks to locate the account in a larger socio-political and educational context.

Second, it takes up Ferguson's (2009:232) recommendation that studies of classroom CS could profit from revisiting methodological and epistemological debates about the extent to which different and competing conversational/pragmatic approaches to CS in interaction can be reconciled. Thus, while CA is the primary approach adopted in this study, alternative pragmatic approaches to CS are considered.

Finally, the study takes up Lin's (2013:212) recommendation that studies of classroom CS need to move away from treating switches as individual cases or from isolating switches from interactional circumstances, and examine switches in terms of how they are an "organic part of specific stages" of unfolding lessons and specific curriculum genres. In this study, switches are examined in their sequential contexts and as part of whole lessons.

#### **1.4 Aims and Scope**

This study investigates multilingual classroom interaction. In particular it focuses on whole-class learner and teacher interaction. It examines CS between isiXhosa, a standard variety, isiMpondo, a regional variety, and English, the official medium of instruction, in twelve secondary school lessons, in two schools.

Along with teacher interviews and participant observation, the study adopts a CA-based approach to bi/multilingual talk in interaction as developed in particular by Auer (2009; 1998; 1999; 1995; 1984), Gafaranga (2011; 2007; 2005) and Li Wei (2002; 1998; 1994). Analyses developed through this approach are

discussed in relation to major alternative pragmatic approaches to multilingual talk, viz., those proposed by Gumperz (1982) Myers-Scotton (1993a) and Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai (2001), as well as post-structuralist approaches (e.g. Blommaert, Rampton, and Spotti, 2011; Heller, 2007).

The study investigates how teachers and learners accomplish lessons multilingually or through CS. The main research question is:

*Is a CA or sequential approach to bi/multilingual talk in interaction an adequate approach to explain how teachers and learners simultaneously use isiMpondo, isiXhosa, and English to accomplish English-language and English L2-medium content lessons in South African rural classrooms?*

'Pure' CA studies (ten Have, 2007:174) do not often proceed on the basis of an a priori hypothesis or thesis statement because their purpose is to discover practices by which participants accomplish interaction. That is, these studies proceed along a grounded and emergent line of investigation (ten Have, 2007:36-38). However, 'applied' CA studies or those that investigate institutional talk (Heritage, 2004) such as that which occurs in classrooms, and those that are CA-based but include other methods, such as the present study, often do proceed on the basis of a thesis statement. Thus the main question can be re-stated in form of a thesis statement as follows.

*On its own, a CA or sequential approach to bi/multilingual talk is an adequate methodological and theoretical framework through which to explain how teachers and learners simultaneously use isiMpondo, isiXhosa, and English to accomplish English-language and English L2-medium content lessons in South African rural classrooms.*

The study answers the following specific sub-questions derived from the main research question.

- (i) What is the pattern of isiMpondo, isiXhosa, and English use in classroom interaction?

- (ii) Can the patterns of language use documented in (i) above be explained in terms of a bi/multilingual sequential approach?
- (iii) In what ways is bi/multilingual classroom talk similar to and different from ordinary bi/multilingual conversation?
- (iv) To what extent can patterns of language use be explained in terms of classroom type, viz., English-language vs. English L2-medium Social Science vs. English L2-medium Technology classroom?
- (v) To what extent can patterns of CS be explained in terms of individual differences in teachers' communicative styles and attitudes to CS?

### 1.5 Overview of the Study

Chapters 2 and 3 provide a theoretical and methodological background to the study. Chapter 2 is a review of literature, beginning with an overview of the language situation in South Africa from the mid-seventeenth century to the present. The chapter then presents a review of the main pragmatic approaches to the study of CS, viz., the approaches of Gumperz, Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai, and post-structuralist researchers. A third and final section presents a review of approaches, methods and major findings from studies of classroom CS.

Chapter 3 begins with a sketch of the setting where the research was conducted, then reviews the ethnomethodological basis and principles of Conversation Analysis (CA), describes key mechanisms for organizing talk in interaction, and concludes with a discussion of the research methods employed, including data collection, production, and analytic strategies.

The subsequent five chapters (i.e., 4 to 8) present and discuss the study's findings. Chapter 4 discusses nine communicative 'codes' in 'code-switching' used by teachers and learners in interaction and identified in the corpus. Four of these are linguistic codes and five non-linguistic. A quantitative summary of the incidence of various codes is presented and discussed. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the implications of these findings for a CA approach to identifying varieties in talk in interaction.

Chapter 5 describes and discusses ways in which participants accomplish classroom interaction through different patterns of CS. Five patterns of CS are described and discussed in terms of how they are organized, and their sequential, institutional and broader meanings. The five patterns are, viz., separate/divergent bilingualism, convergent bilingualism, mixed/flexible multilingualism, isiXhosa-isiMpondo-only, and English-only. The chapter concludes by discussing the implications of these findings for a CA-based approach to bi/multilingual classroom talk.

Chapters 6 and 7 examine how the patterns of CS discussed in chapter 5 are involved in the organization of classroom turn-taking and repair, respectively, and how the different types of turn-taking and repair, in turn, are involved in implementing different patterns of CS. Chapter 6 describes and discusses five types of classroom turn-taking systems, viz., (i) bids, (ii) choral responses, (iii) co-production/turn-sharing, (iv) turn allocation without bids, and (v) learner self-selection.

Chapter 7 describes and discusses eight repair types, four for teachers and four for learners viz., (i) teacher self-initiation and self-repair; (ii) teacher other-initiation and self-repair; (iii) teacher self-initiation and other-repair; (iv) teacher other-initiation and other-repair; (v) learner self-initiation and self-repair; (vi) learner other-initiation and self-repair; (vii) learner self-initiation and other-repair; (viii) learner other-initiation and other-repair. Each chapter concludes with a discussion of how classroom turn-taking (chapter 6) and repair (chapter 7) is different from ordinary conversation, how CS is involved in organising each of these systems of conversation management, and the implications of the findings for a CA-based approach to bi/multilingual classroom talk.

Chapter 8 focuses on the patterns of language use of each of the five teachers in this study. The chapter is divided into two parts. The first contains a comparative quantitative and qualitative analysis of language use according to learning areas/subjects taught, viz., English-language, Social Science and Technology. In addition to considering patterns of CS discussed in chapter 5, this

chapter examines in detail English-only and isiXhosa-isiMpondo-only episodes and their relation to the other patterns.

The second part presents a summary profile of each teacher's language practices, drawing on quantified, transcribed, participant observation and interview data. The chapter focuses on the extent to which observed language practices can be variously attributed to individual communicative styles, to differences in learning areas/ subjects taught, or to wider institutional and social processes.

Finally, chapter 9 presents a summary of findings and conclusions, identifies implications for a CA-based approach to multilingual classroom talk and for education, and concludes with a list of issues for further research.

### **1.6 Significance of the Study**

This study contributes to an understanding of how teachers and learners conduct classroom talk simultaneously in isiMpondo, isiXhosa and English. It documents communicative practices classroom participants have developed to cope with the challenge of teaching and learning English through the medium of English in an English-limited environment.

It makes a multidisciplinary contribution to a number of areas. It contributes to the field of pragmatics of bi/multilingualism by demonstrating the central role of CS in accomplishing lessons in English-limited environments. It contributes to the field of multilingualism by investigating communicative practices in little-studied language combinations and in an under-studied context of rural schooling. It contributes to CA-based approaches to bi/multilingualism by demonstrating how CS is involved in the organisation of classroom turn-taking and repair systems, and how classroom turn-taking and repair, in turn, enables and circumscribes the kinds of CS patterns/practices observed in classrooms. It contributes to the area of multilingual classroom interaction by showing how teachers and learners in interaction orient to and adapt institutional and macro-level linguistic norms to accomplish lessons. Finally, it contributes to on-going debates about language management and policy in multilingual schools.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Introduction

The literature review chapter is divided into three parts. The first part presents a brief historical overview of the language situation in South Africa, from the mid-seventeenth century to the present. It reviews core issues in the South African language debate, examining language-in-education policies in three major historical periods, colonial, apartheid and post-apartheid, with a particular focus on continuities and discontinuities. It then concludes with a brief review of varieties of isiXhosa and South African English.

The second part of the chapter reviews major approaches to CS in talk-in-interaction, viz., approaches by John Gumperz, Carol Myers-Scotton and Peter Auer, as well as newer and alternative approaches associated with scholars with a post-structuralist orientation.

The third part reviews studies of CS in classroom interaction. It discusses strands of classroom CS studies, different conceptions of CS in classroom research, methodologies and major findings of this research. The chapter concludes with a brief summary of the literature.

### 2.2 The language situation in South Africa

This section reviews the language situation in South Africa. First is an overview of the legacy of colonialism and apartheid and of language in post-apartheid South Africa. Second is a review of the language policy options considered during South Africa's negotiated settlement discussions and the choices that were finally made. The section concludes with a review of the South African language-in-education policy debate.

### 2.1.1 An overview

This subsection presents an overview of the language situation in South Africa, beginning in the mid-seventeenth century during the first sustained contact between Europeans and indigenous people in the Cape, and ending in the present.

Khoe and San (Worden, 1994:6) were the first indigenous people Dutch colonists encountered in the Cape. The Khoe were mainly pastoralists, living in relatively large groups, and the San were mainly hunter-gatherers, living in smaller and mobile groups. However, because of a lack of clear-cut socio-cultural and linguistic difference between the two groups, historians refer to the groups collectively as Khoesan (or less commonly, as 'Khoisan') (Elphick and Malherbe, 1989:4; Traill, 1995:15). Many South African Khoesan languages are extinct and the remaining few are highly endangered. Because of 'intimate and longstanding' (Traill, 1995:3) contact between Khoesan and southern Bantu languages, in particular isiXhosa, isiZulu and Sesotho, Khoesan languages have had a lasting impact on these languages, most evident in the borrowing of Khoesan click consonants and their adaptation to the phonological systems of southern Bantu languages.

Colonial rule began in 1652 with a Dutch settlement in the Cape. Dutch colonial rule was briefly interrupted by a British invasion and occupation (1795-1802) and was finally ended by a second British takeover in 1806 (Elphick and Malherbe, 1989). During Dutch colonial rule, the Khoesan were dispossessed of their land and animals and many were incorporated into the burgeoning colony as house servants, herders and labour tenants on White farms, along with south-east Asian, East and West African slaves (Armstrong and Worden, 1989:111-112). The colonists insisted on speaking only Dutch and were not keen on learning Khoesan languages. They made every effort to prevent slaves from using languages common among slaves, such as Malay-Portuguese. To deal with the language issue, six years after settlement (1658), the first school in South Africa was established, with a dual purpose of teaching slaves Dutch and converting them to Christianity (Molteno, 1984:45).

During British colonial rule (1806-1910), a language policy of anglicisation was aimed at the White settler population in particular (Alexander, 1989:16). Colonial governments sought to replace Dutch with English in all important public domains, including public administration, parliament, the judiciary and education. African-language speaking people made up a small proportion of the Cape colonial population and even fewer were eligible to vote. African views about language had no effect, therefore, on colonial language debates (Perry, 2005:106). With the approval of government, missionary societies began to reduce African languages to writing in the nineteenth century, as part of the process of Christianisation and Westernisation of African elites. In 1823, isiXhosa became the first southern African language to be written down (Kamwangamalu, 2001:373). The British tolerated the use of African languages in mission schools at the primary level but insisted on English-medium and Anglo-centric secondary education for the tiny African elite who reached this level (Alexander, 1989:20).

After the bitterly fought South African War (1899-1902), also known as the Anglo-Boer war, the Union of South Africa was created, bringing together two British colonies, the Cape and Natal, and two Boer republics, the Transvaal and the Free State, and establishing the borders of present-day South Africa. The Union government made both Dutch and English official languages, as part of efforts to reconcile the British and Dutch and to forge a “new white South African identity” (Beinart, 1994:76). The majority of Boers at this point, however, no longer spoke Dutch but a Dutch-based creole, Afrikaans, recognised as distinct from Dutch and an official language alongside English only in 1925 (Alexander, 1989:15; Brown, 1992:75).

Between 1948 and 1961, the Afrikaner component of White South Africa won a series of ever larger electoral majorities and felt confident enough to call for a referendum on becoming a republic and thus severing political ties with Britain. The narrow victory of the Afrikaner nationalists in this referendum marked the end of the Union of South Africa (Beinart, 1994:161). In the period which followed, between 1961 and 1994, Afrikaner governments systematized policies of ‘racial’ segregation and discrimination inherited from Dutch and British colonial

governments and also introduced new ones, collectively known as apartheid. With respect to language, Afrikaner governments sought to replace English with Afrikaans wherever possible, especially in the public service, and where it was not possible, for instance in higher education, to elevate Afrikaans to the same status as English (Alexander, 1989).

Apartheid was founded on the political idea that 'race' was a biological reality and that South Africa had four races: African, Coloured, Indian and White. The African 'race' was allegedly made up of nine ethnic groups, conveniently identifiable by the 'distinct' languages they spoke (Beinart, 1994) (i.e. the African languages listed in Table 2.1 below). While missionaries in the 19<sup>th</sup> century 'inadvertently and unintentionally' helped invent language-based ethnic groups and identities by drawing arbitrary language boundaries between groups across Southern Africa (Alexander, 1989:22; Vail, 1991:11-12), apartheid governments consciously exploited the work of missionaries as part of a political strategy to fragment African-language speaking people and to undermine a resurgent African nationalism. Weak support for African languages among the Black political and intellectual leadership in post-apartheid South Africa can in part be attributed to fear that strengthening African languages could consolidate apartheid-era language-based tribal/ethnic identities. This in turn could threaten to fragment an overarching African identity and unity (Alexander, 2003:14), a pillar on which the ruling African National Congress was built.

At the level of language policy, post-apartheid South Africa is very different from South Africa in colonial and apartheid eras. Post-apartheid South Africa is a multilingual country with eleven official languages (see Table 2.1 below). The constitution promises equal status to official languages in all areas of life and requires that government take "practical and positive steps to elevate the status and advance the use of" indigenous African languages (RSA, 1996:4), in particular. In terms of African languages, post-apartheid governments, like those of other post-colonial African states, have taken as given the artificial boundaries created around African languages established in the colonial era and, in the case of South Africa, consolidated during apartheid (Makoni and Mashiri, 2007). This has real

consequences for what counts as a ‘language’ and therefore for who counts as ‘competent’. It is common for speakers of minority varieties of official African languages to be stigmatised and dubbed incompetent (Nomlomo, 1993:105). This issue is discussed in some detail in subsection 2.1.2 below (*Harmonisation of Nguni and Sotho*). Provincial and national government departments are required to use at least two official languages as a step towards promoting and respecting all official languages. Also, the constitution requires government to take measures to promote small and unofficial indigenous languages such as Khoe, San and Nama, commonly used languages such as Gujarati, Portuguese and German, as well as languages used mainly in the religious domain, such as Arabic, Hebrew and Sanskrit.

**Table 1: Home Language Trends 1996-2011**

LANGUAGE	1996		1998 (b)		2001 (c)		2011 (d)		% Change
	N (000)	%	N (000)	%	N	%	N	%	% Change
isiZulu	9,200	22.7	10,195	23.5	10,677	23.8	11,587	22.7	-
isiXhosa	7,196	17.7	7,610	17.6	7,907	17.6	8,154	16.0	-10
Afrikaans	5,812	14.3	5,946	13.7	5,983	13.3	6,855	13.5	-6
English	3,457	8.5	3,692	8.5	3,673	8.2	4,893	9.6	13
Sepedi	3,696	9.1	3,833	8.8	4,209	9.4	4,619	9.1	0
Setswana	3,302	8.1	3,614	8.3	3,677	8.2	4,067	8.0	-2
Sesotho	3,104	7.6	3,539	8.2	3,555	7.9	3,850	7.6	-1
Xitsonga	1,756	4.3	1,777	4.1	1,992	4.4	2,277	4.5	3
siSwati	1,013	2.5	1,069	2.5	1,194	2.7	1,297	2.5	2
Tshivenda	876	2.2	1,228	2.8	1,022	2.3	1,209	2.4	10
isiNdebele	587	1.4	654	1.5	712	1.6	1,090	2.1	48
Other	228	0.6	158	0.4	217	0.5	829	1.6	189
Sign Lang	-	-	-	-	-	-	235	0.5	-
Unspecified	356	0.9	10,868	0.0	n/a	-	n/a	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40,584</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>43,325</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4,4820</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>50,961</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Adapted from Statistics South Africa

Makoni and Mashiri (2007:63) have severely criticised the use of census data or enumerative approaches to describe linguistic diversity on the African continent. Their criticism centres around two issues. First, that on the African continent, the production of linguistic maps was crucial to the production of modern African ethnic groups, i.e., linguonyms were linked to ethnonyms, so that

a speaker of Setswana is a Motswana or a speaker of Shona a Shona. In the case of Shona, for instance, a linguonym preceded the ethnonym and was used as a tool in the construction of a Shona ethnic group. The second issue, for Makoni and Mashiri (2007:63-66), is that enumerative approaches assume that people's use of language, particularly in predominantly oral African societies, is countable, classifiable, describable and therefore subject to control and prescriptive standards.

Notwithstanding criticisms of enumerative approaches to linguistic diversity, census data does provide a general sense of trends in language self-identification, prevalence and shift, as shown in Table 2.1 above. From 1996 to 2011, African languages are identified as home languages by the vast majority of South Africans. Speakers of IsiZulu and isiXhosa, closely related and mutually intelligible African languages, comprise the largest language groups and have significant to large numbers of speakers across all provinces, except for parts of the Northwest and Limpopo provinces. In large urban centres such as Johannesburg, Durban and Cape Town, these two languages are used as linking languages by speakers of African languages, either on their own or in combination with other regionally important varieties (Coetzee- van Rooy, 2014).

Regarding isiXhosa, note that in the period under consideration it is the only African language showing a significant decline (-10%). Reasons for this are unclear. Some speculate that there may be a greater shift to English among isiXhosa speakers and perhaps also a shift to other African languages as isiXhosa-speaking people move to other provinces. Changes in the growth rates for English or isiZulu, the closest language to isiXhosa, do not support this line of reasoning, however. Deumert (2010) also reported language shift from isiXhosa to English and in a small number of cases to Afrikaans in a comparative study of the 1996 to 2001 census data for the Cape Town metropolitan area. In this case, the reported shift was not just among middle class people but also among the working classes.

Many of the African languages appear pretty stable across the period, except for significant growth in two small languages, isiNdebele and Tshivenda. Speculation includes the possibility that the census is becoming more successful in

capturing numbers of speakers of these languages and also that there may be a revival of ethnic pride in languages associated with smaller and, in the past, stigmatised ethnic groups such as the Vhenda (Alexander, 2014:144-145). Some people in these groups may therefore be reassigning their home language status, away from larger and comparatively more prestigious African languages, back to their 'own'.

English is a big gainer, growing by 13% in the period considered. This is expected, given that it is a prestigious and status-raising national and international language. The decline of Afrikaans is also expected, given its close association with apartheid. In apartheid South Africa, language shift, with regard to languages with a high status in the labour market, was towards English or Afrikaans, but in post-apartheid South Africa it is decidedly towards English (Deumert, 2010:32). Note though that in 2011 English was reported as home language by less than 10% of the population.

While census data provides a sense of societal multilingualism, it says little about individual multilingualism. This is because of the monolingual bias of language questions in the census questionnaires, which compels respondents to choose only one language as a home language, a common problem in other countries too (Baker, 2011:35). A census approach also underrates the role of English or Afrikaans. These two languages are the only languages used for keeping records in government, courts, higher education and big business. This is especially so for English. While English is the Home Language of a small proportion of the population, it is a medium of teaching and learning after the first four years of schooling, the primary language of government and of print, digital and electronic media (Alexander, 2014:241-244). It is used as an AL or L2 by a large proportion of people in the society. This is not to say that many or even most of these people are proficient users of English, particularly judged from the point of view of standard South African English (Gough, 1996). Finally, a census does not document the fact that many African-language speakers speak or understand one or more other African language, in addition to their home language (Herbert, 1992).

## 2.2.2 The South African language debate

In this section three issues are discussed which are central to the South African language debate. First is a review of language policy options open to South Africa at the end of apartheid and the policy decision which was eventually taken. Second is a review of debates about harmonisation and re-standardization of related African languages. Third and finally is a brief review of varieties of isiXhosa and English in South Africa.

### *2.2.1.1 Language policy options*

According to Heugh (1995:334-345) negotiators of South Africa's political transition from apartheid to democracy were essentially faced with three options in terms of language policy, viz., assimilation, functional multilingualism, or laissez-faire/human rights. Each option is discussed below.

The 'assimilation' option assumes that multilingualism is a problem to be suppressed or eliminated, rather than a resource to be managed for national development (Heugh, 1995:340). This option has at least two permutations. The first, favoured by representatives of the liberation movement as represented by Nelson Mandela's African National Congress (ANC), sought to install English as the sole official language (Alexander, 2014:141), that is, as the sole language in which to conduct high status language functions in the state, big business and higher education. In this scenario, African languages and Afrikaans would be granted the status of national languages that could be used but were not required for high status functions.

The second permutation was the apartheid era status quo where Afrikaans and English retained their status as official languages and African languages were promoted to be national languages. During the negotiations, Afrikaner representatives refused to agree to English being the sole official language and representatives of the ANC in turn refused to retain an official Afrikaans-English bilingual language policy. The ANC favoured an English-only official language policy but, unable to get Afrikaners to agree to it, they felt unable to grant Afrikaans the status of an official language without granting the same status to African languages (Alexander, 2014:138). Thus African languages were made official languages not

so much because the ANC was *for* African languages as because it was *against* Afrikaans. Subsequent lack of political will to implement multilingual policies can partly be explained by the fact that large sections of the ruling party and its allies, the liberation movement, and the Black middle class more generally, are at best ambivalent about the role of African languages outside of primary education, popular culture, and the processes of mass political mobilisation (Alexander, 2014:268).

So much for the two permutations of the 'assimilation' option. The second option considered was functional multilingualism, an option which seeks to promote languages for instrumental rather than for sentimental reasons (Heugh, 1995:344-345; Alexander, 1989:52). In this option, individual rather than societal multilingualism is placed at the centre of language policy-making. Citizens are encouraged to learn one another's languages. In particular, speakers of Afrikaans and English are encouraged to learn a regionally or provincially important African language as part of efforts to promote cross-cultural communication, reconciliation, and social cohesion. Alexander (2003:32) argued that in order for this to occur on a significant scale, the linguistic market value of African languages would have to be enhanced by making them, for example, a requirement for employment in the civil service, judiciary, or high status professions that involve substantial contact with members of the general public. In addition, approaches based on a functional multilingualism thesis emphasise that it is essential that all South Africans regardless of social background have access to equal and high quality English language instruction (Heugh, 2000:30). Reasons for this are that English is likely to remain the most common medium for secondary and higher education for the foreseeable future, and access to English is key to redress and the reduction of social inequality.

In the end, South Africa took a *laissez-faire* or human rights option, declaring eleven languages official languages, equal before the law. In this dispensation, right-holders or speakers of official languages can approach relevant statutory bodies or courts to enforce their language rights. In theory, any official language can be used for any high status function. In reality, speakers of official

languages have to fight it out in an English-dominated hierarchical ‘linguistic market’ (Bourdieu, 1991:51), in order to maintain dominance, in the case of Afrikaans and English, or for inclusion, in the case of African languages. Given the head start and continued public and private sector political, intellectual and financial support for English, and to a lesser degree Afrikaans, the dominance of English has increased (Deumert, 2010). Under pressure from English, Afrikaans-medium universities, for example, have become or are becoming either Afrikaans-English bilingual or English-medium only institutions (du Plessis, 2006; ENCA, 2016; Radio 702, 2016). Of the universities historically reserved for African-language speaking students, only the University of Limpopo offers an entire degree programme bilingually in English and an African language (Ramadiro and Sotuku, 2011; Ramani and Joseph, 2002). The rest offer nearly all their modules and qualification programmes in English only.

In a country like South Africa, emphasis on language rights based on narrowly conceived ethno-linguistic social and political identities can give rise to destructive ‘ethnic competition’ (Perry, 2005:160). Some of this has been observed in sections of the Afrikaans community, who seek to preserve apartheid era ‘racial’ segregation and privilege under the pretext of defending their language and cultural rights. This has been done, for instance, by attempting to keep out African-language or English-speaking Black children from formerly White, Afrikaans-medium schools or universities (ibid). Arguing from the perspective of the Global South, Stroud and Heugh argue that a rights-based language dispensation, often, (2003:5):

(...) forces groups to differentiate themselves from others by claiming unique linkage of language and identity so as to gain political leverage in the competition for resources.

#### *2.2.1.2 Harmonization of Nguni and Sotho*

The question of ‘harmonisation’ is important to studies of CS because it highlights the difficulty involved in establishing what variety participants/interactants are using in interaction. For example, depending on the context of interaction participants may regard themselves as belonging to the isiXhosa (the standard and

prestigious variety) speech community and therefore to be speaking 'isiXhosa', but in another, different context, as belonging to the isiMpondo (the local and less prestigious variety) speech community and therefore to be speaking 'isiMpondo'. In order to do interpretive work of identifying and assigning meanings to switches, it is essential to establish participants' attitudes to and conceptions of the relationship between the standard and local varieties in particular contexts.

Language 'harmonisation, 'unification' or '(re)standardization' (Msimang, 1998:165) aims to address the question of the fragmentation of African languages (Alexander, 1992; 1989; Orman, 2008) by bringing together related spoken and written varieties into harmonised or unified written standards. Missionaries drew arbitrary and sharp boundaries between varieties of African languages, giving rise to a fragmented Nguni, split into four written languages, viz., isiNdebele, siSwati, isiXhosa and isiZulu. The development of a single written standard for isiXhosa and isiZulu in the nineteenth century, for example, was prevented by rivalry between different missionary societies (Herbert, 1992:3). Missionaries were working with what were essentially foreign languages with "little knowledge of their history, genesis, or linguistic or political boundaries" and because they were "more motivated by the aim to solve their short-term problems of establishing a congregation" (Msimang, 1998:169), they forced varieties of African languages into Western linguistic moulds (Makoni and Mashiri, 2007).

Harmonisation and re-standardization are controversial questions in African linguistics, however (Msimang, 1998; Satyo, 1998). In the South African context there are essentially two major proposals regarding harmonisation and re-standardization. The first is a thoroughgoing and ambitious proposal advocated by Neville Alexander (1992; 1989; and recently by Hadebe, 2009). The proposal seeks to take forward work begun by linguists before the rise of apartheid (Msimang, 1998:170), in order to correct some of the mistakes made by missionaries. It proposes a single, unified written standard of Nguni (isiNdebele, siSwati, isiXhosa and isiZulu) and of Sotho (Sesotho, Sepedi, Sesotho saLeboa and Setswana). Contributing varieties and sub-varieties would not cease to exist as spoken or written varieties, but would exist alongside new standard written varieties. That is,

new standard varieties would be used for high status functions such as formal education, government and the media, intended to reach a wider audience or readership.

There are a number of advantages of harmonisation and re-standardisation. These processes would make it possible to exploit the continuity and mutual intelligibility between related African varieties in order to create, among other things, larger linguistic markets, thus making it cheaper to produce written materials on a large scale. Harmonisation and re-standardization would also strengthen the case for ‘intellectualizing African languages’ (Alexander, 2003:20) as languages of science, technology and philosophy. And, from a socio-political point of view, harmonisation and re-standardization can contribute to efforts to weaken or overcome apartheid-era divisive ‘ethnolinguistic’ or ‘ethnic identities’ and contribute to the emergence or construction of more inclusive identities (Alexander, 1992:61).

Some sociolinguists welcome Alexander’s proposal as ‘an ideal’ (e.g., Zotwana or Cluver cited in Alexander, 1992:60) but argue that it is no longer possible to harmonise Nguni or Sotho along the lines proposed by Alexander (Msimang, 1998; Satyo, 1998). The main reasons given for this are that existing standardized or officialised varieties of Nguni or Sotho have taken on a life of their own and speakers and language professionals have decidedly negative attitudes towards a strong form of harmonisation and re-standardization (Msimang, 1998:171). Alexander, however, insists that the varieties constituting Nguni or Sotho are “Ausbau languages”. That is to say, they are not significantly different but are artificially kept apart in writing by “multiplying or magnifying” differences “through adopting or creating distinctive paradigms for neologisms, word order and grammar” (Fishman, quoted in Alexander, 1992:62).

A second and less ambitious set of proposals for harmonisation goes under the label ‘soft harmonisation’ (Satyo, 1998:223). These proposals take existing official African languages as their point of departure. Strategies of soft harmonisation are intended to deal with issues ‘internal’ to official languages such as efforts to enrich the lexicon of isiXhosa (the standard variety) by purposefully

incorporating synonyms from less prestigious but established varieties such as isiMpondo or isiHlubi, and by incorporating lexical or grammatical features of the urban varieties of standard languages into a dynamic and growing standard (Satyo, 1998). Msimang (1998) believes soft harmonisation could be useful in addressing issues common to, say, Nguni or Sotho. For example, the development of new technical and scientific terminology could be carried out by unified Sotho or Nguni panels/committees.

Perhaps more controversially, both Satyo (1998) and Msimang (1998) have argued that schools' insistence that children learn and speak rural and bookish forms of African languages alienates children from these languages. Msimang (1998:171) has argued that varieties that emerge from "spontaneous harmonisation", such as Pretoria Sotho, which he claims to be "a mixture of Kgatla [a variety of Setswana], Pedi and other Tswana dialects, as well as adoptives from English and Afrikaans", ought to be drawn on for teaching standard varieties in the short- to medium-term. A fair amount of what is covered by the term 'urban variety' can be usefully and adequately explained in terms of CS. Historically, education authorities regard CS and urban varieties of African languages negatively, especially in relation to their use in the classrooms (e.g., Calteaux, 1996:6).

Satyo (1998:228) goes further than Msimang, contemplating a situation in which separate grammars and dictionaries are developed for the urban varieties so that they become separate standard written languages. Elevating urban varieties into written languages has the advantage of legitimating the forms of speech of their users, but an obvious problem with Satyo's proposal is that it would result in more, rather than fewer, written/standard African languages, precisely the problem harmonisation and re-standardization is meant to resolve.

#### *2.2.1.3 Varieties of isiXhosa and English*

Boundaries between varieties of isiXhosa are drawn such that varieties correspond to 'tribal' groupings, i.e. socio-political formations. This can mask internal variation within each variety or underplay similarities across varieties. According to Nomlomo (1993:6,) standardized isiXhosa is based on a variety called isiGcaleka,

which is learned in school by speakers of the following regional or non-standard varieties, viz., isiBhaca, isiBomvana, isiCele, isiHlubi, isiMpondo, isiNtlangwini, isiMpondomise, isiThembu, isiXesibe and isiRharhabe. IsiXhosa speakers perceive isiRharhabe to be equivalent in status to isiGcaleka, at least in speech (Spofana, 2011:3).

Nomlomo (1993:104-105) found that high school students who spoke isiBomvana, a variety close to the standard, felt very secure about their own speech, whereas speakers of varieties that were somewhat different from the standard, such as isiMpondomise and isiThembu, or those who spoke varieties that were quite different from the standard, such as isiBhaca, isiHlubi and isiMpondo, wished to replace their varieties with the standard. The sociolinguistic climate around isiXhosa at the time of her research was influenced by a language ideology of “eradicationism” (Nomlomo, 1993:105) that sought to eradicate traces of non-standard forms in schooled speech and writing. However, Nomlomo also found that speakers of small varieties, viz., isiBhaca and isiCele, showed loyalty to their own varieties.

According to Nomlomo (1993:44-49), prototypical isiMpondo differs from isiXhosa at the sound, grammatical and lexical level, though she admits that this kind of isiMpondo occurs more often in the speech of people who have not been formally educated

than those who have attended or are still attending school. The latter are aware of the stigma conferred to them by these variables [i.e., using features of isiMpondo] and they tend to shift to the norm (Ibid:30).

At the sound level, prototypical isiMpondo exhibits a phenomenon called *ukundrondroza*. That is, the /r/ sound is inserted into nasal compounds so that /nd/ becomes /ndr/; /nt/ becomes /ntr/; and /nk/ becomes /nkr/ as shown below. She cites the following examples (Ibid:44):

***IsiXhosa*****Ndiyahamba** (I am going)**Intombi** (a girl)**Inkosi** (a chief)***IsiMpondo*****Ndriyahamba****intrombi****inkrosi**

IsiMpondo uses the [tʃh] or /tsh/more extensively than isiXhosa, resulting in the following forms (Ibid, 1993:45):

***IsiXhosa***

Ishumi (ten)

Ukushumayela (to preach)

***IsiMpondo*****Itshumi**

Ukutshumayela

The isiXhosa /kr/ becomes /k/ in isiMpondo and the isiXhosa /k/ becomes isiMpondo /kr/ (Ibid, 1993:46), as follows:

***IsiXhosa***

Ukukrazula (to tear)

Ukukroba (to peep)

***IsiMpondo***

Ukrukazula

Ukrukoba

At the grammatical level, there are differences in prefixes to mark person, differences in prefixes for noun class markers and widespread word contraction in isiMpondo as illustrated below.

The isiXhosa grammatical prefix /ku-/ becomes isiMpondo /kwi-/ before pronominal stems as follows (Ibid: 46).

***IsiXhosa*****Kuthi** (to us)**Kuni** (to you)***IsiMpondo*****Kwithi****Kwini**

IsiMpondo assimilates the consonant of the copula to the consonant of the prefix in noun class 2 and 2(a) as follows (ibid:47).

<b><i>Noun Class</i></b>	<b><i>IsiXhosa</i></b>	<b><i>IsiMpondo</i></b>
2	<b>Ngabantu</b> (it is people)	<b>Babantu</b>
2 (a)	<b><u>N</u>goomama</b> (it is mothers)	<b><u>B</u>oomama</b>

IsiMpondo is also replete with word contractions, and the following are examples (Ibid):

<b><i>IsiXhosa</i></b>	<b><i>IsiMpondo</i></b>
Lowa mntu (that person)	Owa mntu
Leya mizi (those homesteads)	Eya mizi
Lawa matye (those stones)	Awa matye

Finally, numerous differences at the lexical level exist. Based on my observations they include the following common words.

<b><i>IsiXhosa</i></b>	<b><i>IsiMpondo</i></b>
Itshomi (a friend)	Umbhemu
Ibhokwe (a goat)	Imbuzi
Utywala (alcohol)	Ijiki

Regarding varieties of English in South Africa, scholars have historically distinguished between African/Black, Coloured, Indian and White English (e.g., Lass, 1995:89). Unfortunately these categories correspond to apartheid era so-called 'racial' groups. As Mckinney (2013:23) points out, this kind of racial labelling of language variation "contributes, albeit unwittingly, to essentialist (re)construction of race" and can lead to the mistaken idea that speakers of a particular 'racial' group speak in the same way. The same can be said of attempts to describe sub-varieties of Black South African English. For example, de Klerk (2006), talks about 'Xhosa English', assuming that isiXhosa speakers all have access to the same kind of English. While research into varieties of isiXhosa or English, like

that into CS, has the purpose of demonstrating the linguistic integrity of sub-varieties in order to help de-stigmatise their use and users, it does run the risk of uncritically (re)constructing ethnicities created or consolidated during colonial and apartheid rule. .

Against this background, Lass (1995:95) considers 'accent' the most salient feature distinguishing varieties of White South African English (WSAE), 'accent' being "a combination of phonetic details and phonological properties (e.g., certain allophonic processes or lack of them, stress-patterns, etc.)". According to Lass (1995:93-94), WSAE has three distinct forms. *Type 1* is a prestigious form associated with a bygone era and older speakers, and is based on attempts by its users to reproduce what they perceive to be a southern British standard, in particular, Received Pronunciation. *Type 2* is a prestige variety used by the White middle class which is recognizably local. In the past it was stigmatised by *Type 1* speakers but it is now the 'normative' (McKinney, 2013:23) South African English variety. *Type 3* comprises various local vernaculars that tend to be stigmatised in high status functions.

When looking beyond those who speak English as a first language, there are serious methodological problems about how varieties of English should be approached. A key methodological problem with studying varieties of English is deciding on norms. For example, should norms of Black South African English (BSAE) be based on the usage of its most proficient speakers, the least proficient speakers, those who are still learning English in school, or on all of the above (de Klerk, 2006:17)? When does an 'error' become a stable feature of a variety?

Generally speaking, BSAE differs from WSAE with regard to several features, including differences in vowel phonology. BSAE shows the influence of the African-language vowel systems on English, leading to "loss of contrasts in comparison to native varieties" (Gough, 1996:59). Some of the examples offered by Gough include:

- (i) Vowels in 'strut', 'bath' and 'palm' merge to an /a/.
- (ii) Vowels in 'thought', 'force' and 'north' merge to /ɛ/ and /o/.

There are also differences in consonantal systems. South African African languages do not have the English fricatives /θ/ and /ð/ which is therefore often realised as /d/ or /t/ respectively (Ibid). These features are stigmatised and tend to occur among young children or adults with little formal education.

Other phonological differences include word stress. Because of the influence of Bantu phonology there is a tendency to stress a penultimate syllable in English words as shown below (Ibid:60).

<b>BSAE</b>	<b>Non-BSAE</b>
Cig'ratte	Cigare'tte
Hospita'lity	Ho'spitality
Seve'nty	Se'venty

Grammatical differences also exist. Gough (1996:60) cites the following examples.

- (i) Non-count as count nouns: '*She was carrying **a** luggage.*'
- (ii) Gender conflation in pronouns: '***She** came yesterday*' (where a man is referred to)
- (iii) Extension of the progressive: '*Even racism **is still existing**.*'
- (iv) Use of 'too' and 'very much' as intensifiers: '*She is **too** beautiful*' (i.e., very beautiful)

At the lexical level the following words occur mainly in BSAE-medium newspapers but have also been assimilated into non-Black English language newspapers as well. Buthelezi (245-246) cites the following examples:

- (i) Loanwords: *Mkhukhu/ mkhukus* ('shack/shacks, from isiZulu); *skorokoro* ('jalopy' from Sesotho); and *isiphaza* (a placebo, from isiZulu)
- (ii) Coined words and expressions: *Stop-nonsense wall* ('a high precast perimeter wall'; *cheeky* (meaning 'harsh, stern' rather than 'insolent'); and *stokvels* ('burial or savings club', a phonological assimilation and semantic shift of 'stock fair').

Much of what is discussed under the banner of BSAE can also be fruitfully studied in terms of CS. A case in point is de Klerk's (2006) book which includes a chapter-long description of isiXhosa-English CS in a book ostensibly about 'Xhosa English'.

### 2.2.3 Language-in-education policy

Three major periods of language-in-education policy are reviewed in this subsection, viz., colonial, apartheid and post-apartheid. The colonial period is characterised by a struggle for dominance between speakers of English and Dutch (and later on Afrikaans), the apartheid period by the rise, imposition of and resistance to Afrikaans, and the post-apartheid period by the decline of Afrikaans, the nascent rehabilitation of African languages, and the growing hegemony of English.

#### *2.2.3.1 Pre-apartheid period (ca. 1652-1948)*

The language situation in the colonial period was characterised firstly by the teaching of Dutch to slaves, later on by British interventions aimed at the anglicisation of White settlers, and much later by the rise of Afrikaner nationalism against British imperialism and anglicisation policies.

Between 1652 and the 1920s Dutch and English were the primary languages of schooling and English the sole language of higher education (Kamwangamalu, 2001:388). African-language speaking children had access to African languages in missionary-run primary schools for between two and six years, but English was the only medium of learning and teaching in secondary schools (Alexander, 1989:18-20). Children classified as Coloured and Indian were educated through English or Afrikaans, depending on the part of the country in which they lived.

From the time of the declaration of a republic in 1961, a series of Afrikaner nationalist governments sought to limit the influence of English, which they considered a threat to their culture and interests. In education, this was done in two ways. Firstly, state-sponsored parallel medium schools were established where English and Afrikaans speaking children were taught separately in their 'own' languages and learned Afrikaans or English as subjects. Secondly, policy

insisted that speakers of African languages be taught through African languages rather than English, especially in the primary grades. The latter issue is discussed in detail in the next sub-section.

#### *2.2.3.2 Apartheid period (ca.1948 to 1994)*

Between 1948 to about 1990 Afrikaner nationalist governments sought to control a wider spectrum of the facets of Black people's lives and to incorporate them into a White-dominated polity (Thompson, 1995:190-200). In terms of the education of African-language speaking children, firm control of their education was assumed through the notorious Bantu Education Act of 1953. The Act essentially institutionalised an underfunded and ill-equipped education system for African-language speaking children (Heugh, 2002:186). 'Bantu education' was part of an explicit government strategy to reproduce colonial forms of 'racial' segregation, inequality and White domination and to introduce new ones (Molteno, 1984:91-94).

From a language point of view, the period of Bantu education can be delineated into two phases, the first phase extending from 1953 to 1976 and the second from 1977 to 1993. In the first phase, the Bantu Education Act (1953-1976) prescribed, among other things, that African-language speaking children should be taught through the medium of an African language (i.e., their 'mother tongue') for the first eight years of school, should take Afrikaans and English as subjects and only in the ninth grade should they switch medium of instruction from the mother tongue, to take one half of their subjects through the medium of Afrikaans and the other half through English. In reality, most schools switched medium from mother tongue to English-only, partly as resistance to Afrikaans and Afrikaner nationalism, and partly because very few teachers were available who could teach through the medium of Afrikaans (Heugh, 2003:10).

Strong evidence demonstrating the cognitive benefits of learning through a mother tongue or a familiar language, rather than an unfamiliar language, came through in the early 1980s and 1990s (e.g., the writings of Cummins as documented in Baker and Hornberger, 2001). That is to say, the architects of apartheid had no such evidence when they insisted on mother tongue instruction

for African-language speaking children in 1953. Their goal was not to empower African-language speaking students, but to stymie the growth of African nationalism by sharpening narrow ethnolinguistically-based cultural and political identities. This is manifest in the apartheid government's creation of ethnolinguistically-based reservations or homelands so that each ethno-linguistic group, such as isiXhosa or isiZulu speakers, had its own so-called independent homeland or reservation (Alexander, 1989:21). Quite unexpectedly, the policy of mother tongue instruction had a positive spin-off for African-language speaking children. The matriculation pass rate for this group reached a peak of 84% in 1976 (Heugh, 2002:187), and has never been higher, even in post-apartheid South Africa.

The end of the first and the beginning of the second phase of Bantu Education was ushered in by the Soweto students' uprising in June 1976. This uprising was triggered by the attempts of a newly appointed school inspector to compel African-language speaking students in Soweto to learn mathematics in Afrikaans from the ninth year (Heugh, 2002:187). Thousands of students organised protest marches and several unarmed students were shot dead by security forces. In the aftermath of the uprising, students demanded an end to Afrikaans-medium instruction as well as to mother-tongue instruction through African languages, believing that this policy was designed to hinder their access to English. Afrikaans, the 'language of the oppressor', and African languages, the 'languages of the people', were lumped together and both rejected as impediments to English-medium higher education and, therefore, to upward social mobility (Alexander, 2014:116).

One of the consequences of the uprising was the replacement of the Bantu Education Act of 1953 by the Education and Training Act of 1979 (RSA, 1979). In contrast to the previous Act, which mandated instruction through the mother tongue/HL/L1 for the first eight years of school and a switchover to Afrikaans and English instruction from the ninth year, the new Act required that the mother tongue be used for at least the first four years, and granted parents the right to choose between Afrikaans or English as a medium of instruction from the fifth year

onwards. Predictably, virtually all African-language medium schools opted for English.

The new, early switchover from mother tongue instruction to English L2-medium instruction - what Baker (2011:216) calls "*early exit transitional bilingual education*" - proved a disaster for most African-language speaking students. This is primarily because teachers were not equipped to teach effectively through English in the early grades, and given the kinds and amount of English they were exposed to, most children had not learned sufficient English to learn through this language from the fifth year of school (Heugh, 2002). This continues to be the case today (e.g., Ramadiro, 2012).

Five years after the reduction of the number of years of instruction through an African language, the matriculation pass rate for African-language speaking students plummeted from 84% to 49% (Heugh, 2002:187). As for children in the lower grades, a large scale study by Macdonald (1990:161-162) showed that they were not coping with the early and sudden shift in medium of instruction from an African language to English in the fifth year of school. Children could not cope with a sudden 'deep-end' launch into a massive range of new vocabulary, structures and concepts in an L2. Macdonald estimated that between the fourth and the fifth year of school, English language vocabulary requirements for these children increased a thousand per cent, from 800 words to 7000 words, and that it was very difficult to catch up, given the amount of English to which they had access, inside and outside of school.

#### *2.2.3.3 Post-apartheid period (ca.1994 to the present)*

In 1996 South Africa officially became a multilingual rather than an Afrikaans-English bilingual country. A number of policies have since been issued to promote multilingualism in schooling and higher education.

In terms of schooling, a key language policy for government schools is the Language in Education Policy of 1997 (RSA, 1997). This policy seeks to correct, among other policies, the Education and Training Act of 1979. It again puts mother-tongue or L1-medium instruction at the centre of the basic education process. It

seeks to achieve additive multilingualism (Baker, 2011:71-72), i.e., it implies L1 instruction for the first six to eight years of school, mandates the teaching of English as an L2 to non-speakers of English from the third year of school (subsequently brought forward to the second year), and, as part of the drive to promote cross-cultural communication and build social cohesion, encourages non-speakers of African languages to learn a regionally important African language. Those who already speak an African language are encouraged to learn another, unrelated, African language.

Except for the requirement that learners take at least two languages, one of which should be their mother tongue/L1, the policy breaks with colonial and apartheid traditions and is remarkably permissive rather than prescriptive. Perhaps this is a partial explanation for the fact that the policy has remained largely unimplemented in a country used to governance by diktat. Indeed, outside of one or two pilot projects (Braam, 2012; Koch, London, Jackson and Foli, 2009), little has been done to promote systematically the use of African languages as a medium of teaching, learning and assessment beyond the fourth year of school.

Until recently (i.e., 2013), very few Afrikaans- and English-medium middle class schools offered an African language as a subject, even though African-language speaking students make up a large proportion, or in many cases the majority of students in these schools. Reasons for this include the fact that the majority of teachers in these schools do not speak an African language (e.g., Plüdderman, Mati, and Mahlalela-Thusi, 1998:20) as well as negative attitudes towards African languages among some learners, teachers and parents (Makoe and McKinney, 2014:664; NCCRD, 2000:49-50). Not until 2013 did government require Afrikaans- and English-medium public/government schools to offer an African language as an option from the first grade (RSA, 2013).

In terms of language in Higher Education, since 2002 every university has been required to create an explicit language policy and in particular to adopt an African language which it will develop, in collaboration with other institutions, as a medium of teaching and learning alongside English and/or Afrikaans (RSA, 2002). All universities have formally adopted an African language, but progress in using

these languages for learning and teaching is slow. However, there are significant moves in that direction, including a bachelor degree programme taught bilingually in English and Sepedi at the University of Limpopo (Ramani and Joseph, 2002). In 2017 the University of Fort Hare will enrol its first cohort of students in an English-isiXhosa bilingual teacher preparation degree programme. Other more modest initiatives I am aware of include the use of simultaneous interpretation facilities to conduct some lectures trilingually in Afrikaans, English and Setswana at the North-West University; the use of isiZulu to teach a psychology module at the University of KwaZulu-Natal; and the use of isiXhosa to teach a pharmacology module at Rhodes University. Even more recently-documented initiatives along these lines can be found in Hibbert and van der Walt (2014).

In 2011, government tabled a Languages Bill in parliament which aims to regulate and monitor language use in government departments (RSA, 2011:3). The bill requires government departments to select at least three official languages for use in communication with members of the public, in order to ensure that all South Africans have “equitable access to services and information of national government” (RSA, 2011:3). However, this bill has never been signed into law. One reason for this is that drafters failed to provide explicit criteria for the selection of the relevant languages (Alexander, 2014:298). This may have given legislators, the executive, or members of the public, an incorrect impression that the proposals contained in the bill were unworkable. The result is that, in the interim, government documents are made available in English, to a lesser extent in Afrikaans, but seldom in African languages.

The prognosis for language development in South African can be summarised as follows. In the short-to-medium term, English is likely to continue to rise as the pre-eminent, de facto official language, and the commonly-used language in high status domains such as higher education, the judiciary, big business, and even public administration (Alexander, 2014; Heugh, 2002).

In the short-term, Afrikaans is likely to continue to be used on its own in specific areas of education, the judiciary and big business, but in the medium-to-long term, if it is not to be seen as exclusionary or discriminatory, it is likely to be

used alongside or together with English and/or African languages. In 2015 and 2016 there were widespread student protests against Afrikaans (and for English instruction) across formerly Afrikaans-medium universities country-wide, resulting in the Universities of Stellenbosch, Pretoria and Free State dropping Afrikaans as a medium of teaching and learning on its own (ENCA, 2016; 702 Radio, 2016). Renowned Afrikaner historian, Herman Gilomee (2012), predicts a steady decline in the use of Afrikaans as a public language outside of the immediate community of its users. Deeply held racist beliefs and sedimented practices among Afrikaner leaders and the Afrikaans-speaking community more generally are a driver of Black support for English monolingualism, even if this is potentially or actually harmful to them.

As for African languages, at present most middle-class African-language speaking people - essentially the political leadership - regard English as the natural linking language and the language of national unity (Alexander, 2014). Therefore, in the medium-to-long term, African languages will remain important, and perhaps even expand their influence in the domain of mass politics, arts, and popular culture, but are likely to remain marginal in high status functions. Reasons for this include the fact that the country's political and cultural leadership, largely made up of the Black middle class, has access to 'legitimate' (Bourdieu, 1991) forms of English and therefore has little use for African languages. Some have described this as a deliberate gatekeeping "strategy of elite closure" (Myers-Scotton, 1993b) by post-colonial English speaking elites, designed to exclude the masses from a small pool of high-end English-mediated jobs. This is especially poignant in a country like South Africa with some of the worst income distribution in the world (UNDP, 2015). Many in this class hold defeatist views about prospects for African languages in high status functions (Alexander, 2014:268-269). Some display concern about the probability of "ethnic/tribal entrepreneurs" (Masondo, 2015:136) exploiting the language issue to promote narrow ethno-linguistic identities in order to gain political and/or economic power and mask their defeatism.

Consensus among scholars (e.g., Alexander, 2014; Kamwangamalu, 2001; Orman, 2008) is that while post-apartheid governments have produced important policy statements intended to promote multilingualism and to elevate and modernize African languages in particular, by and large very little action has followed policy. The South African political-economy and the linguistic order favours English monolingual assimilation in high status domains (e.g., higher education, state and big business) and the use of the other languages either on their own or code-switched with English in low status domains (e.g., primary schooling, home, and pop culture).

### 2.3 Theoretical Approaches to Code-switching in Interaction

This section reviews four of the most influential approaches to CS in interaction, viz., strands associated with John Gumperz, Carol Myers-Scotton and Peter Auer, as well as a fourth and newer strand, made up of a number of scholars who draw on one or more of the three abovementioned scholars, but who share a broad common goal to extend or revise the meaning of the term ‘code’ in ‘code-switching’.

#### 2.3.1 Gumperz: situational vs. metaphorical CS

Although CS was known to linguists before the publication of Blom and Gumperz’s (1986 [1972]) paper, this paper is credited with putting CS at the top of the agenda of linguists (Gardner-Chloros, 2009:56). The paper described CS in Hemnesberget, a small rural village in Norway wherein speakers appeared to deliberately switch between Ranamål, a local variety, and Bokmål, a standard variety. In a later publication, Gumperz describes the kind of language practice observed in Hemnesberget as

meaningful juxtaposition of what speakers must consciously or subconsciously process as strings formed according to the internal rules of *two distinct grammatical systems*. (1982:66, Original emphasis)

Blom and Gumperz (1986) distinguished between two forms of switching: situational vs. metaphorical (or conversational) CS. Situational CS is based on the idea that “there is a direct relationship between language and social situation” (Blom and Gumperz, 1986:424), so that language choice varies according to

changes in setting, participants or activity type. Metaphorical CS on the other hand involves changes in language choice during the course of a conversation, in spite of no change in the social situation. Situational CS was rarely observed in Blom and Gumperz's site, while Metaphorical CS was more prevalent. Gumperz (1982:75-84) identified the following functions of metaphorical CS: addressee specification, quotations, interjections, reiteration, message qualification, and personalization vs. objectification.

Gumperz (1982:66) introduced another influential distinction in the description and analysis of bilingual speech, a distinction between a 'we-code' vs. 'they-code'. A 'we-code' is typically a 'minority' variety associated with informal and in-group activities and relationships, and a 'they-code' with a 'majority' variety and more formal and out-group events. The terms 'minority' and 'majority' do not necessarily refer to 'number' but to social status and are therefore interchangeable with terms like 'less dominant' and 'dominant', respectively.

There are a number of criticisms of this approach. Some scholars have said that applying the term 'code-switching' only to alternation between two distinct 'grammatical systems' is too restrictive. Instead the term should be used

as a much broader, blanket term for a range of interlingual phenomena within which strict alternation between two discrete systems is the exception rather than the rule (Gardner-Chloros, 1995:68).

Auer (1984) and Myers-Scotton (1993a), from different perspectives, have questioned the usefulness of the distinction between 'situational' vs. 'metaphorical' CS. According to Auer (1984:91), metaphorical CS is "less idiosyncratic" and much "less independent of the situation" than originally claimed. This is because metaphoric switches derive their "meaning from whatever that meaning is *when they occur in a situational switch*" (original emphasis). For Auer, the bridge between the two is sequential entailment and therefore the two should not be treated as categorically different.

Both Auer and Myers-Scotton concede that Gumperz identifies some important functions of metaphorical CS, but criticise his account for not

adequately addressing the question about the 'social mechanism' (Myers-Scotton, 1993a) motivating code choices, or, in the case of CA, 'procedures' (Auer, 1984) by which participants produce and interpret switches.

Myers-Scotton (1993a:114) has criticised Gumperz's version of the binary notion 'we-code/they-code' for failing to account for cases where CS itself is an 'unmarked choice' or where it is the 'we-code'. Gardner-Chloros (2009:58) has pointed out that the 'we-code/they-code' notion does not account for cases where speakers take language choice not so much as a choice between two alternatives, but as a continuum, with a range of options which they manipulate to produce not just two identities ('we' and 'they'), but a "multiplicity of social identities".

According to Bailey (2000:166), to conceive of CS as a "strategy", as does Gumperz (1982), can be misleading, because it suggests that CS is invariably a planned, intentional, and skilful act, whereas in practice, it is not always possible to tell apart switches made out of necessity from those out of choice (Gardner-Chloros, 2009:58).

Finally, in a detailed review of Blom and Gumperz's (1986) original study, Brit Mæhlum (1996), a Norwegian sociolinguist, raises a number of methodological and substantive questions about it. Her central claim is that Blom and Gumperz's findings about strict language separation in Hemnesberget are inconsistent with other studies undertaken in comparable small Norwegian villages in the same period. She believes that what Blom and Gumperz observed was not a case of strict language alternation but of "various syntheses of dialect and standard features" that make up a "regional standard" (Mæhlum, 1996:759). She explains that it was common at the time for speakers in small villages across Norway to produce speech with many intermediate linguistic features between a local and a national (standard) variety.

### 2.3.2 Myers-Scotton: Markedness Model and Rational Choice

The stated aim of the Markedness Model (MM) is to explain all code-switches and their social motivations (Myers-Scotton, 1993a:113). The view that language choice is socially motivated originates with Gumperz (e.g., 1992a:39). However, in

contrast to Gumperz's (1982) or Zentella's (1997) classificatory systems, Myers-Scotton puts forward MM not as a taxonomy, but as a comprehensive theory of CS. MM is premised on the idea that competent bilingual speakers know socially acceptable ways in which to grammatically combine their varieties, and to use them to produce social meanings.

Speakers produce and listeners interpret social meanings generated or indexed by linguistic code choices through a social mechanism called a 'markedness metric' (Myers-Scotton, 1993a:151) or a 'markedness evaluator' (Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai, 2001:8). A markedness metric enables speakers and listeners to produce or recognise a multi-dimensional continuum of markedness, "from the more socially marked to the less marked" linguistic code choices (Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai, 2001:8). Speakers code-switch in order to index 'rights-and-obligations sets' (RO) or relationships they wish to bring about or maintain between themselves and others in a given interaction. In MM, speakers have four CS choices available to them (Myers-Scotton, 1993a:114-142): (i) CS as a sequence of unmarked choices. In this form speakers establish or affirm unmarked RO sets. (ii) CS as an unmarked choice. Speakers in this form point to RO sets indexed by their combined codes. (iii) CS as a marked choice. In this form speakers mark their disassociation with an expected RO set. (iv) CS as an exploratory choice. This form occurs when a speaker is uncertain about which code is expected or optimal.

Based on this continuum of markedness, Myers-Scotton (1993a:153-154) makes six predictions about CS in concrete communicative situations: (i) In the default position, speakers make unmarked choices, unless CS is itself an unmarked choice. (ii) The more linguistically conservative a group or speech community, the more likely it is for speakers to make unmarked choices. (iii) The more a group has opportunity for upward social mobility, the more likely it is that speakers will make switches in order to allow for status-raising. (iv) Language choices of people with high status or with a great deal of social, political or economic power are more difficult to predict because they have greater leeway to make marked or unmarked choices. (v) Persons of high status are more likely to make marked choices because there is a much smaller chance that their actions will precipitate sanctions. (vi)

Finally, a greater proportion of CS is likely to occur in the least conventionalised exchanges.

Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai (2001) updated MM by incorporating ideas from Rational Choice (RC) theory in order to explain how and why speakers switch languages in interaction. Their central claim is that bilingual speakers are rational actors who seek to maximise psychological and/or material rewards and to minimise costs. One way to achieve this is to select a language that will secure the most rewards from the speaker's point of view. Unlike a CA approach, which operates according to a behaviourist hypothesis, i.e., it focuses on displayed behaviour, RC holds that much of what occurs in interaction is below the surface or behind observable behaviour. In MM, rationality is understood as a 'social mechanism' subject to 'external constraints' (e.g., large scale societal factors or discourse structures of speech communities) and to 'internal constraints' (e.g., speakers' own markedness evaluators and competence in the varieties involved in an exchange) that bias choices based on experience. Rationality is a "socio-cognitive interface"; while individual code choices are constrained by the social situation, the relationship is "non-deterministic", and therefore choices can be both "situationally and personally variable" (van Dijk, 2008:119).

The notion of a 'markedness metric' has been criticised for failing to explain why speakers switch and how listeners construe the meaning of switches. For MM to explain these phenomena, it would be necessary for speakers and listeners to have the same markedness metric, or, alternatively, for language use in a speech community to be rigidly conventionalised so that language choice is predictable (Li Wei, 2002:167; 1998:158-159). Practice shows, however, that a single switch can be 'strategically ambiguous' (Heller, 1988), or that it can have a 'multiplicity' of meanings (Woolard, 1998).

Like Blom and Gumperz's approach, the MM/RC approach has also been criticised for operating with a fixed and linguist-centred conception of code, rather than a fluid and participant-centred one. All the studies in the edited volume by Peter Auer (1998), for example, make this point.

Finally, Li Wei (2002) and Auer (1995) claim that MM/RC is not a rigorously empirical approach because its analyses rely on making assumptions about 'internal or mental states' of participants, such as their intentions, knowledge and understanding of a speech situation, rather than on their displayed or demonstrable behaviour.

### 2.3.3 Conversation Analytic Approach

This section reviews CA as a theoretical approach to bilingual talk-in-interaction. A review of CA as a research methodology is carried out in chapter 3. As stated before, the CA approach, like MM/RC, is not satisfied with taxonomies of CS, but seeks to discover "*members' procedures to arrive at local interpretations of language alternation*" (Auer, 1984:3, original emphasis).

In the CA approach, 'language or code alternation' is a cover term that includes 'code switching' and 'transfer' (Auer, 1995:116). Auer uses 'code-switching' to refer to locally meaningful switches only, and 'transfer' to switches that have no local meaning. 'Local' refers to the sequential environment in which switches occur, that is, the immediately preceding or following turns or sequences in talk-in-interaction (Auer, 1984:5).

A consequence of CA's behaviourist stance is that it regards bilingualism as a "displayed feature of participants' everyday behaviour" rather than as a "mental ability" (Auer, 1984:7). Thus "discursive and linguistic practices" (Auer, 2007:337) of participants are its primary object of study, rather than codes or conventional languages. CA thus seeks to study CS from the members' or participants' perspective (Auer 1998:13) rather than from that of the linguist, i.e., from an emic rather than an etic point of view.

In order to differentiate CS from other types of bilingual speech, Auer (1999:328) has proposed a typology of bilingual speech that is a continuum consisting, on the one end, of 'code-switching' (CS), and on the other end, of 'fused lects' (FL), with 'language mixing' (LM) falling somewhere in the middle. The continuum is characterized by greater structural sedimentation and grammaticalisation in the course of the move from CS to ML to FL (Auer, 1999:310).

According to this typology, “prototypical CS” occurs (Auer, 1999:312-314): in sociolinguistic contexts where there is a preference for one language at a time, (i.e., where it is possible to identify a “base language” or “language of interaction”); where a departure from the language of interaction signals a change in footing or in contextual frames; where CS is not a variety in and of itself; and where most switches occur at major syntactic and prosodic boundaries.

LM is equivalent to Myers-Scotton’s (1993a) ‘CS as an unmarked choice’. Auer (1999:314-318) characterises LM as involving a number of features: (i) difficulties interpreting switches because the juxtaposition of languages does not appear to signal changes in footing or contextual frames; (ii) difficulties in interpreting whether languages are juxtaposed on account of the language preferences or dispreferences of participants; (iii) difficulties in distinguishing between ‘insertional’ and ‘alternational’ switches, or (iv) the use of LM as a marker of group identity. In general, he observes that LM appears to require greater bilingual competence than CS. While he believes that CS and LM can co-exist for a long, transitional period, the developmental trajectory is from CS to LM, both at the level of the individual and the community. This hypothesis excludes the possibility of a developmental trajectory from LM to CS, although not the possibility of routes to LM other than from CS (Auer, 1999:319).

Neither LM nor FL are locally meaningful. A difference between the two is at the grammatical level, with LM allowing for variation whereas FL makes certain grammatical constituencies obligatory in language A or B. Transition from LM to FL suggests emergence of grammatical constraints in the variety and adaptation towards a new grammatical system. The transition from LM to FL includes (Auer, 1999:323-327): (i) CS for emphasis or foregrounding; (ii) trigger words, including established borrowings; (iii) insertional switches no longer limited to lexemes but sometimes including larger constituents such as verbal or noun phrases; (iv) and, LM constrains language juxtaposition such that the code-mixed variety develops a functional specialisation. Because of functional specialisation, LM does not lead to language loss but to greater complexity in linguistic structure. While there are other ways for LM to arise, Auer predicts that the developmental trajectory is from

LM to FL and that the reverse is not possible. Various structural aspects of language may move independently along the CS→LM line, e.g., utterance modifiers can co-occur at the same point in time with CS or with LM.

According to Auer (1984:12), the motivation for switching as well as the local meaning of switches can be explained in terms of principles that both speakers and hearers use to arrive at local interpretations of switches. These are the category pairs “transfer vs. code-switching” and “participant- vs. discourse-related” language alternation. Speakers switch in such a way that they signal to hearers how they should solve the following problems (Auer, 1984:12):

- (i) Is the language alternation in question tied to a particular conversation structure, for instance, a word, a sentence, or a larger unit (transfer), or is it tied to a particular point in conversation (code-switching)?
- (ii) Is the language alternation in question providing cues for the organisation of ongoing interaction (i.e. is it discourse related), or about attributes of the speaker (participant related)?

As mentioned, Auer’s approach to CS assumes communities or participants that favour the use of one language at a time. Based on this assumption, he predicts four patterns of CS (1995:125-126):

*Pattern IA:* A1 A2 A1 A2//B1 B2 B1 B2

In pattern IA, speakers 1 and 2 begin their conversation in language A and at a particular point in the conversation, speaker 1 switches the language of interaction from A to B. Speaker 2 switches to language B to match speaker 1’s choice.

*Pattern IB:* A1 A2 A1 A2 A1//B1 B2 B1 B2

Pattern 1B is a variation of pattern IA. A switch can occur within a single speaker’s turn and is interpreted as signalling a shift in some aspect of the conversation, e.g. the topic, the participants or the activity. Such switches are often discourse-related.

*Pattern IIA:* A1 B2 A1 B2 A1 B2

*Pattern IIB:* A1 B2 A1 B2//A2 B2 A2 B2

In pattern IIA, speaker 1 uses one language and speaker two another. This is language divergence and Auer says the pattern is uncommon. Pattern IIB on the other hand is thought to be more common, with speaker 1 and 2 beginning interaction in different languages and after a while speaker 1 takes up the variety used by speaker 2. This is a case of negotiating the language of interaction.

*Pattern IIIA:* AB1 AB2 AB1 AB2

*Pattern IIIB:* AB1//A2 A1 A2

Speakers can keep open or indicate their uncertainty about the appropriate language of interaction by making intra-turn discourse-related or participant-related switches as in patterns IIIA and IIIB. In pattern IIIA both speaker 1 and 2 use a 'mixed' variety to keep open the language of interaction, and in IIIB speaker 1 uses an ambiguous 'mixed' variety in the beginning of the conversation and once speaker 2 makes clear her/his language preference, speaker 1 follows speaker 2's language choice.

*Pattern IV:* A1[B1]A1

The fourth pattern occurs when a speaker produces a turn in language A and in the course of the turn, inserts a lexical or grammatical item from language B. Insertions may be discourse- or participant-related and precisely because they are momentary or brief, they often do not signal a change or a negotiation of change in a language of interaction.

Critics 'inside' CA question whether speakers do have a preference for conversation in the same language (Gafaranga, 2007:138), i.e. the central claim that 'code-switching', as defined by Auer, occurs only in speech communities that favour one language at a time. Gafaranga claims that Auer arrives at this position because he equates 'codes' with conventional languages. In contrast, he takes the view that speakers' codes may be monolingual or bi/multilingual. He prefers the term 'medium' over 'code' or 'language'. Thus, a 'code-switched medium' or

'codeswitching as an unmarked choice', in this view, is but one medium of interaction. He proposes two forms of CS: first, a form that occurs at the beginning of an interaction when participants have not established a medium or 'language' of interaction, and second, a form that occurs when a medium of interaction has been established. This gives rise to two possible interpretations.

First, CS is either the new medium of interaction, or deviation from an established medium of interaction. Second, if it is a deviation, it is open to repair, i.e., it is noticeable and can be sanctioned, or it is a functional (or discourse-related) deviation. Gafaranga claims that the difference between his and Auer's position arises, in part, from the fact that Auer takes only a narrow turn-by-turn sequential approach, whereas Gafaranga takes into account both the sequential and the 'overall' local order of an interaction.

From outside CA, criticism centres on CA's definition of 'context'. For instance, Blommaert (2005:54) argues that CA operates with an impoverished idea of context. He claims that CA limits context to sequential context or at best to overall interactional context. Blommaert's (2005:47) view is that, of necessity, those who investigate naturally-occurring discourse must practice 'entextualising'. That is, they must lift pieces of discourse from their original historical, political and cultural contexts

by quoting or echoing them, by writing them down, by inserting them into another discourse, by using them as examples (or 'data' for scientific analysis).  
(Blommaert, 2005:47)

Therefore, like all other approaches to naturally occurring discourse, CA cannot escape the need to be reflexive about its own procedures and concepts. This is because an event or episode represented in a CA transcript, as well as analytical concepts used by CA analysts to make sense of discourse, are not part of the original event or episode but are analyst's acts of entextualising.

In other words, the CA approach assumes that "socio-political aspects of context" (Blommaert, 2005:54) can always be located or found in talk-in-interaction. This implies that if participants cannot be shown to orient to these

aspects of context through their verbal and/or non-verbal behaviour, they have no bearing on the interaction. A consequence of this position is that in CA studies it is often difficult to see connections

between [socio-]structural aspects of linguistic resources and the uses speakers make of them in interaction, whether in terms of organization of interaction or in terms of cultural meaning of categories and practices, or more simply of the making of meaning more broadly (Heller, 2007:13).

#### 2.3.4 Post-structuralist approaches

A major focus of these studies is how people are located and/or position themselves in unequal linguistic landscapes (Martin-Jones and Gardner, 2012; Blommaert, 2010; Heller, 1995) and how they fashion and sustain locally and interactionally meaningful social identities (Prinsloo and Stroud, 2014). Later studies with a post-structuralist orientation examine cultural and linguistic ‘superdiversity’ (Blommaert, Rampton, and Spotti, 2011) that is an outcome of processes of globalisation, in particular immigration, migration, and new information and communication technologies.

These alternatives to Gumperz, Myers-Scotton and Auer are neither a unified theoretical or methodological framework. Rampton describes UK Linguistic Ethnography, arguably one of the more distinguishable strands of post-structuralist approaches, as

neither a paradigm, a cohesive ‘school’, nor some kind of definitive synthesis. Instead, it is more accurately described as a site of encounter where a number of established lines of research interact (...) (2007:588)

Common themes running through these approaches are concerns with “multiplicity, hybridity and simultaneity” (Woolard, 1998:3); “mobility, political dynamics and historical embedding” (Blommaert, 2010:3) and ways of approaching language as a “social practice, speakers as actors and boundaries as products of social action” (Heller, 2007:1). Post-structuralist scholars (e.g., Rampton, 1998; Stroud, 1998; and contributors to Blackledge and Creese, 2014) criticise the previous approaches for having paid too much attention to ‘languages’ rather than to languaging as a social practice.

A particular focus of these approaches has been to revise and extend the notion of 'code' in 'code-switching'. Gardner-Chloros (1995:72) questions the Gumperzian idea that speakers switch between "two discrete systems" and argues that such a notion is a theoretical possibility, but is seldom observed. She has also argued that CS needs to be thought about as part of a continuum of language contact phenomena, viz., borrowing, language mixing and pidginisation, rather than as a categorically different phenomenon. This is similar to a position which was later developed by Auer (1999), reviewed in detail above.

Other researchers (e.g., Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998:38; Heller, 2007:6-7; Meeuwis and Blommaert, 1998:91) have, instead, argued for the abandonment of approaches that investigate CS against the background of presumed full bilingualism, i.e., competence in two monolingual varieties. These scholars argue that in many instances CS is not alternation between two distinct codes, but is itself a language of interaction, i.e., CS is an 'alloy' (Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998:93) or a 'monolectal code' (Meeuwis and Blommaert, 1998:93). Recently, this type of CS has been described as a form of 'translanguaging' (e.g., Garcia and Li Wei, 2014:22). (Translanguaging in the classroom is reviewed in section 2.3.4). While Auer and Myers-Scotton regard translanguaging as one minor aspect of CS, in alternative approaches it occupies a prominent role as an in-group variety through which local meanings are generated (Bailey, 2007:257; Franceschini, 1998:52; Sebba and Wootton, 1998:265).

A consequence of foregrounding a 'CS as unmarked' variety is revision of the Gumperzian notion of 'we-code/they-code' to take account of the fact that in many speech communities there are multiple 'we-codes/they-codes'. For instance, Sebba and Wootton (1998) show that while London Jamaican is normally a 'we code' for youth of Jamaican descent, this variety can also be a 'we-code' for London youth in general in certain kinds of interactions.

Previous approaches to CS are criticized for privileging 'systematicity' and 'coherence' over 'incongruity' and 'contradiction' (Rampton, 1998:290). According to Rampton, this is manifest in the preoccupation of CS research with the need to demonstrate the integrity and the systematic and pragmatic coherence of the

simultaneous use of more than one language in speech. He urges researchers to relax their commitment to systematicity and coherence (Rampton, 1998) in order that the field be set free to capture momentary and creative uses of CS such as 'crossing' (Rampton, 1995) or the 'heteroglossic' nature of switches (Bailey, 2007). CS can also be seen as a form of "layered simultaneity" that is "encapsulated in several layers of historicity, some of which are within the grasp of the participants while others remain invisible but are nevertheless present" (Blommaert, 2005:130).

Alternative approaches stress the need to take account, on the one hand, of speakers' life histories, values, and attitudes, and on the other hand, of ideology, in analysing how switches are produced and interpreted (Li Wei, 2011:1223; Stroud, 1998:322-3). While in one sense every utterance is a unique and creative act performed by a free agent, language choice is entailed and constrained by an agent's own access to and command of existing conventionalised languages, and by interactional arrangements, institutional norms and social structure (Blommaert, 2005:106). Utterances are "suffused with political and moral" (Irvine and Gal, 2009:374) stances towards what is acceptable language use. In educational institutions in particular, language practices are subject to "institutional processes, and to the political economic foundations of symbolic domination" (Heller, 1988:205-206).

## **2.4 Code-switching in the Classroom**

### **2.4.1 Strands of classroom-based CS studies**

At least three strands of classroom CS can be identified in the literature. First is a group of studies which focus on improving teaching and learning processes. The overriding question of these studies is: Does CS aid or impede teaching and learning processes? These studies have produced rich descriptions of 'communicative' and 'pedagogic' functions of CS (Ferguson, 2009:231). Studies in this vein include the majority of the studies reviewed in, for example, Ferguson (2009; 2003), Lin (2013; 2008) and Martin-Jones (2000; 1995). Studies that focus on CS as pedagogical scaffold often treat CS as an episodic, momentary or strategic phenomenon and often associate it with mitigating difficulties encountered in

learning an L2 or L2-medium content (e.g., Finnema-Blom, 2010; McCabe, 2013; Voster, 2008). Turnbull and Dailey-O’Cain’s (2009) volume contains studies that report on how an L1 can be used to enhance learning in an L2 or L3 classroom, and Adler (2000) describes the use of an L1 in an L2-medium content classroom. CS in these studies is talked about in instrumental, i.e. Gumperzian, terms, as a strategic resource under the conscious control of teachers and learners.

A second strand also examines communicative and pedagogic functions of CS in teaching and learning processes, but, in addition to this, investigates how classroom CS is embedded in broader sociolinguistic questions, such as power, inequality and identity. Studies in this strand explore what CS can tell us about these questions. While findings of such studies have implications for teaching and learning processes, they speak more directly to questions of how classroom-level language issues can be addressed and resolved through institutional reform and changes in wider society, in particular through reform in language and educational planning and resourcing (Ferguson, 2006) and the transformation of language management ideologies and practices (Spolsky, 2009). Studies in this strand have a strong socio-political and critical orientation. Prominent examples include chapters in edited collections by Creese and Martin (2003); Heller and Martin-Jones (2001); Martin-Jones and Heller (1996); Menken and Garcia (2010) and Arthur Shoba and Chimbutane (2013).

A final strand investigates classroom CS to test and/or develop hypotheses or theories about bi/multilingual practices rather than to directly inform teaching and learning processes or language policy. In these studies, CS, or languaging, is a primary focus and not teaching and learning processes. A prominent example, using a linguistic ethnographic lens, is Rampton (2006; 1995). Bonacina and Gafaranga (2011) and Li Wei and Wu (2009), also in this strand, use a CA perspective.

Among pedagogically focused studies, enquiries into the use of an L1 in the L2 language classroom form the earliest sub-strand. These studies seek to investigate how best to take advantage of an L1 to accelerate L2 language acquisition without overreliance on the L1 (e.g., Atkinson, 1987; Auerbach, 1993;

Macaro, 2001; Moodley, 2010; Polio and Duff, 1994; van der Walt, 2009). Building on this research, Swain, Kirkpatrick and Cummins (2011) have produced practical guidelines about how and when an L1 can be brought into an English L2 classroom. Practical guidelines such as these assume that CS is a strategic practice within the conscious control of speakers.

Only a few studies have examined the use of 'vernaculars', 'dialects' or less dominant varieties in the L1 classroom. In the case of English, exceptions include studies about Ebonics as a bridge to teaching 'standard' English (e.g., studies in Ramirez, 2005). In the case of African languages in South Africa, the exception is a group of studies undertaken in the early to mid-1990s, summarised in Calteaux (1996). Note though that Nomlomo's (1993) dissertation is a major study which investigates attitudes towards and the pedagogical effects of using less dominant varieties of isiXhosa in an isiXhosa L1 classroom. The use of minority and urban varieties of African languages in the classroom is widely attested to, as are negative teacher attitudes towards them (e.g., Calteaux, 1996: 148). A dearth of research on this issue is indicative of the wider problem of too little investment into research about processes and conditions for the acquisition and learning of African languages as L1's in the home, school and community (Tuomi, Gxilishe, and Matomela, 2001:15).

Research suggests that CS is less stigmatised in the L2-medium content classroom than in the language classroom (Calteaux, 1996:148). This is probably because, in L2 classrooms, language is the focus of lessons and also because dominant approaches to language teaching favour language separation rather than bi/multilingual language use in a language classroom (Levine, 2011). On the other hand, CS is tolerated and sometimes even encouraged in L2-medium content classrooms especially when CS is used intermittently or momentarily to scaffold learning, such as to translate, explain or elaborate a particular point (e.g., Finnema-Blom, 2010; Setati and Adler, 2000; Voster, 2008). Studies of CS in the L2 language classroom, in particular, show that the notion of 'code' or 'language', however defined, is crucial to explaining much of what goes on in L2 classrooms, because

'codes' are the goals/objects of classroom interaction as well as the means for pursuing them.

CS in the content classroom occurs in at least three distinct sociolinguistic settings. First, it occurs in post-colonial countries where an ex-colonial and prestigious language – English, French or Portuguese - is spoken as an L1 or proficiently by a small proportion of the population, yet is the main or only medium of instruction beyond primary education (e.g., Botswana and Brunei: Arthur and Martin, 2006; Hong Kong: Lin, 1996; Mozambique: Chimbutane, 2011 and South Africa: Uys and van Dulm, 2011). In the case of South Africa, the vast majority of students live in poor urban or rural communities where there is little access to the ex-colonial language and go to schools where the ex-colonial language is not taught very well and where there is inadequate access to appropriate learning materials (NCCRD, 2000). Thus, in such settings, learners and teachers often use an L1 or other familiar language to communicate in classrooms, rather than an unfamiliar or less familiar L2/target language.

A second sociolinguistic context typically occurs in the 'global North' and is associated with recently arrived immigrants. Often a prestigious, majority language is the main or only medium of instruction and immigrant languages may be offered as subjects in formal schooling or in complementary schools (e.g., Li Wei and Wu, 2009). In contrast to learners in the post-colonial situation, learners in this context are more likely to encounter many speakers of the medium of instruction in and especially outside of school, and are more likely to have teachers who are proficient in the medium of instruction and may also have command of students' L1 (e.g., Finnema-Blom, 2010). In this context, teachers are more likely to use an L2 rather than an L1 because the L2 is likely to be the teachers' L1 or primary language.

A third distinct sociolinguistic context also occurs often in the global North and involves two, less commonly three, prestigious languages (e.g., Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain, 2005; Palmer, 2009). Teacher-learner and student-learner CS occurs within a policy framework of additive bi/multilingualism (e.g., in Canada, Baker,

2011). In this context, CS is encouraged, with the goal of attaining high levels of spoken and written proficiency in the varieties concerned.

#### 2.4.2 Conceptions of CS in classroom research

Definitions of CS vary according to the disciplinary frameworks and perspectives from which it is investigated (Gardner-Chloros, 2009:7-8) because CS is not some objective phenomenon out there in the world, waiting to be discovered, but a theoretical “construct which linguists have developed to help them describe their data” (Ibid:10). Therefore, the question is not so much about the definition of CS, but is rather about the definition of CS from a particular disciplinary, theoretical, and/or methodological framework.

The most relevant approaches to the present study are those developed within the disciplines of pragmatics and sociolinguistics. These approaches take the view that there can be no hard and fast rules about what constitutes a switch (Ibid) or what a switch means (Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998:31). In addition, these approaches stress that it is unproductive to seek to make sharp distinctions between language contact phenomena like code-switching, code-mixing and borrowing because they overlap one another in communicative practice (Gardner-Chloros, 2009:10). Focus should rather be on the participants’ orientations to and interpretations of language(s) as displayed in talk-in-interaction (Auer, 1984) along with ways in which relevant sociolinguistic factors or variables shape how and when switches are produced and understood (Gardner-Chloros, 2009). These approaches seek to place ‘speakers’ rather than ‘codes’ at the centre of analysis and to replace the notion of ‘code’ as a bounded system with that of an open and not wholly describable “linguistic resource” (Heller, 2007:7). Such conceptions of language, and of CS in particular, have many similarities with recent attempts to re-theorise bi/multilingualism such as translanguaging (e.g., Garcia and Li Wei, 2014).

Nevertheless, in practice, many studies of classroom CS take ‘codes’ of ‘code-switching’ to be more or less the same as a conventional ‘languages’ or distinct varieties (e.g., Chitera, 2009; Cromdal, 2001; Uys and van Dulm, 2011). While other researchers of classroom CS take ‘codes’ to be ‘languages’, they insist

that codes be defined from the point of view of participants as displayed, specifically, in talk-in-interaction (e.g., Bonacina-Pugh and Gafaranga, 2011; Li Wei and Wu, 2009; Raschka, Sercombe and Chi-Ling, 2009).

Studies that take a strong constructivist or post-structuralist position on CS and on language more generally, have explored how CS is involved in questions of identity, and in particular, how aspects of student identities are constructed, expressed in and altered by talk-in-interaction (e.g., Cromdal, 2001; Jørgensen, 2003; Rampton, 1995, 2006). These studies have paid less attention to language use in teaching and learning processes. Notable exceptions include Canagarajah (2011a) and Creese and Blackledge (2010).

In contrast, studies that treat language in a more conventional sense have tended to focus on the details of teaching and learning processes (e.g., a large number of studies reviewed in Lin, 2013 and Ferguson, 2009 and also see Heller, 2007, 1995; Martin-Jones, 1995). This is not to say that pedagogically-oriented studies, by definition, have only conventional ideas about ‘languages’, but rather that in the specific social institution that is ‘school’ and in specific communicative exchanges called ‘teaching and learning’, what counts as language or ‘legitimate language’ is enabled, constrained and regulated by institutional mechanisms, such as language policies, materials, instructional and assessment practices (Heller, 2001; Martin-Jones, 2007). Schools police language use precisely because it is the primary means through which teaching is conducted and evidence of learning displayed (Mercer and Dawes, 2014).

#### 2.4.3 Methodological issues

Studies of classroom CS published in English often report data about switching between two varieties (e.g., most studies in Lin, 2013). A couple of studies report on CS involving more than a single pair of varieties (e.g., Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain, 2005; Moore, 2002) or three varieties (e.g., Alidion, 2014). English is the most paired up language in the literature. There is only a small number of studies reported in English that do not include English switches (e.g., Moore, 2002) or in which English plays only a minor role (e.g., Jørgensen, 2003).

The 'global South' and 'global North' are represented in studies of classroom CS. With respect to Africa, different regions of the continent and several languages are represented in this research (for a list of key studies see McGlynn and Martin, 2009). Studies of classroom CS in Africa have focused on detailed descriptions of switching between varieties of an L1 and an ex-colonial L2. In addition to providing rich descriptions of classroom CS, recent studies report on interventions that seek to harness CS to support teaching and learning processes (e.g., chapters in Brock-Utne, Desai, Qorro, et al, 2010).

CS in the classroom has been studied in nearly all levels of the formal education system including primary (e.g., Arthur and Martin, 2006), secondary (e.g., Mafela, 2009), higher education (e.g., Polio and Duff, 1994), and non-formal language learning programmes (e.g., Raschka, et al, 2009). However, little is known about CS in pre-school and adult formal and non-formal programmes, particularly on the African continent.

Regarding classroom participants, the majority of studies have been about teacher-learner talk in various formats such as one-to-one, small group, and whole-class exchanges (e.g., most studies reviewed in Lin, 2013). A small but growing number of studies focus on learner-to-learner talk (e.g., Cromdal, 2001; Rampton, 2006, 1995). Other studies have focused on CS outside of the classroom but in and around school (e.g., McKinney, 2014).

#### 2.4.4 Findings

The main finding of studies of classroom CS research has been to demonstrate the "local rationality" (Lin, 2013:202) or "classroom functions" (Ferguson, 2009:232) of CS. Using Hallidayan terminology, Lin (2013) lists three primary functions of classroom CS: ideational, textual and interpersonal. Ideational functions refer to talk that facilitates student access to an L2 and to L2-medium materials and discourses. Textual functions refer to classroom management, including marking or signalling changes in topics, focus, or activities. Interpersonal functions include signalling shifts in footing, frames and identities.

Critical approaches to classroom multilingualism (e.g., Heller and Martin-Jones, 2001; Martin-Jones and Heller, 1996) have demonstrated connections between local rationalities or functions of classroom CS and patterns of language use in wider society. Classroom talk occurs against the backdrop of institutional mechanisms that mandate, monitor and punish/reward certain kinds of language use. That is, the broader sociolinguistic environment defines what are “legitimate, standard, valued languages vs. what gets marginalised, reproduced as inferior, non-standard language” (Lin, 2013:202-203). Critical scholars also claim that a consequence of linguistic inequality in postcolonial societies has been the rise of a classroom culture of “safetalk” (Chick, 1996; Hornberger and Chick, 2001), in which teachers and students use language, and CS in particular, for many important communicative functions, but in a way that contributes very little to student learning (Arthur and Martin, 2006:195). In addition, safetalk has been described as a form of “collusion” between students and teachers in order to avoid the “oppressive constraints” of having to learn and teach through an unfamiliar L2 (Chick, 1996:38).

Another important finding is that multilingual language use in the classroom is three-dimensional and that CS makes up but one of these dimensions. Work which has led to this finding is conducted within a combined framework of neo-Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory and Genre Theory in postcolonial classrooms (Setati and Adler, 2000:248). The first dimension is switching between conventional languages, such as English and isiXhosa. The second is switching between informal (exploratory talk) and formal (genre-specific and subject specific) discourses, e.g., informal and formal mathematical discourses. The third dimension relates to helping learners to gain access to classroom discourses. Adler (2002:61-66) claims that these dimensions present teachers with several dilemmas. They are not sure whether to develop English or to develop (subject matter) meaning (to code-switch or not to code-switch). They must decide whether to develop mathematical communicative competence, for example, or to negotiate and develop meaning. And they struggle to find out whether learning

problems arise from language problems or from classroom cultures and pedagogical strategies.

A recent strand of research into classroom multilingualism, under the banner of ‘translanguaging’, proposes to reconceptualise ‘language’, including practices such as CS (e.g., Creese and Blackledge, 2010; Garcia and Li Wei, 2014; Hornberger and Link, 2012). Other words used to refer to translanguaging include: ‘transglossia’ (Garcia, 2013), ‘poly-lingual languaging’, ‘code-meshing’ or ‘plurilingualism’ (Canagarajah, 2011b:2). Translanguaging is defined in many different ways in the literature and Garcia describes it comprehensively as

the act performed by bilinguals of accessing different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous languages, in order to maximize communicative potential. It is an approach to bilingualism that is centred, not on languages as has often been the case, but on practices of bilinguals that are readily observable in order to make sense of their multilingual words. Translanguaging therefore goes beyond what has been termed code-switching, although it includes it (2013:140).

There is another very different meaning for the term ‘translanguaging’, however. According to Baker (2003:81-85), translanguaging, as originally developed by Cen Williams in the context of Welsh-English bilingual education, has the specific goal of developing high levels of language and literacy competence in Welsh and English (as distinct varieties) by providing oral or written ‘input’ in one language (English or Welsh) and requiring learners to produce oral or written ‘outputs’ in the other (Welsh or English).

The new approach to translanguaging wants to differentiate itself in particular from grammatically-oriented approaches to CS. It can be argued that the translanguaging conception of ‘codes’ or ‘language’ is not altogether dissimilar to that advanced within conventional pragmatic or sociolinguistic approaches to CS, especially those discussed in subsection 2.4.2 ‘Conceptions of CS’.

Because the focus of translanguaging is “communicative repertoires and practices” (Hornberger and Link, 2012:267), the emphasis shifts away from

studying ‘speech communities’ to studying “communities of practice” (Garcia, Flores and Woodley, 2012:47). Practical consequences of the translanguaging perspective on classroom research have been attempts to develop and test pedagogies that seek not only to take advantage of students’ translanguaging practices, as is the case in conventional classroom CS research, but to enhance students’ translanguaging practices (e.g., Canagarajah, 2011a, 2011b; Creese and Blackledge, 2010; and Garcia and Li Wei, 2014).

Some proponents of translanguaging have pointed out potential problems with attempts to promote and develop translanguaging as a practice in the context of formal schooling. An example is Canagarajah (2011a; 2011b) who has wondered: Is translanguaging teachable? Does it have a developmental trajectory? Can one make an error in translanguaging, or is it a case of anything goes?

Whatever the merits of translanguaging practices may be, should not valuable classroom time be used to harness translanguaging or CS in order to support the learning of standard varieties that have prestige and fetch a high value in formal linguistic markets?

## 2.5 Conclusion

South Africa is a multi-layered, multilingual society emerging from a recent history of conflict. Language has been and continues to be a source of social conflict. Linguistic hierarchies established in the colonial and apartheid era persist in post-apartheid South Africa, with Afrikaans and English at the top of the hierarchy and African languages at the bottom. Even though the constitution and legislation require government to protect and promote multilingualism in all spheres of life, the current South African political economy and linguistic order favour English monolingual assimilation in high status domains and the use of the other languages, either on their own or with English, in low status domains.

Language in South Africa is implicated in a ‘strategy of elite closure’. English, and to a diminished degree Afrikaans, are the two most important languages for higher education and employment in formal labour markets, but only a small proportion of the population can use these languages proficiently as

first or second languages. Therefore the vast majority of the population cannot compete on an equal footing with this group for places in prestigious universities or for high paying jobs.

Classroom CS occurs in the context of socially differentiated and unequal access to standard varieties valued in the classroom - in our case, isiXhosa and English - and therefore research about classroom CS should focus both on the details of talk-in-interaction and on how social and institutional mechanisms mandate, monitor and punish/reward different forms of languaging. A focus of this study is how isiMpondo, isiXhosa, and English CS is used to manage conversation and how this is related to institutional and wider social factors.

This study seeks to apply and develop Auer's Conversation Analytic approach to classroom CS data. This approach holds that speakers and listeners use the same interpretive procedures to produce and make sense of switches. These involve distinguishing between whether a switch is 'transfer vs. a code-switch', and whether it is 'participant- vs. discourse-related'. The study will also consider alternative explanations of classroom CS data. It will consider the Gumperzian approach which makes the important and influential conceptual distinctions between situational vs. metaphorical CS, and 'we-code' vs. 'they-code', Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model and Rational Choice approach which proposes that speakers, through participation in social life, acquire a 'markedness metric or evaluator' which enables them to judge which code is likely to secure them maximum psychological and/or material rewards and minimise costs in interaction. It will also take into account post-structuralist approaches that argue for a greater focus on social practices rather than codes, the re-thinking of what constitutes a codes or a language, the multiple meanings of switches and the larger social and institutional dynamics which impinge on them.

## 3. Research Methodology

### 3.1 Introduction

This chapter sets out the methodological principles, procedures and methods used to investigate the study's thesis statement, i.e., whether or not a Conversational Analytic approach to code-switching (CS) is an adequate theoretical and methodological framework with which to explain isiMpondo, isiXhosa, and English classroom code-switching in South African rural classrooms.

The chapter begins with a sketch of the setting, then presents a brief review of the ethnomethodological basis and principles of Conversation Analysis (CA), describes key mechanisms for organizing talk-in-interaction in which CS is involved, and concludes with a detailed discussion of the research methods employed, including data collection, production, and analytic strategies.

### 3.2 The Site

The research site is made up of two rural schools which serve Reception Year (6 year olds) to Year 9 (15 year olds). This study focuses on Years 7 to 9 English-language and English-medium content classrooms. The average learner teacher ratio is 35 learners to one teacher. The schools, while under-resourced in South African terms, have basic classroom infrastructure such as desks and chairs and materials such as chalk, chalkboards and textbooks. Only a few children have access to their own copy of an English, Social Science or Technology learning area/subject textbook. In the recent past, the supply of textbooks was a widespread problem across schools. This is no longer a problem in urban schools, but persists in rural schools.

The schools are located in rural Mbizana in the Eastern Cape province, on the south-eastern seaboard of South Africa. The Eastern Cape is one of nine provinces of South Africa. A large number of people in the province live in poverty and have no formal employment, and this is particularly true in Mbizana (HIS Global Insight, 2014). In South Africa as a whole, 39% of the population live in poverty. In the Eastern Cape province, the poverty figure is 50% and in Mbizana 70%. The national unemployment rate is 25%. In the Eastern Cape, 32% are

unemployed and in Mbizana the figure is 42%. Approximately 73% of South Africans have completed primary education, while 66.4% of Eastern Cape residents and only 41.6% of people in Mbizana have achieved this basic level of schooling.

Historically, a large proportion of local income came from the remittances of migrant workers working in gold, diamond and coal mines and factories in and around large metropolitan centres such Johannesburg, Cape Town and Durban (Beinart, 1994:25-34). The decline of commodity prices since the late 1980s, increased mechanisation of mining and manufacturing, and trade liberalisation in post-apartheid South Africa, has resulted in increasing long-term, structural unemployment (Bundy, 2014:143-146). Today a significant proportion of income in many poor urban and rural communities comes from modest state welfare grants (Jacobs and Hart, 2014:163). However, the people of Mbizana are resilient, proud and resourceful subsistence farmers, crafters, weavers, traders and some are involved in an emerging local ecotourism industry.

The two focus schools for the study are about 20kms apart. School A is in a comparatively densely populated village of about 10 000 people. For about five years many homes in this area have been connected to electricity and some of them own a television and/or a radio set and potentially have radio access to content in standard isiXhosa and English. School B, on the other hand, is in a sparsely populated village of about 3000 people on the edge of the Indian Ocean. The village has no electricity and only a few homes have battery-powered radio sets.

In both schools, teachers are from the Eastern Cape, the majority from communities adjacent to Mbizana or in isiMpondo-dominant communities. A couple of teachers are from further away and speak varieties that are closer to standard isiXhosa. Other minority languages that occur in this region include isiZulu and Sesotho. IsiMpondo is by far the most dominant variety in the home, playground, church and at public gatherings. English only conversations are uncommon between local people, even among the educated. Talk among the

young and educated is characterised by the insertion of English nouns into isiMpondo speech.

Children speak the vernacular (isiMpondo) and learn the standard variety (isiXhosa) when they begin school. For many adults, the situation is a lot more complex. Because of an entrenched migrant labour system dating to the beginnings of diamond and goldmining in the second half of the eighteenth century (Beinart, 1994; Worden, 1994), many adults spend parts of their lives as migrant workers outside of the immediate community and in other provinces and therefore tend to be multilingual in other South African African languages.

IsiXhosa is the medium of instruction in the first four years of schooling. The curriculum in the Foundation Phase comprises of Mathematics and Life Skills taught in isiXhosa, English offered as an L2, and isiXhosa as a Home Language. From the fourth year of school, the official medium of instruction switches from isiXhosa to English, isiXhosa is offered only as a subject and all other subjects are officially offered in English. This is, then, a form of subtractive bilingualism in which an 'additional' language (Baker, 2011:72; Spolsky, 2010:106), English, demotes and replaces isiXhosa, the learners' home language, or more accurately, English replaces the language that is "most widely used in the immediate environment of the learner" (Obanya, 2004:5).

Learners' average test scores on an annual national (written) test of English administered to year 4, 6 and 8 learners are an indication of their English language competence. 2014 average test scores for the two schools are summarised in Table 2 below. As shown in the table, children's competence in English is weak, though note that average scores improve a little as children move up the grades. However, as shown in the table, children's English language skills do not develop rapidly enough to keep up with the increasing language and cognitive demands of an English-medium curriculum as they go up the grades. Children's English language competence, in particular, is the background against which patterns of language use documented in this study should be understood.

**Table 2: 2014 Annual National Assessment Test Scores for English**

School	Year 4	Year 6	Year 9
School A	11%	28%	32%
School B	8%	17%	29%

*A personal note*

The two schools are part of a larger school development programme with which I have been working on and off for the last ten years. During that period, I have visited the two schools several times in my capacity as a language and literacy adviser. The focus of my work being Foundation Phase classrooms (Reception Year to Year 3). Before carrying out this study, I had not worked with Senior Phase (Grade 7 to 9) teachers and learners in these schools. However, I knew the teachers and some of the learners, parents and other members of the community from doing work in the area over the years. For better or worse, my knowledge of the site and my ongoing work with participants has inevitably coloured my opinions. Every effort has been made to ensure that my ethnographic knowledge is accountable to other forms of data, such as audio recordings, detailed transcripts, and interviews.

I speak isiZulu and Sesotho as Home Languages. I also speak and understand isiXhosa and isiMpondo. At the grammatical, phonological and lexical level, isiMpondo is a on a continuum between isiXhosa and isiZulu. To the west of Mbizana are isiXhosa-speaking areas and to the north-east are isiZulu-speaking areas. Other languages which I can speak include Setswana, Afrikaans and Swedish. I understand and write both of the latter two languages with moderate proficiency.

As an educator, my main interest is to better understand the links between language and literacy, and, in particular, to find out how multilingualism can be harnessed to improve teaching and learning processes. Progress towards these goals requires, among other things, an examination of the sociolinguistic and pragmatic dimensions of classroom multilingualism, and that is what this study sets out to do.

### 3.3 Conversation analysis as Research Methodology

#### 3.3.1 Ethnomethodological basis of CA

Conversation analysis is both the research methodology and research design for this study. The kind of CA used in this study is one rooted in ethnomethodology. According to ten Have (2007:43) an ethnomethodology-based CA requires of the analyst three things. The analyst needs to notice that something is 'observably the case', to examine why the 'observable' is organised or produced the way it is, and finally, to describe the methods participants or members use to produce and recognise the observable.

Five ethnomethodological concepts are relevant to investigating classroom interaction, viz., indexicality, the documentary method of interpretation, reciprocity of perspectives, normative accountability, and reflexivity (Seedhouse, 2004:7-12). These concepts are used in language-focused and non-language focused research (Garfinkel, 1996). In this kind of CA, focus is trained on linguistic and prosodic aspects of utterances and the latter are taken to be part of 'social action' (ten Have, 2007:6), or to be 'verbal action' (Gardner-Chloros, 2009:70). Drawing on Seedhouse (2004:7-12), each one of the five ethnomethodological concepts is briefly discussed below.

*Indexicality* refers to the idea that members/interactants/participants do not make explicit every aspect of their social actions or utterances. Members use indexical expressions and actions to signal aspects of context that are relevant to the interpretation of their actions or utterances. The *documentary method of interpretation* refers to the idea that the manner in which social actions (or utterances) are produced is a 'document' or an 'example of past patterns'. That is, utterances are partly produced and interpreted according to received formats, existing schema, or past experience. *Reciprocity of perspectives* refers to the idea that a condition for successful communication is that interactants need to show that they are orienting to the same norms. That is, communication is based on interactants mutually creating, sustaining or changing inter-subjectivity in the course of interaction. Indexicals are possible and interpretable precisely because of reciprocity of perspectives. *Normative accountability* treats norms as part of

how utterances or social actions are produced rather than as external to or 'regulative' of them. That is, interactants do not so much follow norms but use them to constitute their own actions or utterances and by so doing they show affiliation or disaffiliation with norms at a certain point in interaction. Reciprocity of perspectives is possible because interactants, as social actors, "design their own social actions and interpret those of others" (Seedhouse, 2004:10) by reference to norms. Finally, *reflexivity* refers to the idea that interactants use the same methods to produce their actions or utterances and to interpret those of others.

That ethnomethodology is concerned with members' methods for producing social actions and interpreting those of others raises a central methodological question about how analysts can be certain that what they observe and describe is in fact what participants are orienting to. Mainstream CA (e.g., Auer, 1998, Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998) would say, somewhat unsatisfactorily, that analysts are required to show, on the basis of transcripts, how participants are orienting to whatever the analyst claims. This merely begs the question.

The issue is that since ethnomethodology-based CA investigates the "practical, social and interactional accomplishments of a culture" (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998:1), how does the analyst acquire the knowledge, dispositions and norms through which to produce and interpret social actions in ways that are appropriate to that 'culture'? This problem becomes quite obvious, such as when an analyst studies a relatively unfamiliar culture such as a school, or an interaction between scientists in laboratory when one is not a scientist. Garfinkel (1996:18) calls this the problem of achieving "uniquely adequate competence". In traditional ethnomethodology, such as represented by Garfinkel, the problem is addressed more convincingly. There the analyst acquires 'uniquely adequate competence' through a range of strategies, including intensive participant observation, breaching experiments, and careful study of artefacts that members produce in the course of interaction. As will be argued presently, in order to obtain a full understanding of what participants are doing with language in the classroom, in addition to analysing transcripts, some ethnographic knowledge of the setting is

required as well, and participants' own accounts of what is going on is often relevant to developing situated analyses. These strategies do not, of course, lead to a definitive account of events, but are important sources of information for understanding participants' interactional goals.

### 3.3.2 Principles of Conversation Analysis

Relevant CA principles are derived from ethnomethodology and have been adapted for application to talk-in-interaction. CA's methodological approach is summarised by the question-set, "Why that, in that way, right now" (Seedhouse, 2004:16), or specifically in relation to bi/multilingual talk in interaction, by the question-set, "why that, in that language, right now?" (Üstünel and Seedhouse, 2005:302).

According to Seedhouse (2004:14-16), CA is based on at least four principles. First, that "there is order at all points in talk-in-interaction", that is, "talk is systematically organized, deeply ordered, and methodic" (Seedhouse, 2004:14). This is not to claim that participants always act rationally, but that their actions are produced in a methodic way.

Second, contributions to interaction are context-shaped and context-renewing in that they cannot be fully understood outside of their sequential environment.

Third, "no detail can be dismissed as irrelevant *a priori*" (Ibid). In an effort to ensure that no detail is lost before analysis commences, CA has developed a set of elaborate transcription conventions to make possible the production of detailed transcripts.

Fourth, CA seeks to do bottom-up and data-driven analysis. In CA studies, analysts do not invoke common sociological constructs such as 'gender', 'race', class, or institutional roles such as 'teacher' or 'learner', unless it can be shown that participants orient to them in some way.

A major criticism of so-called 'radical exponents' (Hammersley, 2003:751) of CA can be summarised as being about the failure to appreciate that

'transcription is theory' (Ochs, 1979). CA purists rely almost exclusively on transcripts to produce accounts of what is going on in interaction. That is, there is an established tradition in CA (e.g., Schegloff, 2007) which regards analysis of transcripts as the only valid way in which to arrive at viable claims about what is going on from the point of view of participants. This contrasts with conventional ethnomethodological studies which employ a range of methods, as discussed above. Exclusive reliance on transcribed data is based on the assumption that transcripts can or actually do document all the features of talk-in-interaction necessary for participants to interpret each others' utterances as discursive actions. However, it is clearly not possible to transcribe everything that is conceivably relevant to the production and interpretation of discursive actions. While analysts seek to capture on transcripts as much detail as possible, transcription by its very nature is a "selective process reflecting theoretical goals and definitions" (Ochs, 1979:44). Also, basic practical considerations limit what can be presented on a page, in particular, available time, the degree of skill of a transcriber, and the constant need to ensure that transcripts are readable and therefore analysable.

While transcripts of classroom talk are a primary source of material for analysis in this study, wherever it is deemed necessary, appeal is also made to ethnographic knowledge, participant observation, and *post hoc* interviews conducted with some of the participants. It is for these reasons that the methodology used in this study is not pure CA but CA-based. A similar approach has been used by Greer (2007). An example of a more complete integration of ethnography and CA is Moerman (1988). The present study falls somewhere in between Greer and Moerman.

### 3.3.3 Four types of mechanisms for organizing talk

The principal aim of CA is to describe methods or procedures by which interactants produce and interpret each other's utterances or interactional moves. Interactants do this through four principal "mechanisms" (Levinson, 1983:297) or "interactional organization" (ten Have, 2007:128), viz., adjacency pair/sequence organization, preference organization, turn-taking organization and repair organization.

Drawing principally on ten Have (2007:128-136), Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998:39-69) and Levinson (1983:294-369), key features of each mechanism/organization are described below.

A turn is basic unit of analysis in CA. A turn is made up of at least one Turn Constructional Unit (TCU). A TCU can be a grammatical sentence, phrase, word, paralinguistic or non-linguistic item (Sacks, et al., 1978:12). According to Sacks, *et al* (1978:13), TCUs are produced in such a way as to indicate a rough projection of their completion (Sacks, et al., 1978:13). The point where a TCU is projected to end and therefore where change of speakership can occur is called a possible Transition Relevant Place (TRP). Speaker change can occur while a current speaker is producing his/her TCU, but the crucial point is that such 'overlapping' talk is interactionally meaningful and is heard, for instance, as competition for a turn, an expression of strong agreement or disagreement. Participants in ordinary conversation use a 'local management system' (Levinson, 1983:297) to manage turn-taking and this system requires them to project possible completion of their TCUs. In addition to grammatical resources, participants also use a range of prosodic cues (Couper-Kuhlen, 2009:178) to indicate possible TRPs such as falling pitch, fading, soft delivery, and so on.

#### 3.3.3.1 *Adjacency pair/sequence organization*

An adjacency pair is a sequence or exchange made up of at least two turns, produced by two distinct interactants or speakers. The first turn, called a first-pair part and the second, called a second-pair part, must be shown to accomplish the same action(s) for the interactants. An important feature of adjacency pairs is that they occur right next to each other. "Nextness" (Schegloff, 2007:15) or "sequential order" (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998:39) is vital to how speakers produce turns and listeners interpret them. This is because a first pair part "creates a context for its own next utterance" (ten Have, 2007:130), but this is not to say that a second pair-part necessarily follows immediately after a first-pair part; only that when it does not, this is noticeable and accountable/meaningful and heard as a withheld or delayed second-pair part.

### 3.3.3.2 *Preference organization*

Preference organization, also known, somewhat confusingly, as “turn design” in some traditions of CA (ten Have, 2007: 137), is built on the notion of an adjacency pair. As discussed, a characteristic feature of adjacency pairs is that first-pair and second-pair parts are interconnected such that questions are followed by answers, greetings by return greetings, or invitations by acceptances. As discussed in section 2.2.3, Auer (1995:125) has applied this mechanism of organization to bilingual talk, formulating a fundamental principle that bilingual interactants have preference for “same language talk”, or even for “same medium talk” (Gafaranga, 2007:138). According to Levinson (1983:333), ‘preferred’ categories, in our case ‘preferred languages’, tend to occur without delay and in ‘unmarked formats’ whereas ‘dispreferred categories’ tend to occur in ‘marked formats’, and are delayed or avoided.

In CA, ‘preference’ refers to ‘structural’ designs of turns rather than to ‘psychological motives’ (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998:43) of interactants. Preference refers to the observation that second-pair parts can be implemented in different ways. Thus a question can be followed by an answer, silence or another question. All three optional responses are sequentially appropriate second-pair parts to a question; however, they are not all equally valued. In other words, they are not “symmetrical alternatives” (Schegloff, 2007:59).

Some second pair parts implement, in relation to a first-pair part, “affiliative” actions and others “disaffiliative” ones (Seedhouse, 2004:24). Affiliative actions such as agreements, acceptances or answers are called “preferred”, and those that do disaffiliative actions such as disagreements, refusals or silences are called “dispreferred” (Schegloff, 2007:60). Turns that do dispreferred actions are often designed differently from those that do preferred ones. Turns that do dispreferred actions tend to be delayed, accompanied by prefaces and accounts before the actual item or turn which does a dispreferred action is produced. Preferred turns, on the other hand, tend to be done without delays and are short and structurally simple.

Seedhouse (2004:25) draws attention to a distinction between preferred and dispreferred turns which he attributes to Roland Boyle. Preferred turns are 'seen' but usually go 'unnoticed', according to this distinction. Dispreferred turns, on the other hand, divide into two categories, with a first set those that are 'seen' and marked but not sanctionable, and a second set that are 'seen', marked and sanctionable. In the first category is, for example, jokes made by learners within a teacher's hearing at the beginning of a classroom plenary. These are seen, can be marked, but are not necessarily sanctionable because they are heard as part of marking an end of the non-formal part of classroom interaction and the beginning of the formal part. Learner jokes made during classroom plenary, in contrast, are likely to be seen, marked and sanctionable.

Preference is ubiquitous to conversation, generating preference principles for every aspect of talk, including for the (Pomerantz and Heritage, 2013:210)

selection and interpretation of referring expressions, the production of and interpretation of both initiating and responding actions, repair, turn-taking, and the progression through a sequence of actions.

### 3.3.3.3 *Turn-taking organization*

In Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson's (1978) seminal paper on turn-taking, turn-taking is described as a "local management system" (Sacks, et al, 1978:7) for conducting talk-in-interaction. This means that speakership is not pre-allocated, but managed locally by participants, and neither what participants talk about nor is the size of their turns agreed in advance.

In an overwhelming number of cases, a rule that the floor is held by one speaker at a time holds. According to Seedhouse (2004:27), in most contexts, less than 5% of speech is done with overlaps. When an overlap occurs, it tends to be brief, and when an overlap is sustained over time, it is interactionally meaningful. That is, it can be read, for example, as doing competition for the floor (Levinson, 1983:301).

In ordinary conversation, speaker change occurs frequently and it often occurs at Transition Relevant Places (TRPs). A TRP is a point at which it becomes

relevant for speakership to change. Current speakers project the end of their turns or TRPs in various ways, leading to three possible outcomes (Sacks, et al, 1978:13). A current speaker may select a next speaker, in which case the current speaker stops talking, another participant may self-select as next speaker, or the current speaker may continue to speak. In contrast, institutional talk often operates according to pre-allocated turns overseen by one party. That is, turn-taking in institutional talk is controlled by the party who “represents formal organization” (Drew and Heritage, 1992:3), e.g., a teacher in a classroom or a doctor in a clinic.

#### 3.3.3.4 *Repair organization*

‘Repair’ refers to trouble in the course of talk-in-interaction and the actions participants take to resolve it (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977). A repair sequence is made up of three parts: a repairable (trouble source), repair-initiator (an act which marks presence of trouble), and repair (an act of fixing troubles). Repairables include errors, mishearings, inadequate or incomplete utterances, lack of hearing, word searches, inappropriate formulations and misarticulations. In classrooms, a significant set of repairables are those to do with inappropriate turn-taking (McHoul, 1990).

In talk-in-interaction, participants document to each other that they are engaged in doing repair work. Repair-initiation can be made by the speaker or the hearer. When it is speaker-initiated it is referred to as self-initiated and when it is hearer-initiated as other-initiated. Self-initiated repair can be made through hesitation markers, repetition or long pauses (Schegloff, et al, 1977). Strategies for other-initiated repair include explicit actions such as questions, calls for repetition or facial expressions, or can involve implicit strategies such as silence or avoidance.

When a repair is conducted by the person who produced the repairable this is referred to as ‘self-repair’ and when it is conducted by the hearer it is referred to as ‘other-repair’. Schegloff, et al’s (1977) claim is that there is preference for self-initiation and self-repair in ordinary conversation.

### 3.4 Specificities of Institutional Talk

There is overlap between ordinary conversation and talk in institutional settings, in this case the classroom, firstly because in both contexts people use the same basic “interactional resources” (Heritage, 2004:107), such as turn-taking or repair organization to produce and interpret utterances. The second reason for overlap is that an ordinary conversation can momentarily assume features of institutional talk, and the converse is also true. In a conversation between friends, a change in topic, for example, can signal a shift in context and roles, such as when one participant asks another, who is an accountant, for tax advice, thus suspending the ordinary conversation and replacing it with a new context where one participant is a ‘tax expert’ and the other a ‘recipient of tax advice’. In institutional settings too, institutional talk can be momentarily suspended, such as when a teacher shifts focus from lesson-related talk to chat about the results of a soccer match. Thus, it is perhaps more accurate to speak about ‘institutional talk’ rather than ‘talk in institutional settings’, because the former captures the idea that institutional talk is not in all cases tied to a physical location.

A shift from ordinary conversation to institutional talk or vice versa is characterised by changes in the system of turn-taking and sequence development. This is discussed next.

#### 3.4.1 Characteristics of institutional talk

Perhaps because ordinary conversation has to deal with a multitude of goals and actions, it is implemented through a large number of procedures and interpretive frames. According to Heritage (1997:224-225), institutional talk, on the other hand, can be adequately described in three ways. First, much institutional talk is tied to institutional goals, roles and identities. Second, much of what is said, can be said, or is considered relevant is constrained by the fact it occurs in an institution, including those cases where the institutionality of talk is only momentarily invoked in an otherwise non-institutional context. Third, the talk is produced and interpreted according to frames or schema specific to that institution or institution-type, that is, participants in classrooms use different frames from those used in law courts or doctors’ consulting rooms.

To investigate institutional talk entails establishing actions, practices, stances, ideologies and identities enacted in talk-in-interaction. Institutional talk can differ from ordinary conversation on several dimensions, viz., turn-taking, overall structure, sequential organization, turn design and lexical choice (Heritage, 2004:115-137; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998:145-171). This study examines how language preference is expressed in classrooms (chapter 5) and how CS is involved in classroom turn-taking (chapter 6) and repair (chapter 7).

In institutional talk, turn-taking is not locally managed by parties to the interaction. One party has control or greater influence on who speaks, when, on what topic, and for how long. This shapes both the content and form in which turns are constructed and interpreted.

Ordinary conversation has a fluid structure which varies according to the kinds of actions accomplished in the course of interaction. The overall structure of institutional talk, on the contrary, is a lot more patterned. It is well documented that classroom talk, as a case of institutional talk, is largely organised and implemented through the Initiation-Response-Evaluation/Feedback (IREF/F) pattern or structure (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975:50).

There is little room to alter roles and identities in the course of institutional interaction. In the case of classrooms, for example, in the plenary/whole-class format of a classroom, teachers generally stick to their pedagogical roles as guides, facilitators and initiators, and learners to theirs as information/knowledge seekers and respondents.

The manner in which participants design their turns is an important vantage point from which to observe, not only how they enact their turns, but also how they comment on their roles and identities, as well as power and knowledge asymmetries in interaction.

Finally, institutional talk uses a large number of domain-specific words, terms of address, and phrases. This is one of the ways in which participants enact

and interpret actions, practices, roles and identities and index their stance towards talk-in-interaction.

### 3.4.2 On quantification of institutional talk

Heritage (2004:137) maintains that even though quantification is a controversial subject among conversation analysts, quantification is essential in some types of institutional research. To illustrate this, he cites two research studies in which quantification had a vital role. The first is an investigation of journalists' questioning techniques of presidents of the United States over nearly five decades. The second is a longitudinal study of visits to paediatricians, in particular how paediatricians construed parents' accounts of their children's symptoms as veiled requests for antibiotics, when in fact *post hoc* interviews showed that parents did not in fact want antibiotics.

Heritage convincingly shows that it is difficult to show patterns in such large-scale or longitudinal studies with a large corpus, without some quantification. Patterns include the location of specific actions and conversational structures used to implement them. Besides, one of the motivations for doing research about interactional practices in institutions, such as classrooms, is to learn enough about behaviours of participants so as to formulate courses of intervention. To do that involves, among other things, showing where correlation exists between certain kinds of practices and interactional outcomes. As Heritage puts it:

If particular features of institutional talk are to be connected to characteristics of the participants such as attitudes, beliefs and perhaps most important, the outcomes of the talk, forms of measurement must be developed that permit the relevant connection to be made (2004:138).

Although Heritage (2004) does not explicitly state the following issues, the claim here is that many of them are implied in his description of the two illustrative studies referred to above. First, categories used to code data in both studies are derived from in-depth qualitative analysis, that is, qualitative precedes quantitative analysis. A phenomenon is first and foremost analysed in its

sequential circumstances and then it is examined in relation to the larger institutional and social context in which it is a part. Quantification therefore is not an independent method of analysis but subordinate to qualitative analysis. This is similar to the way in which Rampton (2006:100) uses survey data in his linguistic ethnography.

Second, quantification requires tolerance for a certain amount of reductionism in order to grasp patterns in observed phenomenon. That is, the process of creating categories requires, among other things, abstracting, recognising or ignoring some similarities or differences according to qualitatively defined criteria.

Third, while qualitative analysis has many advantages over quantitative analysis, a distinct strength of quantitative analysis is that it forces analysts to be more accountable and precise and reduces reliance on informal quantification used in qualitative research, such as in words or phrases like 'most' or 'few', or 'a large number' or 'uncommon' when reporting data and making claims based on it.

The procedures outlined above were followed in identifying the patterns of CS described in chapters 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. Without basic quantification of this kind, it would have been difficult to discern patterns in a large and detailed corpus comprising of twelve lessons.

### **3.5 Data Collection and Analysis**

#### **3.5.1 Data collection and production**

This study seeks to investigate the viability of the CA approach as an explanatory framework for classroom CS in South African classrooms, in particular, the conversational resources - with CS at the centre - by which classroom interaction is accomplished. In that sense it is in the tradition of classroom studies such as Bonacina and Gafaranga (2011) and Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005). Insofar as showing links between local interactional processes and institutional and wider social processes is concerned, the study is in the 'critical' tradition, as described by, for example, Martin-Jones (2015).

Data was collected through audio and sometimes audio-visual recordings of lessons, participant observation and post hoc interviews with teachers. The main data source is lesson recordings. A total of 32 lessons were observed and recorded across two schools and interviews were conducted with four teachers. Following is a description of how data was collected, prepared and produced.

#### *3.5.1.1 Audio recordings and transcription*

Consistent with a CA sensibility, recordings are the primary data source for this study. I was present when all lesson recordings were made. The goal of making recordings is to capture teacher and learner talk during whole class interaction and to this end a set of interlinked microphones were set up right around the classrooms.

Recordings took place in Senior Phase classrooms (i.e. grade 7, 8 and 9) because it was thought that learners and teachers at this grade level would have developed settled ways of coping with the challenge of teaching and learning through the medium of English, as school policy dictates this medium from year 4 onwards.

From the total of 32 lessons, a subset of 12 lessons were selected for detailed transcription according to CA conventions. See Appendix A for transcription conventions used in this study. Selection criteria were that a lesson recording, or much of it, should be audible; that two audible lessons by the same teacher could be found in the corpus; and that lesson recordings of the same subject/learning area could be found in both schools, in order to make possible a comparative analysis of language use between teachers, according to subjects/learning areas and, if relevant, between schools.

According to Seedhouse (2004:87), doctoral dissertations and monographs about classroom interaction are based on a corpus of between 5 to 10 lessons, and therefore a corpus of 12 lessons is more than adequate. The 12 selected lessons are taught by a group of five teachers. One of the teachers taught two of the subjects selected for inclusion in the corpus. See Table 3 below for a summary description of the lessons.

**Table 3: Summary of Lesson Audio Recordings**

Teacher	Gender	Language Dominance	School	Lesson No.	Subject/Learning Area	Grade	Duration in Minutes
<b>Sindi</b>	Female	isiMpondo	A	1	English	7	55
<b>Sindi</b>	Female	isiMpondo	A	2	English	8	50
<b>Anele</b>	Female	isiXhosa	B	3	English	8	45
<b>Anele</b>	Female	isiXhosa	B	4	English	9	45
<b>Thami</b>	Male	isiXhosa	A	5	Social Science	8	45
<b>Thami</b>	Male	isiXhosa	A	6	Social Science	9	45
<b>Bamba</b>	Male	isiXhosa	B	7	Social Science	7	45
<b>Bamba</b>	Male	isiXhosa	B	8	Social Science	8	45
<b>Sindi</b>	Female	isiMpondo	A	9	Technology	7	45
<b>Sindi</b>	Female	isiMpondo	A	10	Technology	8	45
<b>Nande</b>	Female	isiMpondo	B	11	Technology	7	45
<b>Nande</b>	Female	isiMpondo	B	12	Technology	8	45

The group consists of 5 teachers, three females and two males. The range of teachers' ages fell between 40 and 48 years old. All are qualified, fulltime teachers who have taught in South African government schools for periods ranging from between 12 and 18 years.

Two lessons taught by each teacher except Sindi were selected for inclusion in the corpus. In Sindi's case, a total of four lessons were included because she taught both English and Technology. Just over 9 hours of lesson recordings were transcribed, which amounted to about 450 pages of transcribed lessons. Following CA practice, lessons were transcribed in full rather than selecting only sections with code-switched materials. This is because what comes before and after switches is important to a CA or CA-based analysis, and this turned out to be crucial to the description and interpretation of patterns of classroom language use, as is shown in data analysis chapters.

The transcripts were produced through a process of "extensive listening" (Rampton, 2006:32) which involved several cycles of listening, transcribing, and re-transcribing. For convenience, transcription is discussed here in a section about data collection, but in the CA tradition, recordings are regarded as the data and transcripts as the beginnings of the process of analysis (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998:73).

In addition to following CA conventions, transcripts were prepared according to conventions of the Language Interaction Data Exchange System (Gardner-Chloros, Sebba, and Moyer, 2007) conventions. This will enable sharing of the corpus with other researchers on Talkbank

#### 3.5.1.2 *Participant Observation*

Participant observation seeks to represent participants' actions or utterances from an emic point of view and therefore is consistent with an ethnomethodology-based CA approach. Seedhouse (2004:92) acknowledges the usefulness of ethnographic knowledge to a CA analysis but recommends that analysts distinguish between claims based on transcripts from those based on participant observation.

The purpose of participant observation is to learn about "explicit and tacit aspects of a culture" (Dewalt, Dewalt, and Wayland, 1998:260), in this case, about goals and norms that inform participants' language selection. Teachers and learners were informed that I was interested in language use in the classroom but not specifically about a particular focus on CS. This is because I wanted teachers and learners, as far as possible, to go about their business in the normal way. Observing the same teachers and learners repeatedly was one way in which to mitigate against the effect of being observed on participants' behaviour, and helping teachers and learners to relax. Also, I was often asked to make contributions on various aspects of English and Social Science topics and in this way my participation was partially normalized. About 50 pages of field notes were produced, based on classroom observation. Field notes were drawn on to produce transcripts, particularly when working through hard-to-hear parts of audio recordings.

A colleague of mine was also present during some of the recordings. She is an isiMpondo speaker, lives and works in the area and helped clarify some uses and meanings of the local variety. She is also cited in one or two excerpts as Visitor 1.

### 3.5.1.3 Interviews

*Post hoc* interviews make it possible to document and analyse the relationship between observed practices, as documented in transcripts and field notes, and teachers' own accounts of practices. Interviews were used to examine the extent to which participants' accounts converge or diverge from observed language behaviour, in a similar way to that followed by Seedhouse (1998:99).

All of the five teachers were available to be interviewed, except Bamba, who had transferred to another school by the time of the interviews. Again note that Sindi counts as two people (see Table 3 above). A semi-structured interview was used, focusing on the challenges of and strategies for coping with teaching through English in an English-limited environment. See Appendix B for an Interview Guide.

Interviews were conducted one-on-one and took between 20 to 25 minutes. Because the interviews were conducted immediately after recordings were completed, that is, before transcripts were produced, a focused discussion about each teacher's pattern of CS was not possible.

### 3.5.2 Analytic Strategies

Analysis followed a two-step approach. First, actions/utterances were described in terms of CA's sequential approach. Second, ethnographic knowledge was invoked, in particular, knowledge of participants, classrooms and schools and the broader educational and social context in which classroom interaction was embedded. Seedhouse (2004:89) accepts that, in classroom research, CA and ethnography can be used in a complementary way, but insists that ethnographic analysis must follow on sequential analysis. That is, it before invoking social categories of participants such as 'teacher' or 'learner', must be shown that participants employ these categories in interaction (Li Wei, 2002:162), or that they orient to institutional, cultural or socio-political aspects of talk (Li Wei, 1998:163). Methodologically this means privileging findings from the analysis of transcripts over those based on observational and interview data, or one's own professional knowledge.

The question set, “why that, in that language, right now?” (Üstünel and Seedhouse, 2005:302) was used as a heuristic to guide analysis. Analysis began with the production of transcripts. It was decided early on to mark utterances for prosodic cues but not for accent, in particular in relation to English, unless accent was used in a locally meaningful way. This because CS rather than varieties of English is the focus of this study.

Analytic strategies described below are loosely based on ten Have (2007:122-124) and Seedhouse (2004:40-42). Analysis was done in the following way. First, one lesson was examined in detail, focusing on how it was accomplished, paying special attention to turn-taking, sequence development, repair, and how a set of sequences were related by topic (hereafter referred to as episodes), and also how lesson beginnings, endings and transitions were accomplished. At this stage of analysis no special attention was paid to the function of CS.

Second, analysis turned to how CS or language alternation was involved in the management of interaction. Special attention was given to the contexts which CS brought about and what it accomplished. The functions of CS were examined in relation to notions such as ‘classroom modes’ (Walsh, 2006), ‘pedagogical context’ (Seedhouse, 2004) or ‘pedagogical functions’ (Ferguson, 2009, 2003; Lin, 2013).

Third, initial patterns of language use to accomplish episodes were identified and ‘collections’ (Hatchby and Wooffitt, 1998:94; Schegloff, 2009:376) of similar patterns were created. Each episode in a collection was analysed in its sequential context in order to describe its characteristic features. As more and more episodes were described, categories and descriptions of categories were constantly revised.

Fourth, towards the end of completing analysis of the first lesson through the procedures described above, it became clear that sorting and some basic quantification was required to help organize what was fast becoming an unwieldy corpus. Sorting and quantification was very useful in identifying or suggesting patterns which were then closely examined through qualitative analysis. The

process was iterative, with cycles of initial qualitative analysis, sorting or categorising, qualitative analysis, re-sorting, and so on.

Fifth, the rest of the lessons were then analysed according to the procedures described above, and that too entailed revision of categories, descriptions and claims.

Sixth, although analysis was conducted with reference to the sequential interpretive procedures that Auer (1984) claims participants use to interpret language alternation, switches were explained, where necessary, in the context of the totality of the lesson and classroom patterns of language use.

Finally, analysis also drew on participant observation notes and ethnographic knowledge of the setting. This follows the example of other studies of classroom multilingualism such as those in an edited volume by Heller and Martin-Jones (2001), which regard micro classroom interaction and processes as a “window” to and constitutive of wider “education based processes of social and cultural production and reproduction” (Martin-Jones, 2015:446).

### **3.6 Validity and Generalizability**

Validity is about the extent to which the ‘observable’ is in fact what it appears to be and not something else (Dane, 1990:148), that is, the extent to which the bi/multilingual practices documented in the study actually correspond to reality. This is addressed in the following ways. First, this study is based on naturally occurring data, that is, it documents how participants behave in a real world situation. Second, the behaviour of participants is recorded and transcribed in detail. Third, the researcher knows the site well and data was collected over eight months, thus reducing chances that classroom interaction is somehow ‘staged’. Fourth, in order to mitigate against a charge of ‘cherry-picking’, excerpts are cited extensively from across lessons. Lessons from which excerpts are taken are named to keep track of the extent to which the researcher draws on all parts of the entire corpus. Fifth, excerpts are described and discussed in detail. This enables readers to examine the empirical grounds upon which conclusions are based, or whether or not claims are warrantable. Finally, the study uses the principle of triangulation

both for data collection and analysis, that is, data is collected from multiple sources and analysed through multiple techniques.

In terms of generalizability of findings, CA or CA-based studies, like other qualitative studies, do not proceed on the basis of a representative sample and therefore do not produce statistically generalizable results. CA studies proceed on the basis of 'specimens' (ten Have, 2007:35). That is, recordings and transcripts of natural talk are regarded as specimens of or part of reality. Thus, "a specimen may be badly representative of the whole, or it may be technically bad, but it cannot lie" (Pertti Alasuutari, 1995 quoted in ten Have, 2007:35). The point of CA is to discover interactional resources participants use to organize and produce specimens of talk in interaction.

### **3.7 Limitations**

The main limitation of this study is that precisely because it is focused on language use in the whole-class or plenary format of classroom interaction, teacher language use becomes the most documented and therefore the most dominant perspective from which to comment on language use. This is because the kind of recording equipment used in this study in the whole-class format captures most clearly teacher-class talk but little of learner-learner or learner-teacher 'off-stage' talk. This can give the impression that teacher talk is always the most influential talk in classroom interaction.

Nevertheless, the present study is worthwhile because it seeks to contribute to an understanding of language use in communities, languages and language combinations that are little studied, including in relation to how they use language in a whole-class format (Rampton, 2006:32).

### **3.8 Ethical considerations**

Informed consent of caregivers, teachers and learners was sought and secured. See Appendix C and D for the English and isiXhosa versions of an information sheet about the study given to participants and Appendices E, F and G for consent forms signed by caregivers, teachers and learners, respectively. The study was also ethically cleared by the Birkbeck School of Social Science, History and Philosophy.

See Appendix H for a copy of an ethics clearance letter. Finally, care has been taken to anonymise schools and participants. Learners have been anonymised and all names of teachers are pseudonyms.

## 4. 'Codes' in Code-switching

### 4.1 Introduction

The focus of this chapter is on the 'codes' in the code-switching (CS) used by the teachers and learners of this study in classroom interaction. It begins with a brief overview of the procedures used to generate the corpus, describing in particular how codes or varieties were identified and analysed. A detailed discussion of analytic procedures is conducted in chapter 3, section 3.4.2. The overview in this chapter includes a quantitative summary of the incidence of various codes in the corpus, describes and discusses nine 'communicative codes' that were found, and concludes with a summary of the findings and their implications for a CA approach to conceptualising varieties in CS.

### 4.2 Overview of Corpus

As far as possible, codes of CS are conceived from the participants' point of view rather than from that of an analyst (Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998; Auer, 1984). Coding was also informed by insights gained during participant observation. Great care was taken to document not only linguistic codes but also non-linguistic ones, to ensure that classroom "communicative repertoires" (Rymes, 2014:301) were fully represented.

In line with CA methodology, the smallest unit of analysis and therefore for coding utterances, is the Turn Construction Unit (TCU) (Sacks, et al, 1978:13). Although non-linguistic items such as laughter, silence or gesture have been coded the main focus of this study is linguistic TCUs, which can be a grammatical sentence, lexical, phrasal or clausal unit. (For examples from the corpus, see below.) Refer to Appendix A for transcription conventions. Examples of TCUs from the corpus are:

Lexical unit: **lyha**/yes (Lesson 2)

Phrasal unit: 'Of a person.' (Lesson 1)

Clausal unit: 'That is **uku(u)ngava:ni** between the America and Britain/  
that is conflict between America and Britain' (Lesson 5)

The following procedure was used to identify codes of CS.

First, lesson transcripts were examined to identify sequences and actions implemented in them.

Second, varieties in which the actions were accomplished were noted. This study began with a working assumption that classroom interaction is conducted in three linguistic codes, viz., isiMpondo, isiXhosa and English. As shown in Table 4.1 and discussed in section 4.2 below, this working assumption has been revised in the light of data. A major goal of this study is to discover whether, where, and how linguistic codes are used in contrastive ways to generate local meanings (Auer, 1995; 1984).

Third and finally, the incidence of each variety was coded and counted. A summary is presented in Table 4.

The corpus below is quantified at the level of a TCU and is presented at the level of school. Quantification can give rise to at least three incorrect impressions about a corpus. It can suggest that there is no variation in the frequency with which individual teachers use classroom varieties, that there is no variation in how teachers use classroom varieties, and that given a relatively low count of mixed TCUs, CS plays a small role in the corpus. There is in fact considerable variation in the frequency with which and the purposes for which teachers use classroom varieties. A detailed comparative description and analysis is presented in chapter 8. In chapters 5 to 8 it is shown that, above the level of the TCU, CS is the most common way in which classroom interaction is accomplished. With all the variation, however, clear trends are identified across classrooms and Table 4 presents but one example.

**Table 4: Turn Construction Unit by Language/Code**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
School	Participant	English	Xh/Mp	Mpondo	Multi-lingual	Formulaic	Non-Linguistic	Silence	Lack of hearing	Neutral	Total
A	Learner	453	68	1	40	86	194	9	55	6	912
		49,7%	7,5%	0,1%	4,4%	9,4%	21,3%	1,0%	6,0%	0,7%	100,0%
	Teacher	829	857	3	385	14	24	0	3	77	2192
		37,8%	39,1%	0,1%	17,6%	0,6%	1,1%	0,0%	0,1%	3,5%	100,0%
B	Learner	728	393	6	148	112	128	8	72	8	1603
		45,4%	24,5%	0,4%	9,2%	7,0%	8,0%	0,5%	4,5%	0,5%	100,0%
	Teacher	781	1306	1	825	40	16	0	2	95	3066
		25,5%	42,6%	0,0%	26,9%	1,3%	0,5%	0,0%	0,1%	3,1%	100,0%

Nine classroom ‘communicative codes’ were identified. The term ‘communicative codes’ refers both to linguistic codes/varieties (columns 3-7) and non-linguistic codes (columns 8-11). Although the focus of this study is linguistic codes, non-linguistic codes provide important clues about how participants orient to the immediately preceding or following language choices in interaction.

In both schools, the ratio of learner to teacher TCUs is roughly about 1 to 2, in favour of teachers. This is an accurate summary of the fact that classroom interaction in both schools is characterised by ‘student taciturnity’ and ‘teacher volubility’ (Hornberger and Chick, 2001). As will be shown in chapters 5 to 8, language use is an important factor in the production and reproduction of this phenomenon.

Learners produce many more TCUs in English, the medium of instruction, than do teachers. In school A, 49,7% (column 3) of learner TCUs are produced in English and in school B 45,4% (column 3). In contrast, 37,8% (column 3) of teacher TCUs in school A and 25,5% (column 3) in school B are in English. Teachers produce their turns in a range of varieties in addition to English. That teachers allow themselves flexibility of language use but restrict learner language choice is documented in other L2-medium postcolonial classrooms, for example, in Botswana and Brunei (Arthur, 1996) and Burundi (Ndayipfukamiye, 1996).

isiXhosa-isiMpondo is used largely by teachers, with 39,1% (column 4) of teacher TCUs in School A and 42,6% (column 4) in school B produced in isiXhosa-

isiMpondo. Teachers explain use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo in terms of its utility in supporting student learning (e.g., Voster, 2008), and, as documented in other contexts as well, switches to a familiar language are also used for classroom management and to make different roles and identities salient (e.g.; Lin, 2013).

Hardly any participant across the two schools uses isiMpondo as a distinct variety. It accounts for less than one per cent of TCUs. This issue is discussed in detail in section 4.2 below.

In summary, participants produce the majority of their TCUs monolingually in English (column 3) and isiXhosa-isiMpondo (column 4). Thus 57,2% of learner TCUs in school A and 69,9% in school B are produced monolingually in English and isiXhosa-isiMpondo (column 3 and 4), while, 76,9 % of teacher TCUs in school A and 68% in school B are produced in isiXhosa-isiMpondo (column 3 and 4). Teachers produce a large number of intra-sentential switches or multilingual TCUs (column 6), and learners considerably fewer. This is fundamental to understanding the norms of language use in these classrooms as will be shown in chapter 5.

### 4.3 The 'Codes' of Code-switching

#### 4.3.1 English

The English used in the corpus falls into two broad categories. In the first category is a form used by teachers. This form can be complex and multi-clausal and can be described as ordinary English, used by many educated Black South Africans. For an example see Excerpt 1 below.

#### ***Excerpt 1: 'Ordinary' English (Lesson 8)***

- 4            \*Bamba: Last week we spoke about natural disasters. (1.0) MH:: and I gave you  
5            examples of natural disa:ster:s. Eh::m what was an example of Δa natural  
6            disa:ster:? Only oneΔ.

The other form is 'classroom English' used by teachers and learners in predominantly teacher-led Initiation-Response-Evaluation/Feedback (IRE/F) exchanges or episodes. The form occurs most frequently in episodes in which teachers elicit responses to questions which they expect learners know answers to

from previous episodes or lessons, or to which learners can arrive through application of a rule or procedure. Structurally, this form is characterised by simple clauses, use of simple and familiar words, and recycling of vocabulary from an ongoing lesson. Learners recycle words or structures from previous lessons or episodes to produce typically short, single-clause responses, often single words, as shown in Excerpt 2. Chick (1996:24) has described this form of language use as ‘safetalk’. He claims that teachers and learners ‘collude’ to hide the fact that little or no learning takes place through the medium of an unfamiliar L2-medium.

***Excerpt 2: ‘Safetalk’ English (Lesson 2)***

- 444 \*Sindi: O:kay change ba:d to superlative degree.
- 445 \*LNS: ((Hands go up and fingers clicking as part of bidding for the turn)).
- 446 \*Sindi: Ye:s L17.
- 447 \*L17: Worst.
- 448 \*Sindi: Ye:s .di:d- 'that is the wor::st advertisement I have ever seen'.

**4.3.2 IsiXhosa and isiMpondo**

A starting point of this study was that classroom CS involves three varieties, viz., English (the target language as well as the official medium of instruction), isiMpondo (a regional variety of isiXhosa; the vernacular) and isiXhosa (the standard variety), and it sought to investigate whether and how the varieties were used in sequentially contrastive ways. As shown in Table 4, however, only a few cases were found where participants could be shown to be distinguishing between isiXhosa and isiMpondo in interaction. In classroom interaction participants treated virtually all their ‘African language’ talk as isiXhosa talk. From an analyst’s or etic point of view many of the utterances may be considered isiMpondo, or at least not standard isiXhosa. But from the participants’ or emic point of view, the utterances are not marked either as isiXhosa or isiMpondo and hence they are referred to as isiXhosa-isiMpondo. This constitutes a major finding of this study. It confirms a tenet of a CA approach to bi-/multilingual talk, that is, participants’ and analysts’ ideas do not always coincide about what a ‘language’ is and where to

draw boundaries between languages, and, therefore, what constitutes a 'switch' (Auer, 1998:13).

This is not to say, however, that a distinction between isiXhosa and isiMpondo no longer exists in school or in the community. On the contrary, isiMpondo is seeing some revitalisation at some level, as evidenced, for example, by the launch in 2009 of a community radio station, *Inkonjane* (The Swallow), which for the first time broadcasts in a distinctive isiMpondo variety. What appears to be happening is the lowering of boundaries (Bailey, 2007) between isiXhosa and isiMpondo in the classroom. Several factors, taken together, help explain this lowering of boundaries between isiXhosa and isiMpondo in the classroom.

A classroom level factor is that because the interactions recorded in this study occur in English-language and English L2-medium content classrooms participants orient much less to a distinction between isiXhosa and isiMpondo, and more to that between isiXhosa and isiMpondo on the one hand, and English on the other hand. Participants generally regard themselves as speaking 'isiXhosa' rather than 'isiMpondo' and hence the hyphenated 'isiXhosa-isiMpondo' variety. It is this latter variety that is commonly used by teachers and learners. My own participant observation suggests that in the isiXhosa-language classroom, in contrast, participants orient much more to a distinction between isiXhosa and isiMpondo. However, even in that context, it is uncommon for such a distinction to be made in oral communication, but more likely in connection to writing.

A second factor is related to the first and is about the high social status of English and its hegemony over South African education (Alexander, 2000). In general, in post-apartheid South Africa, people regard the relative statuses of African languages either as irrelevant or trivial and are more likely to be concerned about the relative status of English contrasted with African languages. Preoccupation with English is pervasive even when, in reality, people use very little English, as shown for instance in Table 4. English is a language of upward social mobility, as partly reflected in language shift to English shown in Table 1.

A third factor is that as learners move up the grades and as they are increasingly exposed to mass media, they acquire standard isiXhosa. Over time, learners learn to use a variety of isiXhosa that is closer to the standard in whole-class interaction, i.e., during “centre-stage language use”, while distinctive isiMpondo may be used to do side-bars (as shown in Excerpt 4 below), and to conduct interaction outside the classroom, i.e., during “backstage language use” (Arthur, 1996:25-27).

A fourth and final factor that explains the lowering of boundaries is the end of apartheid and the dawn of democracy in South Africa in 1994. In the colonial and apartheid era, a culture of “eradicationism” (Nomlomo, 1993:105) prevailed in which speakers of non-standard varieties of isiXhosa, isiMpondo speakers for instance, were made to feel insecure about their varieties in school and, as a consequence, endeavoured to replace their varieties with a more prestigious isiXhosa. In post-apartheid South Africa, a standard variety of isiXhosa is less identified with a particular geographic region or a sub-group, such as AmaGcaleka. This is partly because of increased migration after apartheid and also because of the partial, but fragile, successes of African nationalism in loosening connections between ethnicity, regional origin and language, in favour of more inclusive, non-territorially and non-linguistically based identities such as class, ‘racial’ and religious identities (Alexander, 2006).

When isiMpondo is used in a distinctive way, it is often used to mark a shift in conversational footing (Gardner-Chloros, 2009:67) as in Excerpt 3 below. In this episode learners select a noun from a list on a chalkboard in order to make a sentence.

**Excerpt 3: IsiMpondo to mark a shift in conversational footing (Lesson 1)**

- 174 \*Sindi: Ye:s (1.0) L18.
- 175 \*L16: ΔI go to XholobeniΔ.
- 176 \*Sindi: ↑**HHE**:?
- 177 %trn: HUH? (Excuse me?)
- 178 \*L16: ΔI go to XholobeniΔ.
- 179 \*Sindi: ((Chuckle)) *Wanditshetshisa kangaka* (TCU1)? I: go: ↑to:..Xho:lo:be:ni
- 180 (TCU2) ((writing on the chalkboard)).
- 181 %trn: ((Chuckle)) why are you in such a hurry? I: go: ↑to: Xho:lo:be:ni ((writing)).

((English = regular typeface; isiXhosa-isiMpondo = bold; isiMpondo = italics; Classroom Formulaic = underlined))

The Excerpt begins with Sindi selecting L16 (174) as a next speaker. L16 produces her answer in a rapid delivery (175), resulting in a repairable (176). Sindi initiates repair with a non-specific isiXhosa-isiMpondo classroom formulaic '**HHE**:/HUH?' (176), which is heard correctly as a call for L16 to repeat her answer. Repair-initiation is produced in a loud voice to indicate that the problem with L16's turn is both soft and fast delivery. L16 repeats her answer (178,) but delivery is still as rapid as the first time around. Non-specific repair initiators such as '**hhe**?' are often used when it is obvious from the context what a repairable or trouble source is. Sindi indicates her annoyance at L16's repeated rapid delivery with a dry chuckle, followed by explicit verbalisation of her feelings in isiMpondo, removing all doubt about the meaning of her chuckle (179).

Although Sindi complains about the rapid delivery of L16's second turn (178), she clearly heard it because she is able to repeat it and copy it on the chalkboard (179) without having asked L16 for another repetition. Thus Sindi's complaint is about L16's rapid delivery rather than that she could not be heard. IsiXhosa-isiMpondo and English in this case are used to do core pedagogical work, including allocating turns, asking and answering questions, and initiating and doing

repair (174-178). isiMpondo is used to do something distinctive, that is, to do complaining/ reprimanding (TCU1, 179). Once the reprimanding action is completed, Sindi switches back to English to continue core pedagogical work (TCU2, 179). In this case isiMpondo is used in a distinctive way, in particular, in a 'discourse-related' way (Auer, 1984:12).

Classroom observation suggests that a distinctive isiMpondo variety is widespread in backstage talk. Excerpt 4 below illustrates a rare occasion on which learner backstage talk is caught on tape. The Excerpt documents an argument between L38 and L39. The argument is partly done in a formal, 'stylized' (Rampton, 2006:225) form of isiMpondo that is not part of the regular language behaviour of participants.

**Excerpt 4: Arguing in stylised isiMpondo (Lesson 2)**

- 827 \*L38: *Uyasiteketela*.
- 828 %gls: He is babbles like a baby.
- 829 %trn: He is talking rubbish.
- 830 \*L39:  $\Delta$ *Udle amagamakho* $\Delta$ .
- 831 %gls:  $\Delta$  You swallow your words $\Delta$ .
- 832 %trn: Shut up.
- 833 \*L38: *Uyasiteketela*.
- 834 %gls: He is babbles like a baby.
- 835 %trn: He is talking rubbish.

%trn = translation; %gls: = gloss and literal translation

L38s '*Uyasiteketela*' (827, 833) is idiomatic isiMpondo associated with the speech style of old people and of days gone by. His insult is partly effective because it is made in isiMpondo, the in-group language, leaving no doubt about its meaning. Doing it in a style associated with the speech of older people is intended to cloak it in an air of authority that comes with age. Its content specifically implies that L39 is a child and therefore can make no sense, and, in contrast, L38 presents himself,

through his speech, as an older, wiser person. The turn is designed to be overheard by other learners seated in and around L38 and L39. Finally, in the turn L39 is talked about in third person as if he wasn't there, that is, L38 is so disdainful of L39 that he could not be bothered to address him directly.

In response, L39 tries to match L38's insult. He produces his own equally idiomatic isiMpondo expression (830), also stylised according to the speech style of older people. That is, he also lays claim to the authority and wisdom of age. He ups the ante by addressing L39 in the first person, producing his turn in rapid delivery to underline his fury (833). L38 (833) is unmoved, however, maintaining a disdainful stance toward L39. He does this by repeating his insult in the exact same words, as if L38 had not said a word, and producing his second turn in an even, deliberate and emotionless voice. In this turn too he does not address L39 in the first person nor acknowledge his turn (830).

#### 4.3.3 Multilingual variety

A multilingual classroom variety is characterized by simultaneous use of two or more varieties in the same TCU. This variety can be used to accomplish momentary discourse- or participant-related functions in interaction, or it can be a distinct 'medium' (Gafaranga, 2005) in its own right or what Myers-Scotton (1993b) refers to as 'CS as an unmarked choice'. Mixed TCUs come in three forms: English insertions in isiXhosa-isiMpondo-dominant TCUs, isiXhosa-isiMpondo insertions in English-dominant TCUs, and mixed TCUs whose language dominance is difficult to establish.

Most commonly, English is inserted into isiXhosa-isiMpondo-dominant TCUs. Excerpt 5 is a typical case.

#### ***Excerpt 5: English insertions in isiXhosa-isiMpondo-dominant TCUs (Lesson 5)***

- 7            \*Thami: **Sohlukene sithetha nge-human rights ezenzeka phaya e-Amerikha ne-**  
8            rights **ezenzeka apha, neh?**  
9            %trn: We were talking about human rights in America and rights here, yes?

English items ‘human rights’ and ‘rights’ (7) are inserted into an otherwise isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCU. The phrase ‘human rights’ and noun ‘rights’ are syntactically assimilated into isiXhosa-isiMpondo via grammatical prefixes to mark subject agreement. The tag ‘neh/yes’ (8) is a common example of classroom formulaic language discussed next. Syntactic assimilation is by far the most common way in which English items are structurally integrated into isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCUs. This practice is widely documented in other studies (e.g., de Klerk, 2006:113). Nouns or noun phrases that refer to key concepts, objects or processes in an episode or lesson account for an overwhelming number of English items integrated into isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCUs. Thus, the general direction of switching is from English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo, but borrowing is from English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo, precisely because English is the medium of instruction, the object of lessons and the more prestigious language. As Gardner-Chloros (2009:37) observes, a ‘minority/less dominant’ language is much more influenced by the ‘majority/dominant’ language rather than the other way round.

The second form of mixed language TCUs is made by inserting isiXhosa-isiMpondo items into English-dominant TCUs, as shown in Excerpt 6.

***Excerpt 6: IsiXhosa-isiMpondo insertions in English-dominant TCUs (Lesson 5)***

54 \*Thami: **Singena** that is what causes tension between the Britain and America, neh  
55 (TCU1)? ((Writing on the board.)) That is causes that is the the tension (TCU2). That  
56 is uk(u)**ngava:ni** the between America and Britain (TCU3).  
57 %trn: We are now going to that is what causes tension between the Britain and  
57 America,yes? ((Writing on the board.)) That is causes that is the the tension that is  
58 disagreement between the America and Britain.

Examples of insertions of isiXhosa-isiMpondo items in English-dominant TCUs are TCU1 (54) and TCU3 (55). TCU1 is initiated in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and completed in English. The TCU informs the class about a new lesson topic. Signalling that a new topic is about to be announced is done isiXhosa-isiMpondo, ‘**Singena**/ We are now going to’ (54), the topic itself is presented in English, ‘that is what causes

tension between the Britain and America, *neh?*' (54). In passing, note that in TCU1 isiXhosa-isiMpondo is used in a discourse-related way, whereas TCU3 anticipates learner problems with English language competence and therefore is participant-related. The isiXhosa-isiMpondo insertion '**uk(u)ngava:ni**' (55) translated as 'tension' in TCU3 is also participant-related.

A final mixed TCU type involves mixed language use in which language dominance is unclear, as illustrated in Excerpt 7. The English phrase 'that is' is used to introduce a clarification. The clarification itself is made in two phrases, first through a borrowed and syntactically-plus-phonologically assimilated isiXhosa-isiMpondo phrase '**bay(i)wina**/they won', and second the English 'that war'. The infinitive phrase '**wina**' is derived from the English 'to win' and is an established borrowing commonly used in isiXhosa-isiMpondo talk about sports.

***Excerpt 7: Mixed TCUs with no clear language dominance (Lesson 5)***

36        \*Thami: That is **bay(i)wina** that war.

37        %trn: That is they won that war.

The question of assimilation and how teachers use it to construct TCUs is discussed in greater detail in chapter 8, section 81.

#### **4.3.4 Classroom formulaic language**

The 'languageness' of classroom formulaic items is not oriented to by participants in certain sequential and pedagogical environments. That is, participants do not treat the items as belonging to language A, B or C, but rather as linguistically neutral. In this corpus, classroom formulaic language is produced in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and consists of phrases tagged to the end of English or multilingual teacher turns. The phrases perform a range of routine and recurrent classroom actions in an English-language, English L2-medium, and isiXhosa-isiMpondo classroom, including doing confirmations of listening, understanding or agreement, or to initiate repair sequences.

Common classroom formulaic phrases with an isiXhosa-isiMpondo origin used to do checking/confirming include the following.

**Siyayibona?/** do we see/get it (Lesson 1 and 2)

**Uyayibona?/** do you see/get it? (Lesson 1 and 2)

**Neh?**/ right? (Lesson 5 and 6)

**Siyavana bantwana bam?/** Do you follow children? (Lesson 6)

**Andithi na?/** isn't that right? (Lesson 7)

**Siyavana?/** do you understand? (Lesson 9, 10 and 12)

**Niyandiva?/** Do you hear me? (Lesson 11 and 12)

When formulaic language occurs in the course of lecture sequences, learners orient to them as doing checking rather than as genuine elicitations of learner questions. In some sequential and pedagogical environments, therefore, participants do not orient to the isiXhosa-isiMpondoness of the items but treat them as formulaic language. In such contexts, the items signal or index doing checking/conforming, and cohorting and re-cohorting of a class as group in session. This issue is pursued further in chapter 6 in connection to Excerpts 26 and 30.

#### *4.3.4.1 Language neutral, non-linguistic, silence and inaudible utterances*

'Language neutral' refers to TCUs that are proper nouns, e.g., names of persons and places. 'Non-linguistic' refers to non-linguistic TCUs, including laughter, or learner bids for turns, such as when they put up their hands. 'Silence' refers to an inability to produce a turn when it is sequentially relevant to do so, such as following a question and 'inaudible' refers to hard-to-hear sections of an audio recording.

## 4.4 Findings and Conclusions

### 4.4.1 Findings

First, nine communicative codes have been identified in the corpus, five linguistic and four non-linguistic. In a sequential approach, non-linguistic codes provide clues about how participants orient to linguistic codes. Although this study is primarily concerned with linguistic codes and therefore with linguistic CS, non-linguistic codes are attended to insofar as they illuminate how linguistic codes are oriented to by participants.

Second, in this corpus, participants use four distinctive varieties in locally or sequentially contrastive ways, viz., English, isiMpondo, isiXhosa-isiMpondo, and a multilingual/ mixed variety. This contrasts to the starting point of this study which held that three varieties were involved in classroom CS, viz., English, isiMpondo and isiXhosa.

This has led to two major findings about the 'codes' of CS in this corpus. The first is that participants make less distinction than was initially supposed between isiXhosa and isiMpondo in classroom interaction. Hence the code isiXhosa-isiMpondo has been introduced. That is, in classroom interaction in the English L2 and L2-medium classroom participants' isiXhosa 'heteroglossia' (Bakhtin, 1981:263) - the fact that isiXhosa has many varieties - is backgrounded through the use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo. Another discovery has been made, of a classroom multilingual/ mixed variety which is unnamed but is a distinct and important variety through which classroom interaction is accomplished.

Third, learners produce significantly more English TCUs than teachers. This does not mean, however, that learners are competent in English; only that they are required to produce their utterances in English-only during whole-class interaction. On the other hand, teacher TCUs are produced in English, isiXhosa-isiMpondo and a multilingual variety. Divergent language use between learners and teachers is a recurrent pattern in many post-colonial situations where a relatively unfamiliar L2 is a medium of teaching and learning, and it is one of the primary ways in which roles of teachers and learners are enacted and in which lessons are accomplished (e.g., Arthur, 1996).

Fourth, English, isiXhosa-isiMpondo, and a multilingual variety are used in distinctive and locally contrastive ways. This means that language use in this corpus can be usefully analysed within the framework of a CA approach to CS.

#### *4.4.2 Conclusions*

First, a sequential approach to bi/multilingual talk must operate within a broader notion of communicative code or repertoire (Rymes, 2010) to include both linguistic and non-linguistic codes. This is because part of the way in which participants display orientation to different linguistic codes is by how they use non-linguistic codes. In the sequential development of talk, linguistic and non-linguistic codes create contexts for their mutual interpretation.

Second, the findings bear out one of CA's core methodological principles, i.e., 'codes' of CS ought to be studied from the perspective of participants (Auer, 1998). This is similar to Blommaert's (2005:15) view that languages ought to be investigated from the perspective of users. It is doubtful whether the variety called isiXhosa-isiMpondo would have been identified if this methodological principle had not been followed. This approach contrasts with approaches that assume that linguistic codes exist prior to interaction (e.g., Myers-Scotton, 1993a and Gumperz, 1982). A CA approach, on the other hand, seeks to establish how different varieties are constituted and made relevant in interaction in the first place. However, throughout this study it is argued that the interactional level is not hermetically sealed off from larger social processes in which it is embedded. It is argued in the next chapters that the view that codes of CS ought to be studied from the point of view of displayed behaviour of participants, requires qualification.

Third, the finding that classroom participants, for example, often orient to isiXhosa-isiMpondo but much less to isiXhosa and isiMpondo as distinct or separate varieties, supports the view that it is insightful to look at language as a 'social practice' rather than as a 'bounded system' (e.g., Heller, 2007:1; chapters in Blackledge and Creese, 2014). However, as will be shown in the following chapters, classroom participants treat languages as both 'verbs' and 'nouns' depending on the sequential, pedagogical and communicative context. This is because in school, language is often objectified, taught, treated as a bounded

system, monitored and assessed (Mercer and Dawes, 2014). In other words, in whole-class interaction, the linguistic codes of CS are more sharply defined and bounded than in 'backstage' interaction (Arthur, 1996:27).

Fourth and finally, even at this initial and general level of data presentation and analysis, it is clear that learner and teacher patterns of language use are different, and that this has to do with the institutional nature of the talk. That is, the goals of school, the different roles of classroom participants, and a special type of turn-taking (Heritage, 1997:224-225) account for the patterns. Thus, a 'pure' CA approach to multilingual talk cannot, on its own, fully account for the patterns.

The next chapter considers how each of the linguistic codes identified here are used to accomplish episodes, and the patterns of language use that emerge.

## 5. Patterns of Language Use in Multilingual Classrooms

### 5.1 Introduction

Classroom interaction in this corpus is accomplished through five ‘language’ patterns, viz., separate/divergent bilingualism, convergent bilingualism, mixed/flexible multilingualism, isiXhosa-isiMpondo-only, and English-only. The last two patterns - isiXhosa-isiMpondo and English monolingual patterns - are not discussed in this chapter, but postponed to chapter 8 where they are examined in relation to individual teachers’ communicative styles. This chapter considers only the multilingual patterns.

Patterns of language use are described and analysed principally in terms of the Conversation Analysis (CA) approach to bi/multilingual talk. A detailed review of the CA approach is presented in the literature review (section 2.3.3) and the methodology chapter (chapter 3). The paragraphs which follow give a brief summary of the conceptual and methodological principles of CA relevant to and explored in this chapter.

First, CA regards ordinary conversation as “a basic form of speech” (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1978:47) or “conversation type” (Hakulinen, 2009:56), against which other conversation types are examined. Other conversation types, such as whole-class talk, are regarded as adaptations of ordinary conversation.

Second, CA assumes that ordinary conversation is *jointly* managed by participants to it. This is evident in a locally managed system of turn-taking (Sacks, et al 1978). In such a system, speakers project the ending of their TCUs or turns and listeners listen for conversational cues, projecting the endings so that they can claim next-speakership, if they so wish.

Third, in bilingual conversation, participants establish a ‘language of interaction’ or ‘base language’ (Auer, 2000:129) early on in the conversation and may renegotiate the language of interaction in the course of interaction (Auer,

2000). A language of interaction is important because, without it, it is not meaningful to speak of alternation/switching.

Fourth, bilingual participants have preference for 'same language talk' (Auer, 1995:124) or 'same medium talk' (Gafaranga, 2007:145). Therefore, switching from an established language of interaction to another is noticeable and accountable (i.e., it is locally meaningful) because, often, switching is a "contextualization cue" (Gumperz, 1982) to signal changes in the interaction, such as to "make relevant/ maintain/ revise/ cancel some aspects of context" (Auer, 1995:123).

Fifth, participants in bilingual conversation display preference for this or that language. 'Language preference' is not necessarily the same as 'to like' or 'dislike' this or that language. Preference-related switching may signal a language(s) in which a speaker has greater or lesser competence. Preference-related switching may also have to do with reasons external to an ongoing interaction, such as political/ideological considerations (Auer, 1995:123). Examples of this include refusal by some speakers to use certain languages on ideological grounds.

Finally, while committed to investigating sequential and organizational principles by which language practices are organized in interaction, an ethnographic sensibility is also adopted in order to examine the interdependence between local, institutional and larger social processes of multilingualism (Gardner and Martin-Jones, 2012).

## **5.2 Separate/divergent bi/multilingualism**

In separate/divergent language use, participants use distinct varieties to accomplish an interactional episode. This is similar to what is variously described as 'un-reciprocal switching', 'dual-lingualism', or 'parallel mode' (Creese and Blackledge, 2011:1200). In divergent multilingualism, participants are not involved in what Auer refers to as 'language negotiation' (1995:125). In this pattern, participants do not seek to establish a language of interaction; divergent language use is itself a medium of interaction.

This pattern has three forms, viz., divergent bilingualism as a medium of interaction (Type 1A), divergent language use as strategic/creative language use (Type1B), and divergent language use as flexible bilingualism (Type1C).

### 5.2.1 Type 1A: Divergent bi/multilingualism as a medium of interaction

#### *Features*

A Type 1A divergent pattern involves the use of two varieties to enact an interactional episode. In this pattern, a teacher uses variety A and learner(s) use variety B. Distinctive features of this pattern include the following: (a) Participants use different varieties to accomplish an episode. (b) Neither participant changes varieties in the course of an episode. (c) A teacher uses isiXhosa-isiMpondo and (the) learner(s) use English. That is, teachers use an ‘unofficial language/variety’, while learners use an ‘official language/variety’. (d) The varieties are not used in a locally or sequentially contrastive/meaningful way. In other words, this is not a case of ‘prototypical code-switching’ in the Auerian sense (Auer, 1999:312; 1995:116; 1984:5).

The meaning(s) of this pattern is not recoverable only by analysis of the ‘sequential organization of interaction’ (Auer, 1984:4) in which it occurs, and certainly not by reference only to the immediately preceding or following TCUs and/or turns. Its meaning(s) is recoverable through analysis of the ‘overall’ environment in which language use occurs (Gafaranga, 2007:136). For Gafaranga (2007) however, ‘overall’ refers only to the episode in which a pattern of CS is located, or which it accomplishes. In contrast, the claim here is that the meaning of a pattern is recoverable also by taking into account broader institutional and sociolinguistic contexts and the ways in which these contexts are constituted, ratified, challenged or reflected in language use (e.g. Heller, 2001; Martin-Jones, 1995; Rampton, 2006).

Excerpt 8 below is an example. The Excerpt is from a grade 8 English literature lesson in which L01 reads aloud a part in an English play, and Anele manages and annotates the reading in isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

**Excerpt 8: Divergent language use as the norm (Lesson3)**

- 414 \*Anele: **Uxele xa udiniwe ufunda.**
- 415 %trn: Say when you are tired of reading.
- 416 \*L01: When she heard her moth[er's cell phone ring a few minutes ago (.) =
- 417 \*Anele: **[Mhm.**
- 418 %trn: Yes.
- 419 \*L01: = she was hoping that somehow it would be Lucky. ((Reading)).
- 420 \*Anele: **Hhayibo njonga:ni. Yiva::ni. Uthi xa uva ifow(u)ni kamamakhe ikhala**
- 421 **uyacing(a) uba. & ↑Hhe::: ↑thixo& kutheni uLucky uzafow(u)nela efow(u)nini**
- 422 **kamamakhe? Niyabon(a) izinto eniz(i)cingayo? Hamba.**
- 423 %trn: Hear that. Hear. She hears a phone ring and she thinks. &Good Lord& why
- 424 would she think Lucky would call her on her mother's phone? You see the things you
- 425 guys get into your heads? Go on.

Anele does her turns in isiXhosa-isiMpondo (414; 417; 420-22) and L01 hers in English (416; 419). Participants do not switch languages for the duration of the episode - Anele stays in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and L01 in English for the duration of the episode. Anele uses isiXhosa-isiMpondo to check if L01 wishes to continue reading (414), to evaluate L01's reading and to issue a continuer (417), to annotate the text (420-422), and to end the current episode and begin a new one (422).

In this episode Anele and L01 are not involved in an exchange negotiating a 'language of interaction' (Auer, 1995) or a 'medium of interaction' (Gafaranga, 2007). It is argued that this kind of divergent language use is the 'proper' mode in which to conduct the interaction, for several reasons. First, learners are blocked from using isiXhosa-isiMpondo. In this pattern, isiXhosa-isiMpondo is only available to teachers to manage classroom interaction and to annotate English texts. English is the language of learners, the language of the written text, and of oral reading.

Second, the sequence occurs in the context in which the 'language' of interaction - in fact the pattern of interaction, that is, isiXhosa-isiMpondo for

teachers and English for learners - has been established in previous sequences or episodes. The pattern is 'normative', unremarkable or unmarked. Teachers use a familiar language, isiXhosa-isiMpondo, to support language acquisition or L2-medium content learning and learners show, or attempt to show, evidence of learning through displays of English (Arthur and Martin, 2006; Hornberger and Chick, 2001; Chick, 1996).

Anele uses this divergent pattern as the primary way in which to conduct interaction in her classroom and because of this it is difficult to make sense of her language use in terms of sequential analysis alone. On the other hand, as shown in Excerpt 9 below, Bamba uses this pattern in a momentary or strategic way and, therefore, his language use is readily analysable in terms of 'local' (Auer, 1984) and 'overall' (Gafaranga, 2007) sequential analysis.

Third, as will be shown in detail in chapter 6 in relation to turn-taking, the normative system for turn-taking in a whole-class session of classroom interaction is a pre-allocated, teacher-directed system (McHoul, 1978). The system creates a specific kind of participation structure where one participant, the teacher, is more or less free to initiate or end interactions, and the other participants, the learner(s), have much less room to do this, particularly in the whole-class session. While classrooms are not the only spaces in which asymmetrical encounters and participation structures are observed in conversation - they are also observed in doctor-patient encounters, trial examinations, calls to emergency services, and political interviews (Heritage and Clayman, 2010) - classrooms, especially L2 and L2-medium classrooms, are distinct from the other encounters in that there is a heightened awareness of language and a control of language use by teachers to enable language and L2-content learning (Fennema-Bloom, 2009; Vorster, 2008). Teacher actions, therefore, often determine what varieties are used, when, how, and for how long. For these reasons, language use cannot be said to be negotiated between participants with equal participation rights on a turn-by-turn basis. Of course, this is not to say that learners have no agency about which varieties to use and when (as clearly shown in for example, Cromdal, 2001; Jørgensen, 2003;

Rampton, 2006), but the point is that learners have much less room to do so where lessons are conducted in whole-class format.

### 5.2.2 Type 1B: Divergent bilingualism as strategic language use

#### *Features*

In this pattern of divergent language use, one participant switches languages in the course of interaction. Features of the pattern are as follows: (a) Teachers switch languages from English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo or isiMpondo; (b) Teachers are the only participants who make switches; (c) Teacher switches are inter- rather intra-turn; (d) As in Type1A above, learners do not switch languages in the course of an episode but continue to use English. Learners do not orient to teacher switches as an invitation to switch languages, but correctly read them as instances of ‘pedagogical or code-scaffolding’ (Finnema-Bloom, 2009:32). That is, they understand that switches are meant to support learners to access and produce English talk or texts.

Excerpt 9 below is from a Social Science lesson and is an example of ‘discourse-related’ (Auer, 1984) divergent language use. The episode follows a series of failed attempts by learners to use grid references to find places on a map. Bamba’s exclusive use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo in this episode is locally meaningful. The episode follows on several episodes in which Bamba used either English or a multilingual variety to produce his turns (for example, 231-232). Switches to isiXhosa-isiMpondo to do disciplining are accompanied by other contextualization cues (Gumperz, 1982) such as rapid delivery, short turns and repetition. In Bamba’s classroom and in the corpus more generally, the use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is associated with ‘management of pupil behaviour’ (Ferguson, 2009:232).

**Excerpt 9: Strategic divergent language use (Lesson 7)**

- 231 \*Bamba: ΔYenza uk(u)ba kube possible to locate the certain place that you are  
232 looking for in a map, isn't itΔ?  
233 %trn: ΔIt makes it possible to locate the certain place that you are looking for in  
234 a map, isn't itΔ?  
235 \*LNS: Yes sir.  
236 \*Bamba: **Niyaqal(a) uyiva?**  
237 %trn: You are hearing this for the first time?  
238 \*LNS: No sir ((some learners)).  
239 \*Bamba: **Niyaqala?**  
240 %trn: Is it the first time?  
241 \*LNS: No sir ((some learners)).  
242 \*Bamba: ΔHhayi yimani madoda ndiyabuza ngokuΔ (.) **Niyaqala?**  
243 %trn: ΔHang on guys I am asking you a question (.) Δ Is it the first time?  
244 \*LNS: NO SIR.

The adjacency pair from line (231) to (235) is included here only to show how language use from lines (236) to (244) differs from its immediately preceding sequential environment. The focus of the analysis, however, is (236) to (244). Bamba does his turns in isiXhosa-isiMpondo (236, 239, 242) and learners (238, 241, 244) theirs in English. A number of actions are accomplished in the episode, including complaining, disciplining, shaming and getting learners to admit to wasting Bamba's time. The 'question' '**Niyaqala uyiva?**/You are hearing this for the first time?' (236), is heard as intended, that is, as a doing a complaint and the beginning of disciplining. It is not heard as a search for information and hence the learners' reluctance to 'answer' it, as displayed in the fact that only a few learners take part in producing a response to it (238).

Support for the claim that learners hear the question as doing complaining and a prelude to disciplining is the phrasing which requires that an appropriate

answer to it should be either a 'yes' or no', rather than an account, for instance. On this occasion Bamba is not trying to elicit learner accounts for why they are unable to competently use grid references. The fact that learners are not simply 'answering' a 'question', but are being corralled into taking part in their own disciplining, is confirmed by the repetition of the question in the exact same words (239), when again it is met with a reluctant response (241). Bamba (242) reads the learners' reluctant participation as implying that they have not been taught how to use map grid references. His outrage and frustration (242) is marked by rapid delivery and repetition of the question for a third time. Phrasing the question in a similar way on all three occasions (236, 239, 242) underlines his resolve to get learners to 'own up' to having been taught how use grid references, to having forgotten how to do so, and, by implication, to 'admit' that they are 'bad/poor' students, and have wasted his time. Learners finally make a clear and loud response (244).

In this pattern too, learners use one language and the teacher another. Thus, one of the ways in which roles of teachers and learners are enacted in these classrooms is that it is expected/normative for teachers in a whole-class session to move between English and isiXhosa-isiMpondo. While learners can occasionally do this, their use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is likely to be 'noticeable' and 'sanctionable' because it constitutes 'deviance' from a classroom norm (Seedhouse, 2004:10).

As in Type 1A above, learners do not read the teacher's switches to isiXhosa-isiMpondo as an invitation to switch languages to match his language use, but rather as the marker of a shift in conversational footing. In this case this is not achieved via CS alone, but together with other contextualization cues.

### 5.2.3 Type 1C: Divergent flexible bi/multilingualism

#### *Features*

Type 1C divergent language use is a pattern which involves the use of two or more varieties to accomplish an interactional episode. The pattern has the following distinctive features: (a) teachers make intra and inter-turn switches; (b) teachers switch between English and isiXhosa-isiMpondo; (c) learners use English or classroom formulaic language to produce their turns, and (d) as with Types 1A and

1B above, teacher switches do not signal language negotiation but are part of a teacher's 'communicative repertoire' (Rymes, 2010). Creese and Blackledge (2011:1197) have referred to this form as 'flexible bilingualism'.

Five sub-types are identified in the corpus. Some of the sub-types cannot be adequately analysed by reference only to Auer's local, sequential approach (1998; 1995; 1984). The sequential approach was thus complemented by reference to Gafaranga's (2007) 'overall order' and also to the broader 'language ecology' (Creese and Martin, 2003:2) in which classroom multilingual language practices are embedded. The five sub-types are:

- (i) Discourse-related transfer;
- (ii) Discourse-related alternation/ code-switching;
- (iii) Other- and self-facilitative participant-related transfer;
- (iv) Between discourse and participant-related switching.

#### 5.2.3.1 *Discourse-related transfer*

##### **Excerpt 10: Discourse-related transfer (Lesson 12)**

28 \*Nande: EH:: today I want to talk about (5.0) the development of (2.0)  
29 of bridges (2.0) through ages ((writing on the board)) (TCU1). **Siyayazi mos uba**  
30 i-bridge is a structure (.) is an an example of a structure, **andithi** (TCU2)?  
31 %trn: EH:: today I want to talk about (5.0) ((writing on the board) the  
32 development of (2.0) of bridges (2.0) through ages. We know that a  
33 bridge is a structure (.) is an an example of a structure, isn't that right?  
34 \*LNS: YES **MISI**.  
35 %trn: YES TEACHER.

This episode occurs near the beginning of a grade 8 Technology lesson. It is accomplished in a complex multilingual repertoire incorporating items from English, township slang, and isiXhosa-isiMpondo. Let us begin by considering actions accomplished in the episode. With her back to the class and writing on the chalkboard, Nande announces in English the lesson's topic in TCU1 (28-29).

TCU2 (20-30) is done multilingually and accomplishes four actions. First, it shifts the focus of the lesson from announcing a topic to discussing it. Second, it links the new topic to previous lessons. Third, it informs learners what knowledge from previous lessons is relevant and taken for granted in this lesson. Fourth, it checks if the new lesson can proceed on that basis.

Learners produce a classroom formulaic in a strong and loud voice giving Nande the go ahead (34). Even though the learners' response is transcribed to show that the phrase is made up of items belonging to two varieties, 'Yes' (English) and '**Misi**/Teacher' (isiXhosa-isiMpondo), participants do not orient to the phrase 'Yes **Misi**/ Yes Teacher' as this or that language. This multilingual phrase is a common classroom formulaic used to address female teachers in an isiXhosa-isiMpondo and English-medium lesson. Its status is that of a linguistically neutral classroom formulaic and therefore learners' cannot be said to have produced a multilingual turn to match Nande's multilingual variety. This is, then, still a case of divergent language use, with learners using a classroom formulaic and Nande a multilingual variety.

The slang item, 'mos' (29), glossed as 'obviously', originates in Afrikaans and is common to the speech of Black South Africans when speaking African languages. The function of 'mos' in the second TCU (29-30) is to underline that she expects learners to know already what a 'structure' is.

We can make the following additional observations about language use. Nande writes the topic of the lesson in English (28-29). Writing by teachers is done exclusively in English in this corpus, highlighting the oral-literate dimension of diglossic language use (Hornberger, 2003) in the corpus and in other post-colonial African classrooms (e.g., Bunyi, 2001). Textbooks and other materials as well as learner's written work is also in English. Precisely because writing is more valued than speaking in formal learning settings, such as classrooms, exclusive use of English in writing is an indicator of its relative prestige and its status as the legitimate language of the classroom (Heller, 2001). IsiXhosa-isiMpondo, slang, and the multilingual variety are restricted to oral communication only, underlining their status as supportive varieties.

### 5.2.3.2 Discourse-related CS

Excerpt 11 occurs in a grade 8 Technology lesson about electrical system diagrams. Before the point where this excerpt begins, the class had already worked through several examples depicting stages of a system diagram: 'input', 'process' and 'output'. In this excerpt, learners are required to work out a system diagram for a bread toaster.

#### **Excerpt 11: Discourse-related code-switching (Lesson 10)**

- 123 \*Sindi: Eh:: what will be the output of the toaster here: (TCU1)? (1.0) At this stage  
124 (TCU2)? ((Points to the 'output' column of a system diagram drawn on the  
125 chalkboard.)) ΔKuzokwenza ntoni kule- kuyonke lento (TCU3)? What is going to  
126 happen at the endΔ (TCU4)? (3.0)  
127 %trn: Eh:: what will be the output of the toaster here:? (1.0) At this stage?  
128 ((Pointing to the 'output' column of a representation of system diagram drawn on  
129 the chalkboard.)) ΔWhat will happen? What is going to happen at the endΔ? (3.0)  
130 \*L01: ((Puts up his hand)).  
131 \*Sindi: Yes L01.  
132 \*L01: °Toast°.  
133 \*Sindi: Hhe?  
134 %trn: What?  
135 \*L01: Toast.  
136 \*Sindi: Ye:s we are going to get a toast.

During observation I saw learners consulting each about the English equivalent for '**isonka esitshisiweyo/toast**'. Many knew how a toaster works and the answer to the question, but only in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. I heard a learner mutter '**isonka esitshisiweyo**'. Sindi asked the question about the output of a toaster four times (123-126) before a bid was made to answer it. The first time this was done in English (TCU1), followed by a second-long pause (123), in which Sindi waited for learners to make bids to answer but they did not. The second time it was also done in English, in a shortened form (TCU2), accompanied by a pointing

gesture. The co-occurrence of repetition (Hellerman, 2003), shortening of utterances and gesture (Schegloff, et al 1977) helps mark the TCU as urgent and requiring a reply. The third time she asked the question in isiXhosa-isiMpondo (TCU3), a translation and repetition delivered in rapid speech, marking her frustration with learners' reticence. And finally by switching back to English (TCU4) delivering the TCU in rapid speech again, to mark her frustration.

Sindi does not offer to provide nor is she asked by learners to provide more examples of how a system diagram works. Thus she correctly deduces that the problem is not that learners do not know how a system diagram works, but mistakenly construes their lack of participation as 'reticence', a solution to which she believes is to repeat the question until it is answered. Language is the problem. That language is the problem is *partially* documented in the interaction that follows. As noted at the beginning of the analysis of this episode, much of what goes on in this interaction becomes clearer once observational data is taken into account.

As noted, it is only on the fourth occasion that a learner, L01 (130), makes a bid to answer Sindi's question. L01 (132) produces his response in a soft voice, implying uncertainty about the correctness of his answer. Sindi (133) initiates repair in isiXhosa-isiMpondo with the item, '**Hhe**/what', associated with repair on account of a lack of hearing. In response, L01 repeats his answer (135) and Sindi (136) ratifies, repeats and displays it to the class.

In terms of CS, Sindi uses a multilingual variety made up of inter-turn, intersentential, alternational or code-switching and learners' English. Two cases of switching in the excerpt can be described as 'code-switching' (Auer, 1984:12) in the Auerean sense. The first is a switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo (125), made more salient by being produced in rapid speech, to stress her frustration with a lack of bids to answer the question. Once this is done, she reverts back to English. Her second switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo strongly marks L01's utterance (131) as repairable on account of a lack of hearing. Once the repair sequence is concluded, she reverts to English to evaluate and display L01's answer and to terminate the exchange.

Excerpt 12 below is an example of a case of the most minimally-indicated discourse-related divergent language use in the corpus. The excerpt is from a grade 7 English grammar lesson. In this episode, learners list objects in the classroom.

***Excerpt 12: English-dominant sequence and brief alternational switches to isiXhosa-isiMpondo (Lesson 1)***

- 90 \*Sindi: CHAI:R.((Writing)) **Eh:[he.** What else? Yes L12. ]
- 91 %trn: CHAI:R.((Writing)) Ye:s. What else? Yes L12.
- 92 \*LNS: [(Hands raised and snapping their fingers.)]
- 93 \*L12:\$ Came:ra\$.
- 94 \*Sindi: **HHE:?**
- 95 %trn: What?
- 96 \*LNS: ((Chortles))
- 97 \*L12: \$CAR:MA:RA\$.
- 98 %trn: Camera.
- 99 \*Sindi: Y:es \$ camera ((writing)). Where do you see a camera?\$ (((laughter))).
- 100 ↑**HHE::?**
- 101 %trn: Y:es \$ camera ((writing)). Where do you see a camera?\$ ((laughter)).
- 102 ↑**WHE:RE?**
- 103 \*LNS: (((laughter))).

The following brief 'isiXhosa/isiMpondo' intersentential items '**Eh:he**/Ye:s (90), **HHE:?**/WHAT (95), '**HHE::?**/WHERE?' (100) have no precise referential meaning, depending for their meaning on the sequential context in which they occur and prosodic cues accompanying them. Although these items originate from isiXhosa-isiMpondo, through participant observation I learned that these and similar items, are used frequently and pervasively (i.e., in all types of classroom exchanges) in the corpus and, therefore, it is not always clear whether or not participants orient to their distinctive 'other-languageness' (Auer, 1984:9) as 'isiXhosa-isiMpondo'. Some uses of these items appear non-contrastive and

therefore contribute to the emergence of a sequentially non-contrastive ‘language mixing’ (LM) (Auer, 1999) or CS as an unmarked choice (Myers-Scotton, 1993a). However, an alternative analysis is also possible. Assuming that the other-languageness of the above items is oriented to, the following analysis can be generated.

The episode begins with Sindi closing a previous episode by writing ‘chair’ (90), a learner’s answer, on the chalkboard. She then begins a new sequence with an isiXhosa-isiMpondo continuer ‘**Eh:he**/Ye:s’ (90). That learners understand the isiXhosa-isiMpondo continuer as intended to mark the beginning of a new episode, is shown by their bids for the turn (92) even before Sindi verbalizes her elicitation.

The episode is conducted largely in English, except for Sindi’s three discourse-related alternational/intersentential transfers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo (90, 94, 100). The first discourse-related transfer is ‘**Eh:he**/Yes’ (90), which marks the beginning of a new episode. A second, ‘**HHE**:/What’ (94), is a repair-initiator on account of a lack of hearing. It is probably discourse-related because Sindi’s switch from English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo marks a shift from doing a regular IRE/F sequence to doing repair. A third is Sindi’s ‘**HHE**:/WHE::RE’ (100), which looks like a repair-initiator, but is in fact a means of prolonging the humorous moment. Laughter (103) is an appropriate response to it.

Humour in the episode begins in L12’s (93) first response in which she produces a ‘heteroglossic’ (Bakhtin, 1981:263) utterance which is both an answer to Sindi’s question (90) and is a humorous comment on the ubiquitous presence of a video camera recording the lesson. L12’s turns (93, 97) are done in a smiley voice, providing an extra contextualization cue (Gumperz, 1982) about the secondary, humorous intent of her turns.

This episode shows that learners can and do initiate humorous exchanges in English. While isiXhosa-isiMpondo and the multilingual variety are associated with emotionally charged as well as complex communicative situations, certain forms of English, in context, can be used in ways that approximate spontaneous rather than pedagogically-scripted forms English.

### 5.2.3.3 *Other- and Self-facilitative participant-related transfer*

Excerpt 13 is from a grade 8 Social Science lesson. The topic under discussion is pollution. At this point in the lesson, Bamba switches to isiXhosa-isiMpondo to explain how oil spills pollute the ocean, but struggles to produce an isiXhosa-isiMpondo equivalent for 'plant' (231).

#### **Excerpt 13: Other- and Self-facilitative participant-related transfer (Lesson 8)**

- 230 \*Bamba: **Uyaw(u)::qaphela uk(u)bana na i-Oi:L amaxhesha amaninzi(.)** (TCU1).  
231 **Eh:: ezindawo** (TCU2). **Eh:: okanye ndingay(i)beke njani?** (TCU3) **Na::- ezi-plant**  
232 **okanye kwezindawo kwenziwa kuyo i-oil uyaqonda** (TCU4)? **Ziba:: Δzi- zi- zi-Δ**  
233 **zidla ngokwenziwa k(u)futshane nolwandle okanye zibe phakathi olwandle,**  
234 **siyavana na:: madoda** (TCU5)?  
235 %trn: Note that often Oi:L eh:: the sites eh:: Or how can I put it? Na::- these plants  
236 or where oil is produced, you follow? They are Δzi- zi- zi-Δ they are often built near  
237 the ocean or in the ocean, are you with me guys?  
238 LNS: Yes ((some learners)).

Bamba's turn is done through a multilingual variety made up of intra-sentential, intra-turn, insertional switching (230-234). The learners use English-only (238). The focus of analysis is the participant-related insertion/transfer 'ezi-plant' (231). Note in passing that there are two other transfers in Bamba's isiXhosa/isiMpondo-dominant turn, 'i-oil/oil', which occurs in two places (230, 232). On both occasions 'i-oil' is a discourse-related transfer. 'I-oil' is used in an immediately preceding turn and its function here is to create discourse coherence by 'tying' (Maynard and Clayman, 2003) the current episode to the previous one.

In this turn learners are addressed largely in isiXhosa-isiMpondo (230-234), their dominant language. That is, a familiar language is used to talk about new or unfamiliar ideas, viz., 'oil spills' and 'oil pollution'. The turn is primarily designed to be 'other-facilitative' (i.e., learner-facilitative). But when Bamba has trouble with an isiXhosa-isiMpondo equivalent for 'plant,' the turn changes, at least momentarily, from being 'learner-facilitative' to 'self-facilitative' (i.e., teacher-facilitative) (Martin-Jones, 2000:3). Bamba's subsequent reformulation (TCU4) and

description (TCU5) of where plants are found shows that he is aware that inserting 'plant' into an isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCU in this context is not helpful to learners because the meaning of 'plant' they are likely to be familiar with is that of 'vegetation' and not 'factory or oil refinery', the intended meaning.

Support for the claim that Bamba struggles to find the right words and examples to explain oil spills as a form of pollution is documented in the excerpt as follows. The stretching of the vowel 'Uyaw(u)::qaphela /note that often' (230) a marker of thinking; the micro pause (231); the token for thinking, 'Eh::'(231); and an abandoned attempt to reformulate TCU1 in TCU2 (231); and, again, the token for thinking, 'Eh::'( 231) and, finally, he verbalises that he is struggling to find the right formulation and example in TCU3 (231). Apart from the word 'plant', Bamba has trouble explaining oil pollution in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. This is indicated by troubles he has in producing the first part of TCU5 (232), for instance.

#### 5.2.3.4 *Between discourse and participant-related switching*

Excerpt 14 below is from a grade 8 English language grammar lesson with a focus on the use of comparative adjectives.

#### **Excerpt 14: *Between discourse and participant-related (Lesson 2)***

- 314 \*Sindi: O:kay (TCU1). **Amany**e ke amagama ayatshintsha nje totally anga-
- 315 **angafakelelwa oo-|e|r noo-|e|s|t** (TCU2). ↑O:kay (TCU3). ↑**Kukhona ke::** (TCU4)
- 316 There are also other adjectives that cannot be: compared (TCU5). **Zikhona**
- 317 **ezinye i**-adjectives **o:ngeke uzi:komperishe** (TCU6). Like for example **xa usithi**
- 318 **umntu ufile okanye into ifile** (.) you cannot say dead, deader, deadeast (TCU7).
- 319 %trn: O:kay. Some words change completely they- they don't take suffixes
- 320 such as '|e|r' and '|e|s|t'. ↑O:kay. ↑There are. There are also other adjectives
- 321 that cannot be: compared. There are other adjectives that you cannot compare.
- 322 Like for example, if you want to say someone or something is dead you cannot say,
- 323 'dead, deader, deadeast.'
- 324 \*LNS: ((Laughter)) Yes ((some))

Three varieties are used to complete this episode, viz., English, isiXhosa-isiMpondo, and a multilingual variety. The first TCU is the English 'Okay' (314), a token often used to mark the end and beginning of a new episode in Sindi's classroom.

The second TCU is done in a multilingual variety: in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, '**Amany** ke **amagama ayatshintsha nje**/ some words change' (314); in English, 'totally' (314); isiXhosa-isiMpondo, '**anga- angafakelwa** /they don't take' (315); and in the multilingual variety, '**oo-|e|r**' '**noo-|e|s|t**'/ such as '|e|r' and '|e|s|t' (315). The multilingual variety is done through prefixing isiXhosa-isiMpondo noun class and plural markers to letters of the alphabet called out in English. All three varieties contribute to the overall meaning of the TCU2. The TCU can be regarded variously as an instance of CS 'code mixing' (Auer 1984:9), CS as an 'unmarked choice' (Myers-Scotton, 1993:49), 'flexible bilingualism' (Creese and Blackledge, 2011: 1197) or indeed 'translanguaging' (Canagarajah 2011:1), in that distinct varieties merge or 'boundaries' (Bailey, 2007:259) between them collapse to 'form an integrated system' (Canagarajah 2011:1).

However, another interpretation is also possible. It can be argued that the contributing varieties are used in contrastively meaningful ways, specifically in a discourse-related way. TCU1 (314) is produced in English. This is a common way to begin and end episodes in Sindi's English lessons. The switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo in the first part of TCU2 (314-5) marks the beginning of the new episode proper (315). 'Totally/completely' (315) is used for emphasis and contrasts with isiXhosa-isiMpondo at the beginning and end of TCU2.

TCU3 'Okay' (315) is in English and TCU4 is begun in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and then abandoned (315). It is reformulated in English and produced as TCU5 (315). TCU5 is the core of this turn and in order to stress the importance of its 'message', it is repeated in a largely isiXhosa-isiMpondo construction as TCU6 (316-7). TCU6 is a quasi-translation; it is a case of discourse-related switching to emphasize a point made in English in TCU5 and repeated in a largely isiXhosa-isiMpondo construction in TCU6.

TCU7 is a three-part TCU (317-8,) accomplished multilingually. 'Announcing' the example is done in (South African Black) English, 'like for example' (317). 'Like for example' (317) is prevalent in the speech of educated African-language speakers. For these speakers, it has the same meaning when used in English or isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCU. The statement of the hypothetical case is done in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, '**xa usithi umntu ufile okanye into ifile**/if you want to say someone or something is dead' (317-8). Demonstration of application of a grammatical rule is done in English, thus: 'you cannot say, dead, deader, deadeast' (318). The varieties are used in a contrastive way to organise information, highlight and implement different kinds of actions. For all these reasons, the claim is that the multilingual variety is used here in a discourse-related way. Use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo (317-8) is participant-related in order to ensure learners understand the example and how to apply a grammatical rule.

Although Excerpt 14 is an example of prolific switching generating a complex multilingual variety, close analysis suggests that the varieties involved in producing it are used in a contrastive way to generate local meaning. Taken as a whole, Sindi's turn is done in a multilingual variety in order to scaffold learning, and therefore can be regarded as participant-related insertional switching. Sequential analysis of the organization and development of TCUs (Auer, 1984) suggests that what we have here is case of 'code-switching' rather than 'code mixing' or 'language mixing', on Auer's definition of the terms (Auer, 1999:314).

#### 5.2.4 Findings

This section summarises key findings about divergent multilingualism and its implications for a CA approach to multilingual classroom talk.

First, although divergent language use is predicted in Auer's (1995:125) model, he believes that the pattern is quite uncommon. In contrast we find that the pattern is widespread in multilingual classrooms and is a principal way in which talk is organised. In divergent multilingualism, learners use English and teachers a range of varieties. Varieties used by teachers include English, isiXhosa-isiMpondo, less commonly isiMpondo, and a multilingual variety that is used frequently and pervasively. The divergent pattern plays two principal roles. It is firstly a

mechanism for accomplishing English L2-medium lessons in an English-limited environment. Relative freedom to switch varieties is one of the ways in which 'teacher' and 'learner' roles are marked and enacted in whole-class formats of classroom interaction.

Second, many teacher switches are functional, marking various shifts in conversational footing: highlighting salient points in talk, creating links between current and earlier episodes, and managing interaction. A large number of teacher switches are designed to accommodate learner English language competence by commenting, elaborating or making full or partial translation of sentences, phrases or words into isiXhosa-isiMpondo, isiMpondo or a multilingual variety. A small number of switches are (teacher) self-facilitative such as when a teacher is unable to retrieve a word or phrase in one language when using the other. The claim that, by and large, teacher language use in this pattern can be explained in terms of pedagogical scaffolding does not depend only on sequential analysis of interaction, but, crucially, on the recognition of the fact that this interaction occurs in a classroom, in an English L2 and L2-medium classroom, and in an English-limited environment. Knowledge of the goals of the institution, participant roles and ethnographic knowledge of the sociolinguistic context is critical to analysis.

Third, in the divergent pattern, participants are not engaged in negotiating or renegotiating a language of interaction (Auer, 1995). Divergent language use is itself the pattern of interaction. This form of divergent language use challenges a basic tenet of the sequential approach to bi/multilingual talk, that is, in bi/multilingual talk there is a preference for participants to use the same language. Same language talk can occur in a monolingual or a mixed variety - as long as participants are using the same 'medium' (Gafaranga, 2007:138). The finding of this study, in contrast, is that participants conduct interaction in different and divergent varieties, as a rule, and show no preference for same medium talk.

Fourth, if the term 'preference' can be used at all here, in this pattern there is preference for divergent language use. 'Language preference' works in a specific way in this pattern. Teachers, because of their roles, expressed in their control over the classroom turn-taking system, display language preference in creative ways

unavailable to learners. This recalls Myers-Scotton's (1993b:154) MM prediction that the language use of people with a higher social status is more difficult to predict, because they tend to have greater leeway to make marked and unmarked choices. Teachers select different classroom varieties to organise their own discourse, manage classroom interaction, and accommodate learner English language competence. It is 'normative' or expected for learners to use English-only in the episodes described here and therefore the learners' use of English can be said to show affiliation with norms. That is, by staying in English-only, learners display that they are attending to the ongoing lesson and that they are 'good' students.

Fifth, although it is difficult to describe some switches as functional, either from the perspective of a 'local' or sequential' (Auer, 1984:5) or 'overall order' (Gafaranga, 2007:135), this is not to say that such switches have no interactional meaning. Their meanings are often not recoverable through the use of a sequential approach only. Having said that, there are switches that appear to have no discernible local meaning in the manner described by Auer and Gafaranga, but which could have a larger social meaning as part of particular discursive and communicative styles of participants. The question about non-functional switches is pursued further in section 5.4 below.

Finally, the divergent pattern is designed to produce 'safetalk' practices (Chick, 1996) and it generally succeeds in doing so. There are moments when safetalk fails, leaving learners 'exposed' or 'unsafe' when teachers get frustrated with a breakdown in safetalk practices, as shown in Excerpts 9 and 11. Excerpts like these lend support to teacher interview accounts about the emotional strains of teaching and learning through an unfamiliar language (e.g., Probyn, 2001).

### **5.3 Convergent multilingualism**

Convergent multilingual language use begins as divergent language use. That is, it begins with a teacher using either isiXhosa-isiMpondo or a multilingual variety and learners English and culminates with the teacher and learners converging around the same language. Teacher and learner language usually converges around the use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo or a multilingual variety; both are non-official or 'non-

legitimate' (Heller, 2001; Martin-Jones, 2007) languages of the classroom. The pattern has two forms. The first is teacher-led and a second learner initiated.

### 5.3.1 Type 2 (a): Teacher-led language convergence

#### 5.3.1.1 From isiXhosa/English divergent language use to convergence around isiXhosa-isiMpondo

##### *Features*

This form has a number of distinctive features. (a) Learners produce their utterances in English, the official variety of teaching and learning. (b) The teacher produces her utterances in isiXhosa-isiMpondo or a multilingual variety, the non-official varieties of teaching, learning and communication. (c) Learners switch languages from English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo, or from an official medium to an un-official medium of instruction and communication. (d) Switches are cued by the teacher.

Excerpt 15 documents interaction around an English play read aloud by learners while Anele makes a running commentary on the reading. Just before the point where the excerpt begins, we learn that a thirteen-year-old girl called Whitney had kissed a boy at school that afternoon. Whitney is now seated on her bed daydreaming about the boy, Lucky.

### **Excerpt 15: Participant-related CS (Lesson 3)**

- 69 \*L01: Star- staring out the window. ((Reading))
- 70 \*Anele: Δ↑**Uyambona kuthwa uhlelphiΔ?** (1.0) **Phezu kwebedi. ΔWENZE TON(I)Δ?**
- 71 %trn: Δ↑You hear it says she is sitting on whatΔ? (1.0) On the bed. WHAT IS SHE DOING?
- 72 \*L02: ((Inaudible)).
- 73 \*Anele: ↑**E::HE::** ((Loud shriek in consternation)). **Usacinga ke yo::nke layo::nto.**
- 74 %trn: INDEED. ((Loud and very high pitched delivery)). She is thinking about what
- 75 happened.
- 76 \*LNS: ((Chortles)).
- 77 \*Anele: **Ebeyenziwa ngubani?**
- 78 %trn: Who was doing this to her?
- 79 \*LNS: **Ngu[LUCKY. ]**
- 80 %trn: Lucky.
- 81 \*Anele: **[NguLucky.]**
- 82 %trn: Lucky.

Language use in this episode can be described as follows. L01 reads in English (69), Anele comments on the text and solicits responses in isiXhosa-isiMpondo (70, 73). Learners (79) co-produce with Anele (81) a turn in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. This episode is not analysable on a strictly sequential basis (Auer, 1984).

Let us demonstrate. L01 reads the text in English (69) and Anele conducts the lesson largely in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. Anele can and does switch languages in the course of the lesson, but learners stay largely in English only. The divergent pattern is the default arrangement for conducting interaction in this classroom. The significance of the learners' switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo in (79) can be lost if it is not recognised first that the first adjacency pair (69) and (70) are a case of divergent language use, that is, a normative pattern.

The learners' (79) and teacher's (81) switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo is realised through simultaneous 'co-production' or 'turn-sharing' (Lerner, 2002:225) and is cued by Anele as follows. By isiXhosa-isiMpondo 'questions' (70)

accompanied by several prosodic cues such as a raised pitch, a pause, fast and loud delivery. That the 'questions' are rhetorical rather than real questions is indicated by the fact Anele (70) states a question, does not wait for an answer, but answers them herself. In the dialogue she holds with herself, she inspects Whitney's behaviour, finds it unacceptable and condemns it.

L02's turn (72) is not caught on tape. It appears to have been about expressing alignment with Anele's point of view (70) and therefore it goes unnoticed and is not sanctionable, even though L02 took the turn without first being nominated by the teacher. Other occasions on which learners take turns without teacher selection include times when they produce sequentially appropriate responses such as laughter, completing teacher turns as a group, or co-producing turns with teachers. In this excerpt an example of this is chortles (76), which indicate learner embarrassment, a sequentially and culturally appropriate response to the content of Anele's turns (70, 73).

Anele cues co-production in (79) and (81) by syntactically designing her elicitation 'question' (77) in such a way that an adequate response to them is one that completes her turn (77). An adequate (sequential) response to her question requires that both its content and language is sequentially 'appropriate', i.e., that it is specifically made in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. Learners could produce the linguistically neutral response, 'Lucky, rather than isiXhosa-isiMpondo, 'Ngu-Lucky' (79). The former may succeed as an 'answer' to Anele's 'question' (77), but it would fail as a grammatically correct completion of Anele's turn, and, crucially, it would fail to show that learners align with the teachers' moral stance. As learners (79) produce their response, Anele (81) joins them, speeds up, catching up with them to co-produce the turn. In addition to cuing a choral learner response to her turn (77), Anele also transforms the learners' turn from a response to her elicitation to a co-produced turn (79 and 81).

To appreciate that the moral point of view expressed by Anele is normative in this community requires some ethnographic knowledge. 'Good' fifteen year-old girls do not kiss boys, and do not sit on their beds in the middle of the day (when presumably, there is much housework to do), daydreaming about boys. Therefore

Anele's turns (70, 73) must be read as 'doing' moral outrage. The purpose of the co-production and the co-produced switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo (79, 81) and turn-sharing is to enlist learners' support to condemn Whitney's behaviour as morally and culturally inappropriate. In other words, she wants learners to adopt her moral point of view (at least, in words). She does this by structurally designing her elicitation such that only a very specific item is an adequate response to it. She designs the turn so that isiXhosa-isiMpondo is the only appropriate language of response. By completing Anele's turn, learners become joint authors of her perspective.

The co-produced switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo is 'participant-related' in that it tells us something about attributes of participants (Auer, 1984:12). In particular it is a switch to a 'we-code' (Gumperz, 1982:66) in order to signal that local values are being made relevant or invoked. English is cast, at least momentarily, in the role of a 'they-code'. Distancing from Whitney's values is partly achieved by cuing learners to switch languages away from English. As discussed, ordinarily learners are required to use English-only but in this case because English is the language in which Whitney's behaviour is reported, switching away from this language to isiXhosa-isiMpondo in this context metaphorically does distancing from her reported actions, the text, and the language in which it is coded, thus casting English in the guise of a 'they-code'.

#### *5.3.1.2 From multilingual variety/English divergent pattern to convergence around isiXhosa-isiMpondo and a multilingual variety*

##### *Features*

Features of this form are that: (a) learners use English; (b) the teacher uses isiXhosa-isiMpondo or the multilingual variety; (c) learners switch languages from English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo or the multilingual variety; (d) and, switching is cued by the teacher.

Excerpt 16 is from a grade 7 English grammar lesson. At this point in the lesson Sindi momentarily shifts focus from talk about grammar to a review of a writing convention. Until this point in the lesson, interaction was conducted in a divergent pattern, with Sindi switching between English and isiXhosa-isiMpondo

and learners using English. Change in focus from the main subject of the lesson, grammar, to a brief review of punctuation is accompanied by a switch from divergent language use in a previous episode to convergent language use (275-281 and 281-285).

**Excerpt 16: Discourse-related switching (Lesson 1)**

- 275 \*Sindi: Like for example **nalapha futhi** 'I go to Xholobeni' ((writing)). **Kuye**
- 276 **kwanyanzeleka uk(u)ba uXholobeni kuba eligama** ↑lantoni:?
- 277 %trn: Like for example here again, "I go to Xholobeni" it is mandatory
- 278 because this is a name ↑of what?
- 279 \*LNS: **LE[NDAWO.]**
- 280 %trn: of a place.
- 281 \*Sindi: [**Elendawo.**] **Masimthi**↑:ni?
- 282 %trn: Of a place. What must we do with it?
- 283 \*LNS: **SI[MBHALE NGE-KAPITAL LETTER.]**
- 284 %trn: We write it with a capital letter.
- 285 \*Sindi: [**Masimbhale nge**-capital letter ]
- 286 %trn: Let us write it with a capital letter

There are two instances of convergent language use in this episode. The first is learners (279) and Sindi (281) converging around isiXhosa-isiMpondo to produce 'lendawo/of a place' (279) and 'elendawo/of a place' (281), respectively. The second is learners (283) and Sindi (285) converging around the multilingual classroom variety 'simbhale nge-kapital letter/ we write it with a capital letter' (283) and **masimbhale nge**-capital letter/ let us write it with a capital letter' (285), respectively. Even though the learners' pronunciation of 'capital' as 'kapital' (283) the /k/ as an unaspirated [k] is non-standard and their '**ledandawo**/ of a place' (279) and '**simbhale**/we write it' (283) are not exact morphological matches of the Sindi's '**elandawo**/ of a place' (281) and '**masimbhale**/ let us write it' (285), learners and Sindi hear and treat these items as equivalent. Thus, as observed by Lerner (Lerner, 2002:226), for 'co-production' or 'turn-sharing' to have sequential

consequence does not necessarily depend on the production of precisely the same items and at the same pace, but on a demonstrated intention to do so.

In Excerpt 16, like Excerpt 15 above, the teacher designs her elicitation turns (275-6, 281) such that learners' turns (279, 283) are both a response to and a completion of her turns.

In this excerpt, participants are doing a review of old information. A shift in focus from talking about new information, a new grammatical rule, to a review of old information, capitalisation, is marked by a shift in turn-taking to choral participation and CS. The switch is 'discourse-related' (Auer, 1984:12). This claim however does not derive only from sequential analysis. It is based on an analysis of the 'overall order' of the episode, the lesson, and on participant observation of how language is typically used and how turns are taken in this classroom.

In summary, the shift in focus is achieved in three ways. Firstly, by switching from divergent to convergent language use; secondly, by the teacher's joining learners to co-produce their responses; and thirdly, by the teacher's allocating turns to learners as a group rather than to individual learners, as is the norm in an IRE/F sequence.

### 5.3.2 Type 2 (b): Learner participant-related language convergence

Prior to this episode, the pattern of interaction was divergent language use. (a) The teacher uses isiXhosa-isiMpondo or the multilingual variety to ask questions and to evaluate learner responses. (b) Learners use English to produce short TCUs. (c) A learner uses isiXhosa in a self-facilitative way.

**Excerpt 17: Learner participant-related language convergence (Lesson 7)**

- 936 \*Bamba: **Njenge**-earthquake ΔAnd what else?Δ
- 937 %trn: Such as earthquake. ΔAnd what else?Δ
- 938 \*L44: ( )
- 939 \*Bamba: **Njenge**?
- 940 %trn: Such as?
- 941 \*L44: ( )
- 942 \*Bamba: **Njenge**?
- 943 %trn: Such as?
- 944 \*L44: **Njengemvula**.
- 945 %trn: Such as rain.
- 946 \*Bamba: **Nje:nge:mvu:la**. But **ayikho nala kulezi. As(i)nayo imvula yona. EHE?**.
- 947 %trn: Such as rain. But we don't have rain [on the list]. We don't have rain. YES?

In this grade 7 Social Science lesson learners are asked to list different kinds of natural disasters. Prior to this excerpt, learners offered a series of single-word responses to Bamba's elicitation, which he evaluated and copied to the chalkboard if they were correct.

In this episode, L44 offers a response in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. Use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo in this context is an inappropriate language choice for a learner. L44's switch is 'self-facilitative' or participant-related because she/he does not know or cannot retrieve an appropriate English equivalent. L44 is aware that she is making a 'marked choice' (Myers-Scotton, 1993a:144) and hence her repeated soft delivery (938, 941). Bamba initiates repair, probably on account of a lack of hearing (939, 942). Although repair-initiation is done in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, this is not meant to encourage L44 to switch to this variety. L44 produces a repair in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, '**Njengemvula**/Such as rain' (946). Bamba repeats L44's answer as, **Nje:nge:mvu:la**/ 'Such as rain', stretching the syllables to carry the implication that it is incorrect and also the language in which it is made inappropriate. In the next TCU in the same turn, he explicitly rejects the response

with, 'But **ayikho nala kulezi. As(i)nayo imvula yona/** But we don't have rain [on the list]' (946).

Without knowledge of what is normal or expected language use in this classroom, it would be difficult to interpret this episode as an instance of convergent language use. Auer's CA approach predicts (1995:125) that participants work towards language convergence, whether this be a monolingual (Auer, 1984; 1995) or multilingual (Gafaranga, 2007) variety. But in Auer's and Gafaranga's model, language convergence is an outcome of language negotiation. As shown here, convergence in this case occurs because of a lack of competence in English and is not about showing affiliation with or matching a teacher's language choice. Also the language convergence is marked. That is, while teachers can work towards language convergence in any direction, learners are circumscribed. Learner convergence is unmarked when it moves towards English, when it is done to show affiliation with a teacher's point of view, or when learners are prompted to engage in language convergence as shown in Excerpt 15.

### 5.3.3 Type 2 (c): Learner-to-learner discourse- and participant-related convergence

#### *Features*

Features of this pattern include that: (a) it occurs in learner-to-learner talk in paired or small group classroom formats; (b) learner-to-learner talk is mostly conducted in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, or an isiXhosa-isiMpondo-based multilingual variety with English insertions; (c) learners use language convergence in a discourse- as well as in a participant-related way.

Excerpt 18 below is from a grade 8 Technology lesson. Learners in small groups of about six learners each read a set of handouts and work through a list of questions about the construction of bridges through the ages. Analysis focuses on the exchange between L04 and L05, that is, lines 371 to 378. Lines 363-370 provide a context for the lines in focus.

**Excerpt 18: IsiXhosa-isiMpondo-dominant sequence with English insertions  
(Lesson 12)**

- 363 \*Nande: ΔNdinikile igunya lothetha ngokuΔ. (2.0) TALK (1.0) No-partner
- 364 **wakho.** What do you see?
- 365 %trn: I have granted you permission to talk. (2.0) TALK (1.0) With your partner.
- 366 About what do you see?
- 367 \*LNS: ((Loud findings among learners)).
- 368 \*Nande: WHAT CAN YOU SAY ABOUT THE PICTURE? BECAUSE YOU ARE
- 369 GOING TO ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ( ). LOOK AT THE
- 370 PICTURE. (2.0) Talk about the picture. (3.0) Talk about the picture.
- 371 \*L04: °Yi-fucked up **yodwa le**°. ((With an American accent on the English items))
- 372 %trn: This is fucked up.
- 373 \*L05: °Andikuva mna uthini°. ((Annoyed))
- 374 %trn: I don't understand what you are saying.
- 375 \*L04: °Yi:nto:ni le:: le ila°?
- 376 %trn: What is this here?
- 377 \*L05: °Abantu aba°. ((Annoyed))
- 378 %trn: People, can't you see.

In her first turn (363-363) Nande instructs learners to commence working through the material in their groups and in her second (368-370) she repeats in summary form what they are required to do.

A focus of analysis is the exchange beginning with L04's turn (371) in which he 'disses' the assigned work and by implication also Nande. For emphasis he produces the English phrase 'fucked up' in an American accent. Use of an 'American' accent in is an uncommon feature of these learners' communicative repertoire and therefore its use here can be regarded as instance of language 'crossing' (Rampton, 1995).

L04 (372) delivers his turn in a soft voice because he is aware that Nande would be upset if she heard his comment. L05 (373) distances himself from L04's comments, not least because he knows that their conversation is being recorded. L05 accomplishes distancing in several ways. First by refusing to join L04 in dissing the teacher. Second by claiming not to understand what L04 is talking about; an indirect way of saying L04 is talking nonsense. Third by refusing to match L04's multilingual style, insisting on 'proper' isiXhosa-isiMpondo only.

Suitably rebuffed, L04 (376) attempts to make amends. He switches to isiXhosa-isiMpondo to match L05's use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo and asks a rather obvious question (375). The purpose of the question is to re-start conversation with L05 on a different basis. It is intended, at least temporarily, to put L05 in a position of 'power'. L05 is set up as a potential 'knowledge dispenser' and L04 as a 'knowledge seeker'. L05 (377), however, is not having any of it, producing a curt, equally obvious answer in flat and annoyed voice. L04's (375) switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo can be regarded as discourse-related in that seeks to change conversational footing.

The switch is also participant-related in that it is a switch from an atypical Americanized multilingual variety to isiXhosa-isiMpondo, a 'we-code' (Gumperz, 1982). The switch seeks to restore a shared we-code as the language of interaction and suspends an 'American' for a regular 'isiXhosa-isiMpondo' persona. This episode shows that learners use their varieties in 'flexible' ways (Creese and Blackledge, 2011) outside of a whole-class format. Learner language use in this episode comes closest to Auer's (1995) prediction about participants negotiating a language of interaction. In other words, the suggestion is that aspects of Auer's model apply to bi/multilingual talk in ordinary conversation, or to talk that occurs outside of an institutional format such as a whole-class plenary.

#### 5.3.4 Findings

In the whole-class format of lessons, language convergence can either be teacher- or learner-initiated. Teacher-initiated language convergence has two forms. It is discourse- and participant-related. Teacher-initiated discourse-related

convergence is used to mark momentary shifts of 'footing' from one activity to another, and participant-related convergence to invoke local cultural norms.

A language convergence pattern occurs in the background of language divergence. That is, convergence patterns begin as language divergence. In divergent patterns, teachers can dichotomize isiXhosa-isiMpondo and English into the Gumperzian (1982) 'we-code vs. they-code' and exploit their distinctiveness to generate local meanings. In convergent patterns, teachers use language convergence to enlist, co-opt or make learners co-authors of their opinions or actions. This is possible because here language convergence is not an outcome of language negotiation but is teacher engineered. Learners can and do resist such teacher moves through, for example, 'weak' group participation. The classroom norm is that a 'good' learner shows affiliation with a teacher's actions or perspectives by taking part in teacher-led language convergent practices.

Teachers use a range of strategies to cue language convergence. The primary strategy is turn design. They design their turns (i.e., first-pair parts) so that learners' turns (second-pair parts) complete their turns. Strategies include designing turns for simultaneous production, question design, vowel lengthening and rising intonation towards the end of TCUs. Turn-sharing as a strategy to manage classroom multilingual talk is discussed in detail in chapter 6 (6.3.3).

In the whole-class format, learner-initiated language convergence towards isiXhosa-isiMpondo or a multilingual variety is noticeable and sanctionable. It often occurs when a learner is unable to produce part of a turn or a complete turn in English. It tends to be brief and is participant-related. Such convergence leads to a learner's language coinciding with a teacher's. The intention in this case is not, however, to align with another's speaker's language choice (i.e., the teacher's), as is often the case in ordinary conversation (Auer, 1995:125), but to use a familiar variety in a self-facilitative way. Use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo by learners in a whole-class format is marked and carries the stigma of incompetence in English. Learners would often therefore rather be silent than switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

Learner language convergence in paired group or small group discussions is similar to that in ordinary conversation in that some of its uses can be described as a case of language negotiation in the Auerian sense. Learners use the pattern in discourse- and participant-related ways to generate sequential meanings.

Findings about a language convergence pattern confirm and build on findings about language divergence in the following ways. First, teachers have greater freedom to switch languages in a whole-class format, in particular to select isiXhosa-isiMpondo or a multilingual variety. In the whole-class format, learners can use isiXhosa-isiMpondo at a teacher's prompting. Any other use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo by learners is a marked choice.

Second, although learners and teachers cannot be described as engaged in a language negotiation when using this pattern in a whole-class format, the contributing varieties (e.g., isiXhosa-isiMpondo, etc.) *and* patterns of language use (i.e., divergence vs. convergence) can be used in a functional and sequentially meaningful way. This claim is not made on the basis of sequential analysis alone, but also on the basis of the analysis of lessons as a whole, classroom observation, institutional and ethnographic knowledge.

Third, in a whole-class format, teacher and learner language convergence around varieties other than English, the official medium of instruction, is momentary and not intended to achieve "same language talk" (Auer, 1995:125) or a state of "one language at time" (Auer, 1999:312) for the duration of a lesson. According to Auer (1999) CS occurs in the background of one language at a time or a 'base language', and that prototypical CS is generated through deviation from the base language. In this case, however, language convergence operates against a background of both English monolingualism and language divergence, which together could be regarded as the 'base language' or base pattern for classroom interaction.

Fourth and finally, much of the observed language convergence tells us a lot about teachers' communicative styles and pedagogical strategies in whole class formats, but little about learners. However, Excerpt 18 shows that when turn-

taking is not under the immediate direction of a teacher, such as in paired or small group discussions, learners draw on a greater range of varieties or ‘resources’ (Bailey, 2007) to communicate among themselves.

## 5.4 Mixed/flexible multilingualism

### 5.4.1 Introduction

This section presents a pattern of classroom multilingualism whose local functions are difficult to demonstrate through sequential analysis. The pattern comes closest to Auer’s (1999:314-318) ‘Language Mixing’ (LM). According to Auer, LM is characterised by, among other things: (a) difficulties in assigning local meanings to switches; (b) difficulties in distinguishing between insertional and alternational switches. Auer also notes that LM is used as marker of group identity rather than contrastively to generate local meanings.

Although some items in this pattern can be described as discourse- and -participant-related, many are not easily analysable on the basis of sequential analysis alone, but require reference to conversation-external context and interpretive frames participants bring along and use to make inferences in interaction. Compared to the divergent and convergent patterns, this pattern is teacher-centred and is used less as a ‘pedagogical scaffold’ (Finnema-Blom, 2010; Voster, 2008) than as an attribute of a teacher’s multilingual communicative style.

### 5.4.2 Multilingualism with some-to-no sequential meaning

#### *Features*

This pattern is probably a good candidate for the description of ‘code-mixing’ (Auer, 1984:9), ‘language mixing’ (Auer, 1999:314) or ‘translanguaging’ (Creese and Blackledge, 2010:104). It is characterised by the following: (a) frequent inter- and intra-sentential teacher switches; (b) learners remaining in English, unless prompted by a teacher to switch to isiXhosa or a multilingual variety; (c) telling us more about the communicative styles of teachers and less about their efforts to mediate teaching and learning processes; (d) having no local meaning, in most cases.

Excerpt 19 is from a grade 8 Social Science lesson in which the class reviews a previous lesson about the American War of Independence.

**Excerpt 19: Frequent insertions with some to no sequential meaning (Lesson 5)**

- 135 \*Thami: **Apha sithethe sithethe ngantoni kuqula?** (TCU1)(1.0) **Siqale sathetha**  
136 **nge**-democracy (TCU2). **Sehlana::yo, neh** (TCU3)? That is i-Britain **ifuna**  
137 **ukuzikhupha pha:ya kwi::** (2.0) (TCU4) That is the the Americans **bafuna** that is  
138 **ukuzikhupha kwintoni** (TCU5)? **kwi-Bri[tain** (TCU6).  
139 %trn: We first spoke about spoke about what? (1.0) We first spoke about  
140 democracy. At length, right? That is Britain wants to leave the: from:: (2.0) That is  
141 the Americans wanted to leave what? To leave Britain.  
142 \*LNS: [°**kwi**-Britain° ((some learners.))  
143 %trn: Britain.  
144 \*Thami: **Sisahamba sonke bafundi?**  
145 %trn: Are we together learners?  
146 \*LNS: °Yes sir° ((some learners)).

The excerpt documents convergent and divergent patterns of language use. An instance of convergent language use is Thami's (135-138) multilingual variety involving inter- and intra-sentential switches and the learners' multilingual response (142). Divergent language use is Thami's isiXhosa-isiMpondo elicitation (144) and learners' English response (146).

Only two instances of language use in this excerpt can be described as sequentially consequential. One involves Thami (138) and learners (142) and the other just Thami's (144). The first involves turn-sharing to co-produce the multilingual item, '°**Kwi**-Britain°/Britain' (138; 142). Turn-sharing is used for similar purposes as those exemplified in Excerpts 15 and 16. Thami uses turn-sharing to involve learners in co-accomplishing the review activity, and learners, in turn, use it to display their orientation to Thami's goal. Simultaneous production of the multilingual item is a case of discourse-related CS because it helps mark the episode as accomplishing a review rather than as introducing new information.

The second instance is not so clearly discourse-related CS (138; 142). Thami uses the isiXhosa-isiMpondo formulaic '**Sisahamba sonke bafundi?**/ Are we together learners?' (144) frequently and pervasively during long expositions because there is a greater need in such contexts to check regularly whether or not learners are attentive to and following the unfolding discourse. It is not clear that Thami or learners orient to '**Sisahamba sonke bafundi?**/ Are we together learners?' as a distinctly isiXhosa-isiMpondo phrase. The phrase is clearly not an invitation for learners to switch languages but a formulaic to do 'checking' and hence learners respond with their own formulaic phrase which is in English, 'Yes sir' (146).

Thami's language use in (135) to (138), particularly in TCU1 to TCU5, is not sequentially contrastive and therefore does not generate local meanings in the Auerian sense. Also it is difficult to say what items in TCU 4 (136-137) and TCU5 (137-8) are insertions because it is hard to tell apart a 'matrix language' from an 'embedded' language (Myers-Scotton, 2009:484). Even though it is difficult to demonstrate how contributing varieties are used in a sequentially contrastive way, the claim is that the language pattern is socially meaningful. It is characteristic of the speech of educated isiXhosa-isiMpondo and English bilingual speakers (de Klerk, 2006) and is therefore LM rather than CS (Auer, 1999). Consider also Excerpt 20 and 5.21 below of other instances of switches with no obvious local meanings.

Excerpt 20 documents Brian's typical language use from the same lesson. His turn is done in English, except for brief isiXhosa-isiMpondo insertions, discourse markers, in particular. At this point in the lesson Brian is talking about the great migration of Bantu-speaking people, thousands of years ago, from the Congo basin towards the south of the African continent.

**Excerpt 20: isiXhosa-isiMpondo insertions/transfers in an otherwise English turn**

- 530 \*Brian: Okay but they came down like like to the south a:bou::t I think about ten  
531 thousand years before the birth of Christ **neh**? Before Christ was born. It is LO::NG  
532 TI::ME ago **neh**?. That that they came down from the ∇Congo basin∇. But before  
533 then **neh abantu** who were living **apha** in the south **neh** ? It's it's like what they call  
534 the the Khoe[san].
- 535 %trn: Okay but they came down like like to the south a:bou::t I think about ten  
536 thousand years before the birth of Christ, yes? Before Christ was born. It is LO::NG  
537 TI::ME ago, yes? That that they came down from the ∇Congo basin∇. But before  
538 then, yes, people who were living here in the south, yes, it's it's like what they call  
539 the the Khoesan.
- 540 \* Thami: [Khoesan

The turn is part of an exposition or a lecture to which sequentially and culturally appropriate listener responses include interpolations of tokens of attentiveness such as ‘mhm’, ‘yes’, or voluntary co-production of TCU or turn endings, such as Thami’s ‘Khoesan’ (540) co-produced with Brian’s (534). Thami’s move, in addition to displaying attentiveness to the unfolding discourse, does two other things. It ratifies the content of Brian’s turn as ‘correct’ and gently reminds the class (and Brian) he is in charge and that Brian is speaking at his behest.

This exchange is essentially done in English. The isiXhosa-isiMpondo items ‘**neh/yes**’ (531,532, and 533), ‘**abantu/people**’ (532), and ‘**apha/here**’ (533) have no apparent local, sequential meaning. These insertions do not mark a shift in conversational footing. It can be said, at the best, that ‘**neh/yes**’ is part of Brian’s communicative style and is used as a rhetorical device to check if learners are paying attention to the unfolding discourse. It is far-fetched, however, to say ‘**Abantu/people**’ or ‘**apha/here**’ could be accounted for in a similar way.

It is claimed that these items can be fully accounted for when Brian’s turn is viewed in the context of the lesson as a whole and classroom practices in particular. From that point of view, his use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo can be seen as

an attempt to ‘soften’ extensive use of English to do his turns. This is because teachers do not use as much English in this in the corpus. In other words, even though these items are not doing locally or sequentially meaningful participant- or discourse-related work, it is claimed that they help make Brian’s turn sound a lot more like patterns of English commonly found in these classrooms.

Finally, consider Excerpt 21 from a grade 9 Social Science lesson about human rights. VST1 (i.e., Visitor1), is a colleague of mine. She comments in a multilingual variety on a learner response made in a previous turn (172-174) and the learners acknowledge her turn in English (178).

IsiXhosa-isiMpondo and English are used in such a way that it is difficult to establish the language-dominance of the turn, and, therefore, whether and how contributing varieties are used in sequentially contrastive ways. Multilingualism is a distinct code or variety in its own right. As a consequence, it is difficult to ascribe local or sequential functional meaning to items of the contributing varieties because they appear to be used only in a strictly referential manner (rather than in a locally contrastive way).

***Excerpt 21: Multilingual variety without sequential or local meaning (Lesson 6)***

- 172      \*VST1: So **ibalulekile la-point ayirey(i)zayo** about i-respect. (Be)cause **ungathi**
- 173      **unamalungelo kanti amalungelo wakho uwa eksesay(i)za** in a manner that (.)
- 174      **afike abe** in conflict **axabane namalungelo abanye abantu, siyavana?**
- 175      %trn: So the point she/he raises about respect is an important one. (Be)cause you
- 176      should not exercise your rights in manner that (.) they are in conflict in conflict
- 177      with the rights of others, do you understand?
- 178      \*LNS: Yes.

VST1's turn (172-4) is accomplished in a multilingual variety that is put together in the following way. English discourse markers 'so' and (172) 'because' (172) and the item 'i-respect' (172) recycles 'respect,' a word used by a learner a few turns earlier. 'I-respect/respect' can be thought of as linking this turn to previous ones and if that interpretation is correct, it is the only item in the turn that can be described as discourse-related CS. The phrase 'in conflict', which VST1 immediately translates to isiXhosa-isiMpondo as '**axabane**' (174), is the only participant-related switch in order to accommodate learner English language competence.

The multilingual variety is also done through syntactic assimilation of English items '**la**-point/ that point' and **i-respect/respect**' (172), and syntactic-plus-phonological adaptation of 'raise' as '**ayirey(i)zayo**/ what she/he raises' (172) and 'exercise' as '**eksesay(i)za**' (173). Because English items are assimilated into isiXhosa-isiMpondo grammar, rather than vice versa, according to some grammatical approaches to CS (e.g., Poplack and Meechan, 1995) isiXhosa-isiMpondo is the dominant language of the TCUs. Even so, it is hard to see how the other switches can be accounted for along similar lines. For example, the English items 'so', 'about' 'because' (172) or the phrases 'in a manner that' (173) and 'in conflict (173-4).

Even though it is difficult to demonstrate clear local, contrastive use of varieties and items involved in the multilingual variety documented in Excerpts 19, 20 and 21, this does not mean that this kind of pattern lacks social meaning. Like Thami's, VST1's language use is like that of educated African language-speakers when holding informal discussions about topics that circulate in society, in particular in the media, through the medium of English. 'Human rights' is an example of such a topic. The speech of educated African-language speakers about such topics tends to be in CS as an unmarked choice. As shown, this form is characterised by pervasive use of English nouns, discourse markers, and intra and inter-sentential switching into African-language (in this case, isiXhosa-isiMpondo) constructions.

### 5.4.3 Findings

Forms of language use observed in this section share features with what Auer (1999:314-318) calls 'language mixing' (LM). Two of Auer's (1999) predictions about LM are confirmed. First, that CS and LM can co-exist for a long period in the speech practices of bilingual individuals. As shown in Excerpt 19, 20 and 21, as well as in previous excerpts, CS, defined as sequentially meaningful language juxtaposition, and LM, defined as sequentially non-meaningful language juxtaposition, occur side by side.

Second, frequent switching has the effect of weakening the power of language juxtaposition to generate local meanings. It is for this reason that it is more difficult to assign meaning to switches in LM. This is illustrated in Excerpt 21, for example, where it is unclear whether or not some of the isiXhosa-isiMpondo items are used in a contrastive way in an otherwise English turn. In relation to English, it is shown in chapter 8 that discourse markers such as 'but', 'and' or 'although' when used in an otherwise isiXhosa-isiMpondo turn, present a similar difficulty. Classroom observation and systematic examination of the corpus suggests that such items are used frequently and pervasively, often in a locally non-contrastive way.

The analysis of language use in this corpus challenges three of Auer's (1999) predictions about LM. First, Auer hypothesises that in LM it is difficult to distinguish between alternational and insertional switches. Auer's conception of LM relies on a sharp distinction between insertional and alternational switching because he associates LM with frequent insertional switching and prototypical CS with alternational switching. In this study, once it was determined to which varieties items belonged, no serious difficulties were encountered in distinguishing between insertional and alternational switches. In any event, determining the local function of switches in the kind of multilingual pattern or LM documented in Excerpts 19, 20 and 21 is not primarily reliant on making that distinction.

Second, Auer (2009:506) claims that because insertional switches are brief and momentary, they do not signal (re)negotiation of a language of interaction, but that on the other hand, alternational switches do. In this corpus, neither form of switch in itself signals (re)negotiation of a language of interaction. As shown in

connection with divergent (section 5.2) and convergent patterns (section 5.3), in these classrooms the language of interaction, or more accurately language use, is not negotiated on a turn-by-turn basis but is orchestrated by teachers according to changing pedagogical and/or communicative demands of an unfolding lesson. This is because, for the most part, teacher-learner whole-class interaction disregards Auer's rule of one-language-at-a-time. Even though Auer (1999:312) concedes that CS and LM overlap, he conceives of 'prototypical CS' against the background of 'separate bilingualism' (Blackledge and Creese, 2011:1200).

Third, another basis on which Auer (1999) distinguishes between CS and LM is that CS is locally meaningful but that LM is globally meaningful, a marker of group identity. Even though the kind of LM documented here is recognisably a speech style of educated African-language speakers, the varieties that make up this pattern are used, on occasion, in contrastive ways to generate local meanings. In conclusion, if the developmental trajectory of bilingual speech involves greater sedimentation and grammaticalisation from CS to LM (Auer, 1999:310) and, if CS and LM overlap over a long transitional period (Ibid:312), then the LM documented here lies somewhere in the middle of the CS to LM continuum. In other words, the kind of LM observed here is shallowly sedimented and only patchily grammaticalised.

## 5.5 Summary findings and conclusions

This section begins with a brief summary of findings and conclusions about each of the three patterns of multilingualism found in the corpus, and, on that basis, considers major theoretical implications for a CA approach to bi/multilingual classroom talk.

### 5.5.1 Findings

#### 5.5.1.1 *Divergent pattern*

Divergent or parallel bi/multilingualism is one of the most common patterns in which interaction in a whole-class format is conducted in the corpus. This pattern is the main practice through which teachers support or cue learners to produce English talk in whole-class formats and in which learners momentarily pass for English speakers. This is achieved through carefully orchestrated teacher

elicitations that enable learners to produce short, routine or known information in English.

A certain kind of asymmetrical relationship in terms of language use emerges between teachers and learners. This relationship arises from attempts to cope with the challenge of learning through English in an English-limited post-colonial classroom. It is characterised by teachers who, in the 'privacy' of their classrooms, allow themselves great latitude to switch languages in the course of interaction but who, largely, create classroom communicative patterns and norms that make it noticeable and sanctionable for learners to switch language away from English in a whole-class format. In this format a 'good' learner is one who produces English only utterances. Although teachers have a greater latitude to switch languages in the course of interaction, many teachers understand this to arise out of learning and teaching through English in an English-limited environment. Not all teacher switches away from English can be shown to be supportive of students' learning, however. While they can be shown to have the aim of scaffolding learning, there are switches which are not pedagogically-oriented but are a feature of teachers' communicative styles.

In this pattern, teachers and learners co-construct, among other things, lessons characterised by teacher volubility and learner taciturnity and teacher displays of knowledge accompanied by low-level factual questioning (Arthur and Martin, 2006:195). That is, they produce 'safetalk' practices (Chick, 1996; Hornberger and Chick, 2001) that may preserve the dignity of participants but contribute little to learning. The fact that learners are obliged to use English only, makes it difficult for them to initiate turns in order, for instance, to ask questions, introduce or elaborate on topics, or produce extended and linguistically complex answers. An outcome of this is that possibilities for exploratory talk and the co-construction of knowledge between teachers and learners is severely constrained (Mercer, 1995).

The divergent pattern is often used successfully to produce safetalk, but from time to time participants fail to produce safetalk. When this happens, the emotional strains of learning and teaching through a relatively unfamiliar language

are laid bare (Probyn, 2001). This is documented in many cases of teacher frustration with learners' inability to competently enact their classroom roles.

#### 5.5.1.2 *Convergent pattern*

Convergent patterns often begin life as momentary deviations from divergent or English-only patterns. Unlike divergent patterns, these patterns tend to be brief and are not common. They can either be discourse- or participant-related.

In whole-class formats, language convergence is often teacher initiated but can also be learner initiated with the aim of expressing alignment or affiliation with a teacher's utterance and/or action. Teachers use the pattern in participant- and discourse-related ways. Participant-related uses include the use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo or a multilingual variety to make local values relevant in interaction, and discourse-related uses include doing disciplining and enlisting learners in co-authoring a teacher's perspective.

Learner language use in paired group and small group formats diverges from that taking place in whole class formats. In the former contexts, learners produce switches and code-mix; that is, their language practices approximate to those observed among young people in ordinary conversation. This underlines the fact that while language use in a whole-class format is central to an understanding of what goes in classrooms and schools, it only applies to one context of classroom language use.

#### 5.5.1.3 *Multilingual pattern*

As in the other two patterns, teachers have greater freedom to switch varieties than learners, who use English only unless prompted to make brief switches in choral and co-produced turns. What is distinctive about this pattern is that teacher turns are characterised by frequent insertional and alternational switching, whose local or sequential functions are difficult to demonstrate.

The corpus confirms two of Auer's (1999) hypotheses: that CS and LM can co-exist over a long period, and that constant juxtaposition of varieties tends to weaken CS as a resource for generating local meanings.

However, Auer's central hypothesis that interactional functions of CS depend on participants making a distinction between insertional and alternational switches is not supported. In the kind of LM documented in this corpus, local functions of CS do not necessarily rely on participants distinguishing between insertional or alternational switches. Insertional or alternational switching, on its own, does not signal that a current language pattern is being maintained, nor that there is negotiation to change it. This is because language use in a whole-class format is not negotiated between participants on a turn-by-turn basis. While some teacher switches in LM have local functions, many simply appear to be an attribute of teachers' communicative styles.

### 5.5.2 Theoretical implications

What follows is a discussion of the theoretical implications of the findings for an Auerian CA approach to bi/multilingual classroom talk. First, Auer's model and in particular his hypothetical patterns (1995, 1984) of bi/multilingual speech largely apply to ordinary bilingual conversation. They do not explain much of what goes on in multilingual classrooms. Difficulties in applying this approach to classroom talk is most evident in the inadequacy of a sequential analysis alone to explain why patterns such as divergent or convergent language practices occur at all.

Accounting for these patterns requires recognition that much of what goes on in institutional talk is not interpretable unless, in addition to sequential analysis, analysts keep in mind that (Heritage, 1997:223-225): (a) institutional talk is suffused with and shaped by institutional goals, roles and practices; (b) what is considered relevant talk or action in institutional talk is constrained by (a) above, and; (c) institutional talk is interpreted according to frames relevant to the institution type. Language practices and roles of teachers and learners documented in this corpus make better sense when analysed against the background that classroom talk occurs in a society in which English is highly desired and desirable, but where access to this variety is unevenly distributed in society and across school-types. In poor rural schools, such as the ones making up this study, learners and teachers live in communities where little English, apart from the mixed English described in section 5.4.1, is used or heard outside the

classroom, and yet the official role and goal of school is to produce English-proficient learners by teaching – or trying to teach - through English only.

Second, to accomplish the language patterns/practices described in this chapter, teachers and learners need to orient to the same norms. Orienting to the same norms does not mean, for example, that learners always take part in teacher-designed turns for co-production or turn-sharing, but that when they fail to do so, or only do so reluctantly, this is noticeable and sanctionable. It is significant that orienting to the same norms means that the norms are acquired over a long period of time through membership of a class. That is, they are part of “Common knowledge that has been generated through the history of talk and shared activity of a teacher and their class” (Mercer and Dawes, 2014:436). Of course, the norms are ratified, constructed and reconstructed, or challenged, in the course of daily interaction. It is for this reason that learners and teachers are able to produce and reproduce these practices with little reliance on explicit verbal or other cues.

In other words, it is not essential for participants to jointly and locally manage the system of turn-taking in order to accurately interpret each other's utterances. In institutional talk, participants have an asymmetrical power-relationship, with one party officially sanctioned to have control over the system of turn-taking. What is essential to interpretation in interaction is that participants orient to the same interpretive norms. This allows participants to interpret each other's moves and therefore to co-create interaction, not on the basis of local management of turn-taking, but by drawing on their previous experiences, schema and formats for taking part in similar exchanges. That is, participants rely on their pre-existing knowledge to produce their own and to interpret others' indexical utterances and/or actions (Silverstein, 2003).

Third, Auer (2000:129) claims that it is not possible to speak of ‘code-switching’, that is, locally meaningful juxtaposition of languages/varieties, unless a ‘language of interaction’ or ‘base language’ is first identified for the interaction or part of it. Also that CS occurs against a background of norms of language use that encourage the use of one language at a time. Thus, for him, CS means language

choice that diverges from an established language of interaction to generate local meanings.

The divergent, convergent and mixed/flexible language patterns by design involve simultaneous use of more than one variety, and yet these patterns can and are used in contrastive ways. More accurately, these patterns are used in locally contrastive and non-contrastive ways depending on the sequential context in which they occur, the institutional goals which are pursued, and the institutional frames which are invoked at that point. It could therefore be concluded that a locally meaningful juxtaposition of languages/varieties can be generated against a background of one language at a time as well as in the context of bi/multilingualism.

Although a 'language' of interaction can be realised through different varieties or a combination of varieties in these classrooms, English is symbolically the most dominant and prestigious (Heller and Martin-Jones, 2001) and legitimate language of school (Heller, 2001). Unlike in Canadian French-English bilingual programmes where the 'legitimate' language of school say, French, is also the language of the teacher and of some of the learners (Heller, 2001), in this study, as in other post-colonial settings (e.g., Arthur, 1996; Chimbutane, 2011; McGlynn and Martin, 2009; Ndayipfukamiye, 1996), the legitimate language of school is often neither a language of the teacher nor that of any learner. In a contrasting situation to that found in Canada, non-legitimate varieties are widely used in post-colonial classrooms, especially by teachers, but also by learners on the "unified floor" (Heller, 2001:395) or in the whole-class format. Even though English is used less often than other varieties in the corpus (this is shown in chapter 8), it is the most dominant variety against which other varieties are seen. In general, other varieties have the status of 'smuggled' goods (Probyn, 2009), and have legitimacy insofar as they are perceived to support the acquisition of English and/or English-mediated content. The classroom dominance and legitimacy of English is assured by the fact that written materials and formal assessment are available only in this variety.

Fourth and finally, directly arising out of the question about a 'language of interaction', Auer (1995) claims that bi/multilingual participants have a preference for same language talk or monolingual talk. That is, participants may begin talk in different codes but tend to converge around one variety. This is not the case in this corpus. In some classrooms we have observed that divergent or parallel bi/multilingualism, along with English monolingual patterns, together make up normative or unmarked language practices.

At best, we can say there is a multi-layered preference system in these multilingual classrooms. Perhaps, for instance, there is a preference system for English monolingual interaction and another for the other classroom varieties. In English monolingual talk between learners and teachers in whole-class interaction, when a teacher initiates a first-pair part in English, learners are expected to respond in English. In contrast, when a teacher initiates a first pair-part in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, as teachers often do in the corpus, a preferred learner second-pair part is not isiXhosa-isiMpondo but English. In the latter case, selecting a language that diverges from a teacher's is the 'preferred' or normative choice. This is because outside of the turn-by-turn development of interaction, 'global' institutional norms enable learners to interpret that choosing isiXhosa-isiMpondo in such a context constitutes a marked or dispreferred option. Details of the sequential development of interaction alone would not provide a learner with such an interpretive frame.

For the other classroom varieties, the language preference system can be summarised as follows. Unless cued by a teacher to produce their turns in another variety, learners produce all their turns in English. If learners use any other variety in a whole-class format without such cuing, this is noticeable and may also be sanctionable.

Throughout this chapter, reference has been made to the central role of turn-taking in the production and reproduction of language patterns/practices discussed in this chapter. In the next chapter turn-taking and its intersections with CS is examined in detail.

## 6. Code-switching and Classroom Turn-taking

### 6.1 Introduction

This chapter begins with a brief overview of how classroom turn-taking is different from ordinary conversation. Then the core of the chapter is presented, in which different turn-taking systems are identified, described and analysed in terms of how they are involved in producing patterns of language use, in particular CS, and how CS, in turn, is involved in producing particular kinds of turn-taking systems. It concludes with a discussion of the theoretical implications of the findings for a CA approach to bi/multilingual talk in classroom interaction.

### 6.2 An overview: Turn-taking in ordinary conversation vs turn-taking in classroom talk

A primary difference between ordinary conversation and classroom talk is that in the former, turn-taking is largely managed locally by parties to it (Sacks, et al, 1978) and in the latter, it is teacher managed (McHoul, 1978). Teachers direct who speaks, in what order, about what, and for how long. As McHoul (1978:188) puts it, in classrooms, “Rules i-iv [refer to Table 6.1 below] break down, that is, into a summary rule: Only teachers can direct speakership in any creative way”. Because teachers control the turn-taking system, they have no need to compete with learners for turns and this is partly reflected in the fact that teacher turns are shot through with pauses, silences and digressions, all without risk of challenges for or loss of speakership.

It is not that learners cannot and do not self-select as next-speakers in whole-class formats, but that self-selection is noticeable and often sanctionable. Table 5 presents a comparative summary of turn-taking in ordinary conversation and in classrooms.

**Table 5: Rules of 'ordinary' conversation compared to classroom talk**

Ordinary conversation	Classroom talk
<p>Rule 1: Change of speaker at the first Transition Relevant Place (TRP). This can take three forms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If 'current speaker' selects a 'next speaker', the current speaker must stop talking.</li> <li>b. If 'current speaker' does not select a 'next speaker', any participant can self-select.</li> <li>c. If 'current speaker' does not select 'next speaker' and no speaker self-selects, the 'current speaker' may continue but need not do so.</li> </ul>	<p>Rule 1: For any teacher's turn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If the turn is allocated to a specific learner, no other learner may speak.</li> <li>b. If the turn is not designed to involve a 'next speaker', then the teacher must continue.</li> </ul>
<p>Rule 2: Applies recursively to all subsequent TRPs when Rule 1(c) has been applied.</p> <p>Rule 1(a) to (c) applies until speaker change occurs.</p>	<p>Rule 2: If Rule 1(a) is applied, and any selected learner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. selects teacher as next speaker, then the teacher has the right but no obligation to speak.</li> <li>b. does not select next speaker, then the turn reverts back to the teacher at the next TRP.</li> <li>c. does not select next speaker then she/he may continue, unless the teacher self-selects as next speaker.</li> </ul>
	<p>Rule 3: For any teacher's turn: If Rule 1(a) or 1(b) has not been applied at TRP, then Rule 1(a) and 1(b) apply recursively.</p>
	<p>Rule 4: For any student's turn: If Rule 2(a) or 2(b) has not applied, and following provision of Rule 2(c), then Rule 2(a) to 2(c) apply recursively.</p>

(Adapted from: Levinson, 1983:298; McHoul, 1978:188; Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1978:13)

In both types of conversation, there is a strong 'preference' for one speaker at a time. This is because, in both, participants need to hear or follow what is being said or done by other participants, in order to produce utterances and/or behaviours that are interactionally relevant to an ongoing interaction. Evidence for the normativity of the principle of one speaker at a time is that, in both types of conversation, overlap is minimal. When overlap occurs for a considerable stretch of talk, one, some, or all of the participants in the talk withdraw (Seedhouse, 2004). Overlap is often sequentially or locally meaningful to the ongoing interaction. As shown in chapter 5, teachers design turns for simultaneous production in order to enlist learners in co-authoring a teacher's perspective.

A distinctive feature of classroom turn-taking is the prevalence of a three-part Initiation-Response-Feedback/Evaluation sequence (IRF/E) for turn-taking (Mehan, 1979:52; Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975:50). This sequence has been criticised on pedagogical grounds as authoritarian and a form of teacher-centred pedagogy (e.g., Cazden, 1988). The occurrence and relative frequency of IRE/F sequences is not in itself an indicator of poor/good pedagogy. In a recent review of classroom talk, Mercer and Dawes (2014:436) argue that research shows that it is not so much the IRE/F that is at issue, but the quality of elicitations, learner responses and evaluative actions that differentiates dialogic from conventional classrooms. The relative frequency of an IRE/F pattern, at best, tells us something about the overall participation structure of a lesson. IRE/F patterns must be interpreted in their sequential contexts and in relation to actions which they implement.

In multilingual classrooms where classroom varieties are valued differently, perform different functions, and where participants have different competencies in the classroom varieties (Heller, 2001), turn-taking is an important mechanism through which teachers orchestrate and manage different forms of classroom participation (Lerner, 1995), in particular, who may speak, in what language, in what sequential context and for how long.

### **6.3 Turn-taking Types and Code-switching**

In this corpus, turn-taking in a whole-class format comes in two forms, viz., teacher-led and learner-led turn-taking. Teacher-led turn allocations are by far the most common and have four sub-types, described as Type 1 to Type 4 in Table 6.2 below. Type 1 turns are designed for bids and are allocated to a single successful bidder. In Type 2, learners are cued to produce group or choral responses. In Type 3, a teacher cues learners to co-produce a turn with him/her. And in Type 4, teachers allocate a turn to a learner without first soliciting bids.

Learner-led turn-taking, or Type 5, is the least common form of turn-taking, accounting for only 6% of all turns. More than half of these turns occur in one lesson, Lesson 11, in the context of a learner-managed small group discussion. In

other words, the form is rare in a whole-class format. See Table 6.1 below for a summary of each turn-taking type.

**Table 6: Turn-taking types**

	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5	Total
	Bids	Choral response	Co-production	Turn allocation without bids	Learner self-selection	
<b>Count</b>	460	556	44	48	76	1184
<b>%</b>	39	47	4	4	6	100

The following section identifies and describes features of each turn-taking type, and examines how each type is involved in accomplishing different language patterns and the local actions implemented through each type.

### 6.3.1 Type 1: Teacher Elicitation and Learner Bids

#### 6.3.1.1 Features

Although in quantitative terms this form of turn-taking accounts only for the second largest number of turns in this corpus (460, or 39%), it is the normative form. That is, the other forms can be considered sub-varieties of this form because they are only interpretable in relation to it and share many features of this form. Learner self-selection is quite distinct from this form and contrasts with features of this form. A canonical version of Type 1 involves classroom participants doing the following set of moves:

First, a teacher issues an elicitation. An elicitation can be in the form of an imperative, as in Excerpt 22 (42), a declarative, as in Excerpt 23 (917), or an interrogative as in Excerpt 24 (215). Elicitations can also be done non-verbally through gesture, such as pointing at an item next on a list.

Second, whatever the form of elicitation, learners need to interpret elicitation as an invitation to make bids for a turn at talk. Learners compete for a turn by putting up their hands, often accompanied by finger-snapping and/or calling out to the teacher.

Third, a teacher selects one learner as the next speaker. In general, soon after a turn is allocated to a specific learner, bids stop. When bids continue after a turn has been allocated, this is often interactionally meaningful. It could mean that learners do not believe the selected learner will produce an appropriate response, that they are eager to put their names on a teacher's 'scoreboard' of 'good' learners, or, in some cases, that they are questioning a teacher's authority or sense of fairness in allocating turns. They may perceive that the teacher allocates turns to the same set of individuals, over and over again, for example.

Fourth, the selected learner makes a response.

Fifth, if the response is deemed appropriate and complete, and does not lead to a repair sequence, it is followed by an implicit or explicit evaluation/feedback, bringing an episode to an end. Some examples follow.

Excerpt 22 below is from a grade 8 English language reading lesson. The episode is accomplished through the divergent language pattern. L01 was selected as 'next speaker' or in this case, 'next reader', after competitive bidding for the turn in a previous episode. Anele (40; 44) does her turns in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and L01 does her reading in English (42; 46).

***Excerpt 22: Divergent pattern - doing reading and managing reading (Lesson 3)***

40 \*Anele: **Yha**.

41 %trn: Yes.

42 \*L01: There is just something I would like you know a::bout. I:s this a good time to

43 speak with you? ((Reading.))

44 \*Anele: **Uyabuza** (TCU1). **Eeh**: (TCU2.)

45 %trn: She/he asks. Yes.

46 \*L01: Yes yes of course what is it? Whitney's mother wa::s quite concerned ((Reading)).

isiXhosa-isiMpondo is the language of the teacher, which she uses to manage the episode. **Yha**/yes' (40) and '**Eeh**/yes' (44, TCU2) evaluates learner

reading and tells the learner to continue reading. '**Uyabuza**/she asks' (44, TCU1) is an elliptical comment about the contents of L01's turn (42-43). The comment does not say who 'she/he' is, because this is obvious from previous turns. The comment is meant to keep learners engaged with the reading and to telegraph that something dramatic is about to happen.

On the other hand, English is the language of the learner. This is partly because it is the language of the text and therefore of the reading (42; 46). By reading the text with appropriate pronunciation and fluency, L01 enacts the role of a competent English language learner. Anele enacts her role of 'teacher' through a combination of control over turn-taking and her exclusive right to the use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo in this context. Once a learner is selected to read, the appropriateness of their reading is subject to constant evaluation through the interjection of evaluative continuers such as '**Yha**/yes' (40) and '**Eeh**/yes'. In this way, Anele continually renews L01's right to the turn as well as her directorship of turn-taking. Also note that L01 (42-3) immediately stops reading when Anele (44) makes a comment (TCU1) and then resumes reading at the end of a continuer (TCU2). By designing the episode such that learners take their turns in English and hers in isiMpondo-isiXhosa, Anele constructs learners as 'English language learners', who are required to practice their English through reading aloud in this instance, and marks herself as a competent English speaker, who is not required to 'practice' her English, but rather who uses isiXhosa-isiMpondo to create opportunities and possibilities (Lerner, 1995:111) for learners to become English competent.

If analysis of this episode relied only on sequential analysis, Anele's and the learners' language practices would most likely be regarded as a case of language negotiation. Or, Anele's use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo would not be regarded as locally non-contrastive because she uses mainly this variety across this lesson and not just in this episode. As shown in the previous chapter, this pattern of language use can be both interactionally and socially meaningful in the light of the lesson as a whole, of participant observation, and when account is taken of institutional goals and the broader sociolinguistic context.

Excerpt 23 documents how Type 1 turn allocation is enacted through convergent language use. There are two instances of convergent language use in this episode and in both, the teacher follows learner language selection.

**Excerpt 23: Convergent language use - Inspecting an answer and rejecting it (Lesson 7)**

- 915 \*Bamba: BECAUSE IT DOES NOT MAKE NOISE. BECAUSE IT DOES NOT MAKE  
916 NOISE. Like what? (3.0) ∇It does not make noise like what?∇ Which natural  
917 disasters make noise? BIG noise.  
918 \*LNS: (Learners put up their hands.)  
919 \*Bamba: ((Selects L43 by pointing at him.))  
920 \*L43: **Is(i)bhamu.**  
921 %trn: A gun.  
922 \*Bamba: *IS(I):BHA:MU* (TCU1). **ΔHHE HHAYI** I-NATURAL DISASTER *IS(I)BHAMU*  
923 **NGOK(U) BHUTI** (TCU2)?Δ EEH:: (TCU3)?  
924 %trn: A GUN. REALLY NOW A GUN IS A NATURAL DISASTER BROTHER? REALLY?  
925 \*L43: I-drought.  
926 %trn: Drought.  
927 \*Bamba: I-drought **EE:: HHE? PHAKAMA poni ume ngenyawo?**  
928 %trn: Drought REALLY? ON YOUR FEET dude/mate.

This excerpt is from a grade 8 Social Science lesson about natural disasters. It is a review lesson. It's 'reviewness' is marked partly through language use. Exclusive use of English to formulate the elicitation turn (915-17) communicates Bamba's implicit expectation that learners should be able to make their responses in English. Unlike in monolingual conversation (e.g., Drew, 2013), language choice is an important aspect of turn design in bilingual conversation (Auer, 1984). As if to guarantee successful enactment of this IRE/F sequence, Bamba designs his turn such that in response, learners are required only to produce a single word or short phrase.

Despite having made a bid for the turn and securing it, L43 (920) is apparently uncertain of his answer. This is displayed by the unusual step of making his response in isiXhosa-isiMpondo (920). In a whole-class format and in the context of a review lesson, learners are expected to be able to take their turns in English. Doing a response in isiXhosa-isiMpondo in this case is noticeable and sanctionable.

The turns of L43 (920) and Bamba (922) represent the first case of language convergence. Bamba (922) holds up L43's response to the collective scrutiny of the class by repeating it twice. Repetition of the item in an incredulous tone indicates that it is questionable and likely to be rejected. Convergence is achieved by repeating the item in the language in which it was made. Note though that L43 and Bamba orient to the 'languageness' of 'isibhamu/a gun' in different ways. L43 orients to it as a regular isiXhosa-isiMpondo item, whereas Bamba orients to it as a distinctly isiMpondo lexical item and therefore as 'linguistically illegitimate' (Heller, 2001), in addition to being factually incorrect. He indicates this by repeating the offending item (922), loudly, pronouncing it syllable by syllable to emphasize that he rejects its form as well as its substance. This reading is also supported by participant observation. Bamba is a speaker of a variety of isiXhosa-isiMpondo that is close to the standard and is the most concerned teacher in this group about distinguishing between isiXhosa and isiMpondo in what in fact is an English L2-medium classroom. Thus the design of his turn for language convergence (922) is not to mark acceptance or affiliation with L43's response, but to do precisely the opposite. His rejection of L43's response is made explicit in TCU2 (924) and TCU3 (925), both of which are formulated as 'questions' but are in fact expressions of outrage at L43's answer and choice of language.

The other case of language convergence is found in L43's (925) and Bamba's (927) 'i-drought/ drought'. L43 (925) makes another attempt to answer the question but again gets it wrong. Prefixing the word 'drought' with the isiXhosa-isiMpondo noun class marker and of syntactic assimilation, 'i-', here indicates an intention to show alignment with Bamba's use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo at the end of his previous turn (923). Bamba (927) rejects L43's second response,

however, in the same format used to do the first evaluation. In rejecting it he quotes L43's answer verbatim, using the precise multilingual form in which it was made, i.e., with the isiXhosa-isiMpondo noun class prefix marker (-i) attached to the English 'drought' to make it 'i-drought'. This results in a second convergent language pattern. This item is followed by a rhetorical question expressing disbelief and implicitly rejecting the response. Finally, he (927) orders L43 to get on his feet and stand for the rest of the lesson, joining several other learners already on their feet after having gotten their answers wrong in previous episodes. This is another 'unsafe' moment for the learners.

Ordering L43 to stand does several things. It marks explicit rejection of his answer, his 'disciplining' for getting it wrong, and termination of the episode. Bamba's imperative incorporates a diminutive term of endearment, 'poni' (927), that is associated with (Eastern Cape) urban culture. 'Poni' probably derives from the English 'pony', meaning 'small horse', and this context has the rough meaning of 'dude'. In this case the term is not used as an endearment but ironically, and it makes relevant several differences between L43 and Bamba: age, social status, classroom roles, and origin. 'Origin' refers to the fact that Bamba is from an urban centre rather than a rural area and speaks a form of isiXhosa closer to the standard variety. Use of 'dude' in this context can be properly referred to as a case of 'multi-voicedness' or 'heteroglossia' (Bailey, 2007:257-258; Blackledge and Creese, 2014:3-4; Busch, 2014:223).

In this episode, CS is used in variety of ways. L43 uses isiXhosa-isiMpondo in a self-facilitative way (920), and a multilingual variety in a discourse-related way (925) in an attempt to show alignment with Bamba. Bamba, on the other hand (922-23; 927,) uses isiXhosa-isiMpondo, a multilingual variety, and slang in discourse-related ways to mark a negative evaluation of L43's responses, and to do disciplining and disaffiliation.

While Excerpt 23 illustrates convergent language use, the episode in Excerpt 24 below is done exclusively in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. It follows several episodes conducted largely in an English-dominant multilingual variety in which VST1 tries but fails to elicit learner participation. The excerpt is from a grade 9

Social Science lesson. In general in this corpus, use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo only by learners and teachers together in a 'curriculum context' (Walsh, 2006) is marked. IsiXhosa-isiMpondo is often not marked when it occurs in classroom management contexts such as the beginning of lessons, transitions from one topic / activity to another or the conclusion of lessons.

***Excerpt 24: IsiXhosa-isiMpondo only to encourage learner participation (Lesson 6)***

- 215 \*VST1: **Ngubani lo abambuleleyo?**
- 216 %trn: Who is it that they killed?
- 217 \*Thami: **Ngubani? Ngowaphi k(u)qala?**
- 218 %trn: Who? To begin with where is she/he is from?
- 219 \*L08: ((Unintelligible talk in isiXhosa-isiMpondo.))
- 220 \*VST1: **Hmh hmh.**
- 221 %trn: No no.
- 222 \*Thami: **Hhaah.**
- 223 %trn: No.

In the case of Excerpt 24 (215-223), switching to isiXhosa/isiMpondo in a curriculum context is meant to elicit learner participation. The troubled nature of the episode is marked linguistically by CS from a multilingual classroom variety to exclusive use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo. VST1 stays in isiXhosa-isiMpondo throughout the episode in order to encourage learner participation.

Although teachers often use isiXhosa-isiMpondo in a curriculum context to initiate elicitation, initiate repair, or evaluate learner responses, for instance, it is uncommon for teachers to use isiXhosa/isiMpondo only in an IRE/F sequence allocated through a Type 1 turn allocation system. This is probably because Type 1 turn allocation is largely used to conduct sequences that involve the elicitation of known or shared background information, knowledge from previous episodes or lessons, or the application of a known procedure (e.g., a grammatical rule) to a new situation, and, therefore, it is often unnecessary to use isiXhosa-isiMpondo

only in such contexts. A common variety in such contexts is English. Thus Type 1 turn allocation is associated with the implementation of English-only episodes.

To interpret Excerpt 24 above as a switch from English and/or a classroom multilingual variety to isiXhosa-isiMpondo only, requires reference to episodes that precede it, patterns of language in the corpus, to official language policy and curriculum expectations and how they shape linguistic behaviour, over and above the sequential circumstances of the episode. Again, sequential analysis alone could not produce the kind of analysis developed here.

Having examined an isiMpondo-isi-Xhosa-only episode, I now turn to an example of the use of English only. English-only episodes are more common than isiMpondo-isiXhosa-only, but less common than multilingual episodes. As mentioned above, English often enacts relatively straightforward pedagogical episodes, as shown in Excerpt 25. In particular, it is associated with short, conceptually and linguistically simple and routine episodes, as documented in the excerpt. Chick's (1996) initial formulation of 'safetalk' referred to this kind of English used in South African English L2-medium schools.

***Excerpt 25: Monolingual English to do 'easy' work (Lesson 9)***

- 66      \*Sindi: ↑Another one:?
- 67      \*LNS: ((Some learners put up their hands.))
- 68      \*Sindi: Ye:s L05.
- 69      \*L05: Shearing force.
- 70      \*Sindi: Ye:s it is a shearing force.

Sindi's elliptical question (66), follows a series of similar episodes, and thus also marks the turn as doing something routine or easy. Learners put up their hands (67), Sindi (68) selects L05, L05 produces a response (69) which Sindi ratifies as correct and repeats for good measure (70). This is an example of a smooth English IRE/F sequence. Although English accounts for only about 30% of episodes in this corpus, the use of other varieties in the classroom often make sense in relation to English. Other varieties are never used in their own right, as shown in

chapter 5, but are often used in order to avoid English for competence-related reasons, or to support learners as they produce English-only turns. In this excerpt, the use of English only indexes the fact that the episode accomplishes an easy task.

As in monolingual classrooms (e.g., Cazden, 1988, Mehan, 1979; Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975), Type 1 turn-taking in multilingual classrooms is primarily used to elicit and evaluate known information or knowledge. Language(s) or language patterns which teachers use to initiate or set up episodes tell us something about their perceptions of how 'easy' or 'difficult' it is likely to be to accomplish the task. Episodes done in English only in the curriculum context indicate a relatively easy task, whereas those done in isiXhosa-isiMpondo only or in a multilingual variety indicate unfamiliar or complex tasks. Thus, patterns of language use have an 'indexical' function (Hanks, 2001). Also, they can be regarded as 'contextualization cues' in the Gumperzian (1992) sense, but not in an Auerean (1996) sense, which limits the term 'contextualisation' to turn-by-turn sequential development.

#### *6.3.1.2 Findings*

Findings about how episodes initiated through Type 1 turn-taking are organised and used in multilingual classrooms are summarised as follows. First, Type 1 is used in similar ways in multilingual classrooms as it is in monolingual ones. That is, it is used to co-construct, revise and make knowledge displays in a whole-class format. A difference in the two kinds of classrooms is that in multilingual classrooms this can be accomplished in range of varieties, viz., convergent, divergent, English, a multilingual variety and isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

Second, episodes initiated and/or done in English only, in contrast to other classroom varieties, often indicate that teachers regard tasks to be accomplished in those episodes as relatively familiar, easy, or as requiring application of known procedures (to new situations).

Third, even though indexical meanings can be attributed to the various classroom varieties, e.g., use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is associated with doing disciplining, or use of English with doing 'easy' tasks, the relationship between

varieties, on the one hand, and the contexts in which they are used and the actions they help accomplish, on the other hand, is not a causal one. However, this does not mean the varieties are interpretable only in terms of turn-by-turn sequential development. Varieties used in the classroom do not all have the same 'legitimacy' and therefore carry different indexical meanings depending on *where* they occur in a sequence. 'Where', in this case, refers to something broader than an immediately preceding or following TCU or turn. It refers to a lesson as a whole, the semantic content of turns and episodes, and, crucially, communicative and/or pedagogical actions accomplished in an episode.

Fourth, teachers design episodes through Type 1 largely in order to produce English language 'safetalk'. In order to accomplish this, teachers are required to do the bulk of the talking, which inevitably, but unintentionally, leads to a classroom culture characterised by 'teacher volubility' and 'student taciturnity' (Hornberger and Chick, 2001). The intention is of course to create opportunities for learners to use, produce or experience English or English L2-medium content.

Finally, while each classroom variety or pattern must be examined in its sequential context, the use of varieties other than English makes sense in relation to how they contribute to 'staging' (Arthur, 1996:25) English Type 1 exchanges.

### 6.3.2 Type 2: Teacher Elicitation-Learner Choral Response

#### 6.3.2.1 *Features*

Type 2 is the most common form of turn-taking in the corpus, accounting for 46% of turns. Teachers use group/choral responses to do routine activities such as eliciting background or known information and confirming listening/understanding. They cue learners, through a small set of recurring words, phrases or prosodic cues, to make a group or choral response. Learners use choral responses in a defensive way, such as when they are not sure of their answers and therefore do not want to make bids for individual turns.

**Excerpt 26: Multilingual variety - doing checking/confirming listening (Lesson 9)**

- 81 \*Sindi: That means (.) as you know that the structure (.) is made up out (.)  
82 fro:m the ma::terial and the ma::terial are acted upon by forces. ↑Even the  
83 structures can be acted upon by the::? ∇By the forces∇, **siyevana?**  
84 %trn: That means (.) as you know that the structure (.) is made up out (.)  
86 fro:m the ma::terial and the ma::terial are acted upon by forces. ↑Even the  
87 structures can be acted upon by the::? ∇By the forces∇, do you understand?  
88 \*LNS: Yes **mis(i)**  
89 %trn: Yes teacher.

Excerpt 26 is an example of Type 2 turn-taking used to check listening, to check whether or not the teacher can continue with an exposition, or to confirm understanding. This type occurs when teachers make a series of lengthy multi-TCU and multi-turn expositions in lecture mode. Teachers and learners often use various formulaic phrases to accomplish these sequences. In the excerpt, Sindi tags to the end of her English turn the isiXhosa-isiMpondo phrase, ‘**siyevana?**/do you understand?’ (83), producing a multilingual TCU that marks a momentary shift from doing an exposition to doing checking. Learners respond with a multilingual formulaic, ‘Yes **mis(i)**/Yes teacher’ (88). Other common learner formulaic phrases used to do confirmations include the multilingual, ‘yes **titshala**/ yes teacher or sir’ and the English, ‘Yes sir’.

Sindi’s switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo opens up the possibility for learners to switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo to ask a question, for instance. Asking questions is one of a few situations in which it is momentarily unmarked for learners to use isiXhosa-isiMpondo or a classroom multilingual variety in a whole-class format. But learners rarely ever ask questions, as mentioned in chapter 5, and this is partly because of a classroom culture that stigmatises the use of isiMpondo-isiXhosa by a learner in a whole-class format.

The ‘languageness’ of items such as Sindi’s, ‘**siyevana?**/ do you understand?’, (83) is often not oriented to by participants, that is, such items are

not treated as belonging to language A or B. This is because such items are used frequently and pervasively, in this exact format, regardless of whether they occur in an English, an isiXhosa-isiMpondo or a multilingual episode. Other formulaic phrases with an isiXhosa-isiMpondo origin that do checking/confirming are presented in chapter 4, section 4.2.4.

Doing periodic checking/confirming can be thought of as a form of doing classroom ‘cohorting’ and ‘re-cohorting’ (Içbay, 2008:79). That is, at the beginning of lessons, teachers assemble or cohort a group of learners into a class in session, through practices such as doing greetings, seat taking, and so on. Also, throughout a lesson, teachers use classroom formulaic language to periodically re-cohort a class as a “listening and instructed cohort” (Ibid:83). This is especially necessary when teachers make long expositions, as in Excerpt 26. Thus Sindi’s, ‘*siyevana?*/ do you understand?’ tag switch (83) and the learners’, ‘Yes *misi*/ Yes teacher’ (88), in addition to doing checking/confirming, periodically and interactively re-cohorts the group as a class in session.

In Excerpt 27 below, Bamba attempts to generate learner interest in a geography map lesson by activating the learners’ prior knowledge of Eastern Cape place names. He does this (48) by asking learners to provide an isiXhosa-isiMpondo place name for a small town called King Williams Town.

***Excerpt 27: isiXhosa-isiMpondo - building on prior knowledge (Lesson 7)***

48 \*Bamba: E-King Williams Town **kuphi kanene ngesiXhosa?** ((His back to the class))

49 %trn: What is King Williams Town in isiXhosa, by the way?

50 \*LNS: °**EQonce**° ((some learners)).

51 %trn: °Qonce° ((some learners)).

52 \*Bamba: ↑**Ku:phi?**

53 %trn: ↑Where?

54 \*LNS: **EQONCE**.

55 %trn: QONCE.

Excerpt 27 is a preliminary episode and this fact is marked in two ways. First, the turn is clearly designed for a group response, because Bamba has his back to the class, and second, he asks learners in isiXhosa-isiMpondo to produce an isiXhosa-isiMpondo response item in isiXhosa-isiMpondo (48), which is rare in this classroom and corpus. Learners produce their turn as a group (50, 54) while Bamba manages the episode in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, doing an elicitation (48), initiating repair (54), evaluating and endorsing the response and displaying it on the chalkboard (56).

The success of isiXhosa-isiMpondo as a contextualisation cue in this episode relies on the fact that its use diverges from normative language use in this classroom. Normative, unmarked teacher classroom varieties include English and a classroom multilingual variety. Use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo in a pedagogical context, helps mark the episode as distinct. Simultaneous use of choral turn-taking and CS to isiXhosa-isiMpondo marks the activity of 'building on prior experience' from immediately preceding and following activities.

Excerpt 28 below is from an English grammar lesson which focuses on transforming verbs to adjectives. Preceding this excerpt are a series of episodes conducted in English and through Type 1 turn-taking. The Type 1 episode ran smoothly as follows: Sindi put to learners a verb she wanted transformed to an adjective, learners made bids for a turn, she allocated a turn to a learner, the selected learner produced a response, the response was evaluated and accepted, and then the class moved on to the next verb on the list. In Excerpt 28, however, they ran into difficulties.

**Excerpt 28: English, to divergent pattern, and to English - choral response as a defensive strategy (Lesson 2)**

- 540 \*Sindi: 'Attract'.
- 541 \*LNS: A:TTRACTA:BLE.
- 542 \*Sindi: **Andivanga?**
- 543 %trn: I didn't hear that.
- 544 \*LNS: A:TTRACTA:BLE ((accompanied by giggles)). (2.0) Attracting
- 545 ((others)). Attractive ((others)).
- 546 \*Sindi: ↑YHO:: amanyala eklasini. lindlebe zam. Nanga amanyala azwiwa
- 547 zam ( ). ↑ATTRACT?
- 548 %trn ↑OH NO:: such drivel in class. My poor ears. Such drivel I'm hearing
- 549 ( ). ↑ATTRACT?
- 550 \*LNS: ((Hands up and learners offer various responses accompanied by
- 551 giggles and laughter)). Attractful ((some)). Attracting ((others)).
- 552 Attractive. Attractness ((others)).
- 553 \*Sindi: Δ↑Hha:yi bo (TCU1). ↑Hha:yibo (TCU2)Δ. ((Laughter)) (TCU4). Ye:s L23 (TCU5)
- 554 %trn: Δ↑No. ↑NoΔ. ((Laughter)). Ye:s L23.
- 555 \*L23: Attractness.
- 556 \*LNS: ((Giggles)).
- 557 \*Sindi: Yes L20.
- 558 \*L20: Attractive.
- 559 \*Sindi: Ye:s goo:d. 'Attractive'. Attractive ((writing)).

Excerpt 28 documents the use of both Type 2 (540-553) and Type 1 (553-559) turn-taking systems. On the one hand, learners wish to conduct the episode through Type 2 as a self-facilitative 'safetalk' strategy (Chick, 1996). By producing group responses (541, 544) learners ensure that the responses will not be attributed to any one of them individually. In this way, learners make their responses 'off-the-record' and gauge teachers' reactions to them before committing to make them

'on-the-record'. The correct response, 'attractive' (545), is first offered as part of a group or choral response (545) and eventually in an individual turn (558). In contrast, Sindi seeks to conduct the lesson in the Type 1 format (540, 554, 557, 559). In this case, teacher and learners have different perceptions of the degree of difficulty of the task. This is expressed in part through different perceptions about which turn-taking system is appropriate. Sindi regards the task at hand as 'easy' and therefore best accomplished through Type 1 turn-taking, but learners respond to it as 'hard' and try to accomplish it through Type 4.

From a language point of view, Sindi's switches to isiXhosa-isiMpondo to simultaneously initiate repair (542), evaluate, reject and protest learners' responses (546, 553), and to replace Type 2 turn-taking with the required Type 1. Once she succeeds in re-establishing Type 1 turn-taking, she switches back to English to manage the remainder of the episode, beginning with TCU5 (553) to the end of the episode (559). In other words, in this classroom, when interaction runs smoothly English only is used and when it runs aground then a divergent pattern is introduced, in which a teacher switches to isiXhosa-isiMpondo and learners remain in English. Once troubles are resolved, learners and teachers produce English-only episodes. Sindi uses the most English of all teachers in the corpus, as is shown in detail in Chapter 8.

#### 6.3.2.2 Findings

Findings about Type 2 turn-taking may be summarised as follows:

Firstly, teacher-initiated turns for choral production are cued prosodically, through questioning, as well as CS.

Second, Type 2 is the most commonly-used form of turn allocation in this corpus. This is probably because the form is used to do recurrent actions such as cohorting and re-cohorting a group of learners into a class in session, and to do checking/confirming of listening/understanding in a whole-class format.

Third, a small number of formulaic classroom phrases is used to elicit and produce this kind of speech exchange system. Teachers often use isiXhosa-isiMpondo formulaic phrases to cue it. Thus, the simultaneous use of Type 2 turn-

taking and isiXhosa-isiMpondo helps contextualize or index an episode as doing something distinct from preceding or subsequent ones. These episodes often have to do with doing preliminary exchanges, cohorting or re-cohorting work.

Fourth, isiXhosa-isiMpondo phrases used to cue choral production leave open the possibility for learners to ask questions in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. However, this is rarely taken up by learners in a whole-class format because the use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is stigmatised in this context.

Fifth and finally, learners occasionally transform turns designed for individual responses (Type 1) into turns for choral production (Type 2). This occurs when learners are uncertain about the correctness of their answers.

### **6.3.3 Type 3: Co-production/ turn-sharing**

#### *6.3.3.1 Features*

A third type of turn-taking system in this corpus is ‘co-production’ or ‘turn-sharing’ (Lerner, 2002). Actions performed through turn-sharing include: doing agreement, confirming listening, displaying understanding, and showing orientation to what is going on in interaction.

Turn-sharing is often initiated by teachers and occurs at the end or near the end of TCUs. Through turn-sharing, participants intend to simultaneously co-produce a TCU or part of a TCU by matching the “words, voicing and tempo of the other speaker” (Ibid, 2002:226).

Teachers initiate co-production in three ways. Firstly, they initiate it through questioning. A teacher asks questions that she expects learners to know answers to from previous episodes, lessons or general knowledge. Secondly, teachers cue co-production by designing turns so that learners co-produce parts or all of a teacher’s previous turn, using choral repetition. Thirdly, co-production is initiated through utterance completion, teachers cueing this by producing items immediately preceding those intended for co-production with raised intonation or elongated/stretched syllables.

Below are two examples of co-production accomplished through different kinds of multilingual practices. Excerpts 29 and 30 are from grade 8 English grammar lesson.

**Excerpt 29: English, to isiXhosa-isiMpondo, and to convergent pattern - collaboratively closing an activity (Lesson 2)**

- 444 \*Sindi: Superlative degree. o:kay change ba:d to superlative degree.
- 445 \*LNS: ((Hands up and fingers clicking)).
- 446 \*Sindi: Ye:s L17.
- 447 \*L17: Worst.
- 448 \*Sindi: Ye:s di:d- (TCU1). That is the wor::st advertisement I have ever seen TCU2).
- 449 Aw:ri:ght (TCU3). **Injalo ke into** ↑**yantoni:?** (TCU4) **Ye-a:d[je:ctives ]** (TCU5).
- 450 %trn: Ye:s di:d- 'That is the wor::st advertisement I have ever seen'. Al:ri:ght.
- 451 That's how what works? A:dj:ectives.
- 452 \*LNS: [adjectives] ((some learners)).

In Excerpt 29, turn-sharing is used to mark the end of an activity of transforming comparative adjectives to the superlative form, as shown in lines 444 to 448. A regular and unmarked IRE/F sequence (444-448) is done in English, and the closing of this activity is done first through Sindi's switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo (TCU4, 449) and then through a multilingual TCU (TCU5, 449) designed for turn-sharing (449; 452).

Co-production is cued in several ways. By switching to isiXhosa-isiMpondo (449); through use of the interrogative '**yantoni:/** of what?', produced with a raised intonation and lengthened vowel (449); by stretching the first two syllables of 'a:dje:ctives' (449) as if waiting for learners to catch up with her, which they do eventually, to co-produce the target item (449; 452).

In this case, turn-sharing is used to enlist learners' participation in closing a current activity. By taking part in turn-sharing and co-authoring the ending of this activity, learners implicitly endorse Sindi's assessment that the class has reached a good enough understanding of how superlative adjectives work and therefore the

lesson can move forward. Teachers often interpret weak learner participation in co-producing target items, such as the case in this episode (452), as a call for more examples, elaboration or reformulation of teacher contributions. In this excerpt, Sindi reads weak learner participation in turn-sharing as indicating a need for more examples, which she provides in subsequent episodes.

***Excerpt 30: from isiXhosa-isiMpondo/ English divergence to English/English convergence - re-cohorting (Lesson 2)***

- 44 \*Sindi: **Akeze omnye neyakhe.**
- 45 %trn: Other contributions.
- 46 \*LNS: ((Bids for the turn)).
- 47 \*Sindi: **Itsho::** L04. **Nditsho kuwe** ((pointing at L04)). **Ndiyenzeni?**
- 48 %trn: Yes L04. I am talking to you (pointing to L04). What should I do?
- 49 \*L04: ( ).
- 50 \*Sindi: ↑What?
- 51 \*L04: Lindelwa is a good person.
- 52 \*Sindi: Hm: ye:s. ∇Lindelwa is ↑a::: ? Lindelwa is a [good person] ∇ ((writing)).
- 53 \*LNS: [Good person] ((some learners)).

In Excerpt 30, turn-sharing occurs in lines 52 and 53. The episode is done through two patterns – isiXhosa-isiMpondo/English divergent pattern (44-49), with Sindi using isiXhosa-isiMpondo and learners English, and an English/English convergent pattern (50-53), with both Sindi and learners using English.

In this episode, L04 uses the adjective ‘good’ to make a sentence. Sindi uses isiXhosa-isiMpondo to solicit bids and to allocate the turn (44, 47). To signal that repair (on account of a lack of hearing) is being initiated, Sindi switches to English (50) contrasting this turn with a previous and adjacent one, done in isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

Here too, Sindi signals turn-sharing through multiple cues, the first being the slow repetition (52) of part of L04’s response (51) as she writes out the answer on the chalkboard. Right before the phrase targeted for turn-production, ‘good

person', she stretches the vowel "↑a::?" (52) and produces it with rising intonation. This is then followed by a repetition of L04's response as a whole, after which some learners (53) join her to co-produce the target phrase.

Sindi uses simultaneous production of the phrase 'good person' to momentarily re-cohort the group of learners as a class in session. By simultaneously co-producing the target item with the teacher, learners display attentiveness, purposefulness, and that they are in sync with the teacher. Of course this does not always work smoothly, partly documented here by weak learner participation (53) in co-producing the target item.

#### *6.3.3.2 Findings*

There are two broad findings about Type 3 turn-taking systems. First, turn-sharing is brief, often involving one or two lexical items. Through turn-sharing, teachers establish whether learners are following a lesson and whether or not to move forward to another topic or activity. One way of doing this is by enlisting learners as co-authors of a teacher turn. For example, strong learner participation in a turn designed to end or close an activity carries the implication that learners have understood the activity. Weak learner participation is an indication that an activity may have to be continued. This kind of turn-taking appears designed to deal with two problems common to this corpus. One is large class size. Large classes make it hard for teachers to monitor and pick up cues about the degree to which each learner follows and is engaged with a lesson. The other is a classroom culture in which learners hardly ask any questions. One way in which teachers overcome this is through turn-sharing. Turn-sharing is an efficient way to take the temperature of a class about whether to end an activity, extend it, or begin a new one.

Second, CS helps organise sequences designed for turn-sharing. Turn-sharing is implemented through CS that operates on a turn-by-turn basis, as shown in Excerpt 29. That is, a switch from English only to isiXhosa-isiMpondo and then to a multilingual variety, together with turn-sharing, marks the turn as doing something distinct from other turns in this episode. This form constitutes classic Auerean (1984) sequential CS.

Turn-sharing is also implemented through a kind of CS that is grounded in, but operating above the level of, the adjacency pair. This kind of CS is, however, locally meaningful, not just on a turn-by-turn basis. It represents patterned forms of language use, some of whose meanings are autonomous from the sequential environments in which they occur, such as that in Excerpt 30. That is, social or indexical meanings are conventionally attached to varieties prior to and long after interaction. However, their meanings in these patterns are only indicative and their full meanings are only realised or made concrete in the course of interaction.

### 6.3.4 Type 4: Turn allocation without bids

#### 6.3.4.1 Features

This form of turn-taking usually occurs after other forms of turn-taking have been tried, especially after Type 1. It is often produced with ‘delays’ (Drew and Pomerantz, 2013: 210) or ‘markers of dispreference’ (Levinson, 1983:333), and it is rare in the corpus.

Excerpt 31 follows several attempts by Bamba to solicit learner bids for a turn. The episode is from a grade 7 Geography lesson. The beginning of the excerpt (643) follows a learners’ turn in which learners confirm as a group that they know what a map ‘grid reference’ is and also how to use it to find a place on a map. Yet learners do not to make bids to answer a question about where on a map grid references are to be found. The Excerpt documents Bamba’s frustration with the lack of bids (643-651).

***Excerpt 31: Frequent switching between isiXhosa-isiMpondo and a multilingual variety - ‘face-threatening’ turn-taking (Lesson 7)***

643 \*Bamba: ↑KALOKU NDIYABUZA NJE UBA ZIPHI (TCU1)? YOU CANNOT MENTION  
 644 UBA ZIPHI ILANTO I- I- I-RE- REFERENCES (TCU2)? ZIPHI (TCU3)? ZINDAWON(I) II-  
 645 REFERENCES (TCU4)? II-REFERNCES ZINDAWONI (TCU5)? ((BAMBA calls on L27 to  
 646 answer the question. Note L27 did not bid for the turn). HHE (TCU6)? ((Bamba  
 647 paces about the classroom and then stops at L27’s desk and selects L27 as a next  
 648 speaker even though L27 did not 648 bid for the turn.))

649 %trn: I HAVE JUST ASKED WHERE ARE THEY (TCU1)? YOU CANNOT MENTION  
 650 WHERE THE I- I- I-RE REFERENCES ARE (TCU2)? WHERE ARE THEY? WHERE ARE  
 651 THEY (TCU4)? WHERE ARE THE REFERENCES (TCU5)? Yes (TCU6)? ((Bamba paces  
 652 about the classroom and then stops at L27's desk and selects L27 as the next  
 653 speaker even though L27 did not bid for the turn.))  
 654 \*L27: ((Silence.))

Bamba's frustration at the lack of learner participation is marked in several ways. It is marked prosodically through loud delivery throughout the turn (643-651) and through a rising intonation at the beginning of the turn, which marks that he is doing something different from a previous turn. It is also marked by the repeated use of the interrogative to formulate all six TCUs that make up his turn and by repeated use of short TCUs (TCU3 and TCU6). Finally, it is marked linguistically by frequent switching between isiXhosa-isiMpondo and English throughout the turn as if he cannot decide in which variety to express his displeasure.

TCU1 in isiXhosa-isiMpondo (643) is a complaint. In these classrooms, the use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is associated with expression of strong emotion, positive or negative.

TCU2 (643-4) is begun in English, developed in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and concluded in English. Switching back and forth between isiXhosa-isiMpondo and English, and the repetition of 'I- I- I-RE' (644), a hesitation and word-search marker, underline his frustration and his failure to find the appropriate words and language to express it.

A shift away from 'doing' frustration and complaining to soliciting bids in TCU3 (644) is marked linguistically by switching from a multilingual variety to isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

TCU4 (644) and TCU5 (645) are done in a multilingual variety and, essentially, ask the same question. TCU5 repeats TCU4. Repetition underlines Bamba's resolve to compel the learners to make a bid for the turn and to have his answer.

After several attempts to solicit bids through pleading (TCU1), complaining (TCU2), sharp questioning (TCU3), and reiteration (TCU4 and TCU5), Bamba gives up on soliciting bids and allocates the turn to L27 - who has not made a bid for the turn - with a curt isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCU 'Hhe/Yes/' (646). Allocating a turn to a learner who has not made a bid for it is rare as well as interactionally marked. As shown, this form is used only after several failed attempts to initiate the exchange through Type 1. The form is dispreferred because it is a 'face-threatening act' (Brown and Levinson, 1987) and goes against the grain of a carefully constructed and constantly renewed classroom culture of safetalk (Chick, 1996). As it happens, L27 (654) responds with silence because she/he does not know the answer.

Another reason for the face-threatening nature of this system of turn allocation is that it is strongly associated with doing disciplining. Teachers sometimes allocate turns to learners whom they know do not know an answer to a question as part of disciplining them, such as when a learner is caught engaged in off-task behaviour such as chatting during a whole-class format. Whether intended or not, this kind of practice is humiliating and harmful to children's self-confidence.

While this system of turn allocation can be face-threatening, as shown in in the above excerpt, teachers also use it for the opposite purpose, that is, to produce 'safetalk' moments as documented in Excerpt 32 below. In this case Sindi allocates a turn to a learner who she reckons can be relied upon to know the answer or work it out. This form is also used in cases where a class works through an especially challenging or new problem and therefore there is little expectation that learners will know an answer, and in such a case there is little risk of 'loss of face'. If anything, a learner who can be relied on to take on 'hard' questions, earns the respect of his/her peers, even if she/he gets an answer wrong in that context.

Excerpt 32 is from a grade 8 English lesson. It is part of a series of attempts by learners to use the adjective 'enjoyable' in a sentence.

**Excerpt 32: Mixed language use - restoring safetalk (Lesson 2)**

- 791 \*Sindi: **Awuthethe** L20.
- 792 %trn: Speak up L20.
- 793 \*L20: **Uxolo mis(i)** soccer is an (.) is an enjoyable team.
- 794 %trn: Excuse me teacher soccer is an (.) is an enjoyable team.
- 795 \*Sindi: Is ↑a:n?
- 796 \*L20: Is an enjoyable team.
- 797 \*Sindi: Ye::s (TCU1). Soccer is an enjoyable team (TCU2). **Okanye** is an enjo:ya:ble
- 798 ga:me (TCU3). ∇**Siyevana** (TCU4)∇?
- 799 %trn: Ye::s. Soccer is an enjoyable team. Or better still is an enjo:ya:ble ga:me. Do
- 800 you understand?
- 801 \*LNS: Yes ((some learners.))

Sindi (791) allocates a turn to L20 even though L20 made no bid for it. On a first reading, Sindi's turn looks like an imperative, but in fact it is a plea to L20 to help answer what is apparently a hard question for the rest of the class. From participant observation I know that L20 is a star student and often relied upon to answer difficult questions in the class. Use of the phrase, '**Awuthethe** L20/ Speak up L20' (791), is both culturally and sequentially appropriate. The learner reads Sindi's (791) turn as a 'plea' rather than an 'order' to be resisted. He hears it, correctly, as a call to rescue a stuck class. In this case Sindi's allocating a turn to L20 without a bidding process implicitly communicates her high expectation of this learner.

L20 (793) recognises that Sindi's turn (791) is phrased in a culturally marked way. He responds to Sindi by prefacing his turn with a rather formal, but culturally and sequentially appropriate form of address '**Uxol(o) mis(i)**/ Excuse me teacher' (793). Through this form of address, he acknowledges and ratifies Sindi's turn (791) as both culturally and sequentially appropriate. Also by taking up the turn he accepts Sindi's plea to rescue the class, enacts his role of a 'reliable' and 'smart'

learner, and by producing an acceptable answer, confirms and renews Sindi's high expectations of him and his status as a smart learner.

Securing L20's participation is done in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and, once the episode is underway, Sindi switches to English (795-797). Thus repair initiation (795), evaluation of L20's response (797, TCU1), and display of his answer are all done in English (797, TCU2). Repair initiation (795) could either be about a lack of hearing, or about giving L20 a chance to modify his response (796). L20 (796) reads repair-initiation to be about a lack of hearing and therefore repeats his initial response (793).

Then Sindi make two switches to isiXhosa-isiMpondo, one to make TCU3 (797) and the other TCU4 (798). She begins TCU3 with an isiXhosa-isiMpondo item '**Okanye/** Or better still' (797) to announce that, while L20's response is acceptable, it is inadequate and is about to be modified in some way. In this way the class is signalled to pay special attention to what is about to follow. A second switch is a tag question, '**Siyevana/** Do you understand', which ends the episode and marks a shift from a Sindi-and-L20 interaction (Type 1) to Sindi-and-class interaction (Type 2), and from doing an IRE/F to a checking-confirming exchange.

In this episode, Sindi and L20 both use isiXhosa-isiMpondo as a 'we-code' (Gumperz, 1982) to index culturally appropriate relations between learners-and-teachers or between children-and-adults more generally, to generate sequentially appropriate meanings. IsiXhosa-isiMpondo is also used in a discourse-related way to signal shifts in conversational footing. Interpretation of the first set of switches (791 and 793), for instance, requires taking account of their semantic content, pedagogical and/or communicative functions, sequential location, other behaviour or talk noted during participant observation and of the broader cultural and social context in which the interaction occurs. Interpretation of the second set of switches (797, 798), however, is recoverable by reference only to the local, sequential context.

#### *6.3.4.2 Findings*

Findings about Type 4 turn-taking may be summarised as follows. First, this type of turn allocation comes in two forms. The first is a 'face-threatening act' and the second restores safetalk.

Second, it is produced with 'delays' or 'dispreference markers'. Delays are marked by several teacher attempts to allocate turns through Type 1 – that is, first by soliciting bids and allocating a turn to learners who have made bids – before resorting to allocating turns without bids.

Third, the face-threatening form has the following features. It follows repeated failure or reluctance by learners to bid for turns. When learners do bid for the turn eventually, they produce incorrect or inadequate answers. Because this form often occurs in contexts where teachers expect learners to know an answer or to know how to apply a rule from a previous episode or lesson to get to an answer, teachers regard learners' reluctance to make bids as indicative of learners' failure to take seriously their lessons. For this reason, this type is often seen as part of punishing/ 'disciplining' learners. Allocating a turn to a learner who has not made a bid in such a sequential context is especially threatening. In this case, the teacher may have to supply the correct answer, or to go over the material again in order to enable learners to produce the correct answer.

Fourth, the form that seeks to restore safetalk practices has similar features to the first, but also different ones. In this form, learners bid for turns but produce a series of incorrect or inadequate answers. In this case, teachers may or may not expect learners to know the 'right' answer. A key difference is that, even though learners get it 'wrong', they exhibit appropriate classroom participation behaviour by readily making bids. This is one of the reasons why teachers do not necessarily conclude, in this case, that learners have failed to pay proper attention to their lessons. Another difference is that in this case, a turn is allocated to a star learner who has not made a bid for the turn, but who can be relied upon to help restore safetalk.

### 6.3.5 Type 5: Learner self-selection (speaking out of turn)

#### 6.3.5.1 Features

Features of this type of turn-taking include that: (a) learners self-select as speakers; (b) learner utterances may be addressed to a teacher, another learner, or broadcast to be overhead by other classroom participants; (c) learner utterances are overwhelmingly single-word TCUs or short phrases; (d) it is rare, and; (e) when it occurs, it is noticeable and sanctionable.

Low frequency of learner self-selection in this corpus reflects the dominance of a 'traditional', teacher-centred pedagogy in South African English and English L2-medium classrooms, in which learners speak only when spoken to, ask very few questions, and wherein little exploratory talk takes place (Bloch, Guzula and Nkence, 2010; Macdonald, 1990).

A common form of self-selection is chatting among learners during a whole-class format, documented in Excerpt 33 below. Sindi writes on the chalkboard, with her back to the class (577). Learners take this action to signal momentary suspension of a whole-class format and therefore regard their chatting to be pre whole-class, informal or 'off-stage' talk (578). Sindi, however, considers the whole-class format and norms to be operative. In accordance with norms, it is unmarked for learners to speak only when allocated a turn. She turns around to face the class and to re-cohort and discipline it (579). She addresses the class in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, a variety associated with doing disciplining in the corpus. She reprimands learners three times in rapid succession. For extra emphasis, she delivers the last item with vowel lengthening, rising intonation and loud delivery.

**Excerpt 33: IsiXhosa-isiMpondo for maintaining classroom order - 'off-stage' group self-selection (Lesson 1)**

- 577 \*Sindi: ((Teacher with her back to the class writes on a chalkboard)).
- 578 \*LNS: ((Chatting among learners)).
- 579 \*Sindi: ΔNiyangxola niyangxola niyangxola niyangxo::↑LA..Δ ((Turns to face  
580 the class.))
- 581 %trn: ΔYou are making a noise you are making a noise you are making a noiseΔ.  
582 ((Turning her body to face the class.))
- 583 \*LNS: ((Learners immediately quieten down. A few minutes later they resume  
584 talk in murmurs.))

The form of self-selection documented in Excerpt 33 is fairly common, because it is conducted behind a teacher's back. Also it is done in group format, making it harder for teachers to identify 'offending' learners. As a result, teacher sanctions, directed to the group, as is the case here (579), do not carry the same kind of force as when directed to an identified individual.

Sindi reprimands learners for making a 'noise': 'niyangxola/ you are making a noise' (579). The fact that learners are chatting in hushed tones says that her reprimand is not so much about 'noise making' as it is about talking out of turn. In large and authoritarian classrooms, 'chatting' among learners in group form is a constant classroom management problem for teachers and an effective learner strategy to erode teacher authority, with little risk of detection and sanctions. This makes large and rowdy classrooms psychologically 'unsafe' spaces for teachers and this is probably why teachers spend a significant portion of lesson time periodically cohorting and re-cohorting a class as a group in session - that is, trying to make classrooms 'safe' spaces.

Excerpt 34 documents persistent learner self-selection in a whole-class format. L08 self-selects on three occasions (178, 184 and 190). The excerpt is from a grade 7 Technology lesson.

**Excerpt 34: From divergent language to isiXhosa-isiMpondo - learner self-selection, noticeable but perhaps not sanctionable (Lesson 11)**

- 173 \*Nande: The driver changes the gear and the car changes speed. Do you understand?
- 174 \*LNS: Yes **mis(i)**.
- 175 %trn: Yes teacher.
- 176 \*Nande: **Okanye ihambe kancinci imoto kuba umntu etheni? Ey(i)hlisile.**
- 177 %trn: Or the car moves slowly because the driver has done what? Lowered a gear.
- 178 \*L08: **ΔAfake u-oneΔ.**
- 179 %trn: Selects the first (gear).
- 180 \*Nande: **Ewe kukh(o) o-one no-two. .**
- 181 %trn: Yes we have first and second (gears).
- 182 \*L08: **No-three.**
- 183 %trn: And a third.
- 184 \*LNS: ((Laughter)).
- 185 \*Nande: **Umntu okwaziyo uqhuba uzaw(u)yazi.**
- 186 %trn: If you know how to drive you know all about it.
- 187 \*L08: Yes **mis(i)**.
- 188 %trn: Yes teacher.
- 189 \*Nande: \$Awright\$.
- 190 \*%trn: Alright.

The excerpt begins with Nande (173) concluding a discussion in English about how gear leavers work and learners confirming understanding with a classroom formulaic (174). Language use in this adjacency pair (173, 174) indexes that participants are doing something 'easy', routine or unremarkable. In terms of language use, this is indexed by Nande's use of English only.

The remainder of the episode is essentially done in isiXhosa-isiMpondo (176-190). English insertions are merely transfers/borrowings of words for numbers, viz., 'u-one/one' (178); 'o-one/one'; 'no-two/two' (180); and no-three/three (182). Use of English number names in speech conducted in African

languages is a well-established practice and therefore it is unlikely that participants orient to the Englishness of the insertions.

Transition from giving general explanation about how gears work to illustrating how gears work in a familiar case, that of a car, is linguistically marked by a switch from a less familiar (English, 173) to a familiar (isiXhosa-isiMpondo, 176) variety. Familiarity of the case as well as Nande's use of a familiar language, provides a basis and indeed a justification for L08's self-selection (178, 180 and 182).

In this sequential context Nande does not reprimand L08 because self-selection is timely, helpful and aligned to her teaching goals. L08's final self-selected turn (187) appears to result from a belief that Nande (185) has endorsed his initial self-selection moves and the content of those turns (178, 182). Nande (192) ends the exchange with a wry smile, suggesting, perhaps, that she endorses the content of L08's turns, but maybe not his self-selection moves.

Finally, consider Excerpt 35 below from a grade 7 English language lesson. The episode is essentially done in English except for Sindi's two discourse-related switches to isiXhosa-isiMpondo (41, 44). In this excerpt, learner self-selection is noticeable but, if anything, mildly sanctionable.

***Excerpt 35: English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo, noticeable and mildly sanctionable (Lesson 1)***

- 34 \*Sindi: What is a noun? [What is a noun? ]
- 35 \*LNS: (((Hands go up and fingers click)).]
- 36 \* Sindi: YE:S L02.
- 37 \*L04: Noun is the name of person o::r (2.0)
- 38 \*L05: °Place°
- 39 \*L04: Place
- 41 \*Sindi: Hm:: **uphele:le?**
- 41 %trn: Hm. Is that it?
- 42 \*L04: °Yes **misi.**°

- 43 %trn: °Yes teacher°.
- 44 \* Sindi: **Ingathi uL05 usafuna ukongeza. ΔUyongeza ↑L05?Δ**
- 45 %trn: Looks like L05 wants to make an addition. ΔAre you making an addition ↑L05?Δ
- 46 \*L05: A noun is name of a place, person or t(h)ing.
- 47 \* Sindi: Ye:s goo:d ((writing on the board)). A NOUN is a name of a
- 48 person (.) a name of a place (.) or a na:me ↑a:: [Of a thi:ng.]
- 49 \*LNS: [Of a thing ] ((Some learners)).

Sindi does most of her turns in English (34, 37, 48, 47-48) and learners theirs mostly in English (35, 37, 38, 39, 46, 49), except for a multilingual term of address (42) to confirm understanding.

Sindi's uses of isiXhosa-isiMpondo (41, 44) is locally functional. The first switch (41) checks and indicates to L04 that his response is incomplete (37, 39). In her second use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo she indicates her awareness of and disapproval of L05's earlier self-selection (38). She does this through the phrasing of her turn (44). She addresses L05 in the second person and asks in a rapid and rather impatient manner, if he has anything to add. Her disapproval of L05's self-selection is not explicit but it is clear enough from her turn (44) that she is aware that L05 self-selected in an earlier turn. Perhaps she heard the correct answer he offered in that turn, but did not acknowledge that turn because she had not concluded her exchange with L04. This excerpt is analysed once more in connection with repair organisation in section 7.27 as Excerpt 47.

#### 6.3.5.2 Findings

Findings about Type 5 turn-taking may be summarised as follows. First, in this corpus, this type of turn-taking is rare, noticeable and sanctionable. A continuum of 'noticeability' and 'sanctionability' can be observed. On the one end of the continuum are forms of learner self-selection that teachers consider to be disruptive and to constitute a challenge to their authority. This includes chatting among learners during a whole-class session as documented in Excerpt 33. Such actions are noticeable and sanctionable. On the other end of the continuum are forms of learner-selection that are intended to align with and realise a teacher's

pedagogical goals as documented in Excerpt 34. Learner talk is addressed to a teacher. While such self-selection is noticeable, it is often not sanctionable. Somewhere in the middle, lie forms of self-selection in which learner talk is directed to other learners during a whole-class format. This form is noticeable and, depending on the sequential context in which it occurs as well as a teacher's classroom management style, it may also be sanctionable. This form is illustrated in Excerpt 35.

Second, CS contextualizes what goes on in the cited episodes. In Excerpt 33, a switch from English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo marks a shift in focus from pedagogical talk to doing re-cohorting and disciplining. In Excerpt 34, a switch from English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo marks checking and the termination of an exchange with one learner and the beginning of another. In the final excerpt, a learner shows alignment with a teacher's goals partly by switching using isiXhosa-isiMpondo and thus matching the teacher's language use.

#### 6.4 Conclusions

This section confirms, qualifies and extends some of the conclusions made in chapter 5 about the adequacy of a CA approach to bi/multilingual classroom CS. First, any classroom variety, viz., English, isiXhosa-isiMpondo or a multilingual variety, and any language pattern, viz., monolingual, divergent, convergent, or multilingual, can occur in any turn type. Therefore language use is not rigidly tied to any turn type or participation framework.

Second, perhaps slightly less generally applicable than the first conclusion, but still covering a large numbers of cases, is the following. Any classroom variety can occur with any turn type to accomplish any 'classroom function' (Martin-Jones, 1995; 2000) or 'classroom context/mode' (Walsh, 2006). That is, classroom varieties and turn types can perform 'knowledge transmission and construction', or 'pedagogical functions' or occur in a 'curriculum mode'. They can perform classroom management functions and manage interpersonal relations, roles and identities.

The first and second set of conclusions support Auer's (1984) basic claim that, apart from cases of strict diglossia (Ferguson, 2000), it is not possible to explain locally contrastive functions or conversational functions of bi/multilingualism or CS, without reference to the sequential contexts in which they occur.

Third, having said that any classroom variety can co-occur with any turn-type or vice versa, classrooms are not flat linguistic landscapes. Varieties and turn types do not occur with the same frequency across a lesson and they do not have the same 'symbolic value' (Bourdieu, 1991) and 'legitimacy' (Heller, 1995) in the classroom. For example, participants generally regard frequent and pervasive use of English as desirable and unmarked, but use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is generally marked, particularly when used by learners in a whole-class format. Its use by teachers, although somewhat marked, is not undesirable, but requires justification. That is, its occurrence is justified on the basis that it is a 'pedagogical scaffold' (Voster, 2008).

In other words, when participants ask themselves 'why this, in that language, right now?' (Ünstel and Seedhouse, 2005:302), they are asking questions about sequentiality, as well as broader questions about appropriate language choices given their orientation to and experiences of the linguistic market and institutional goals and roles. This orientation and these experiences make up interpretive frames that speakers and hearers use to produce and understand language choices in interaction. Myers-Scotton (1993b:151) refers to these interpretive 'socio-cognitive' frames (van Dijk, 2008:119) as a 'markedness metric'. In summary, 'codes' of code-switching generate local sequential meanings partly because they are socially indexical.

Fourth, Auer (1995) considers divergent bi/multilingualism, a language practice described in detail in chapter 5 (sub-section 5.2.1), to be rare and momentary in 'ordinary' bilingual interaction, but in fact it is commonplace in the multilingual classrooms making up this corpus. A primary reason for its prevalence from the point of view of the sequential organization of interaction is that turn-taking is centrally controlled by one participant, the teacher, and not locally

managed by all parties. Switches in bi/multilingual institutional classroom talk cannot be explained in terms of the idea of 'language negotiation' (Auer, 1995:125). Teachers' use of classroom turn-taking in post-apartheid English and English L2-medium classrooms, as in apartheid-era classrooms, prevents genuine turn-by-turn language negotiation. This is because teachers often continue to mistakenly but understandably interpret the goal of classroom talk as the production of English medium 'safetalk' (Chick, 1996).

Fifth, teachers largely use choral responses to set up safetalk practices. Choral responses are also used to do other actions that overlap with the production of safetalk but are different from it, such as cohorting and re-cohorting large and sometimes noisy classrooms; marking an exchange such as doing preliminary, revision or background work before new information is presented; or to check/confirm understanding. Learners use choral production to 'hide' when they are not certain of their answers.

Choral responses provide further support for the claim that varieties have indexical meanings, that is, meanings above the level of an adjacency pair or sequence. There is no instance in the corpus where teachers explicitly tell learners to produce choral responses, yet learners correctly read the use of certain isiXhosa-isiMpondo phrases and prosodic cues as eliciting choral responses. This is possible because a shared history of talk between learners and teachers enables learners to interpret the use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo and other cues in certain contexts as an elicitation of choral production (Mercer and Dawes, 2014).

Sixth, as in the Botswana classrooms (Arthur, 1996:24), learners in this corpus hardly ever use isiXhosa-isiMpondo in a whole-class format, even when this is the only way in which they can produce an utterance or complete it. Use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo by learners is heavily marked because of a classroom culture that values the use of English over any other variety. This culture is produced and reproduced daily in several ways. Teachers design their turns or elicitations such that appropriate second-pair parts to their first-pair parts must be made in English. This is partly made possible by the fact that teacher elicitation almost entirely consist of questions that, in response, require brief knowledge displays. Learning

materials are in English, and formal assessment is conducted in English only, reinforcing the idea that English is the only valued language. Learners often mock other learners who make mistakes in their English speech and also those who use isiXhosa-isiMpondo in a self-facilitative way, with the result that learners are silent in a whole-class format. At this grade level - in contrast to lower grades - it is rare to hear teachers explicitly prohibit the use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo by learners. This is probably because, by this grade level, learners have internalised school and classroom norms for language use which prescribe that they use English only or be silent in a whole-class format. All this occurs in a broader sociolinguistic context dominated by English, expressed, for example, in the fact that it is the primary language of mass media, public affairs and a gate-keeping language to higher education in South Africa (e.g., Alexander, 2014).

The use of a sequential approach alone may have led to the discovery of this pattern of language use and could perhaps have partially explained how it is organizationally structured, but it is doubtful whether it would have revealed much about why it occurs. That is, it cannot explain why learners are averse to using isiXhosa-isiMpondo in a whole-class format, or the absence of exploratory talk in the corpus, or why learner turns comprise exclusively of one word, a single phrase or short sentences. To explain these things requires an appeal to participant observation and a knowledge of the institutions and society in which classroom interaction occurs.

Seventh and finally, there is no question that English is the legitimate classroom language, but learners and teachers are quite anxious about it. For learners, it is no exaggeration to say that they are often fearful of it. This is part of the reason why, in the normal course of events, teachers do everything to try to reduce language-based anxieties by setting up interaction for safetalk practices. As shown in this chapter, turn-taking is a central mechanism for classroom language management. For example, on the one hand, allocating a turn to a learner without first soliciting bids in a safetalk culture is a form of symbolic punishment in the place of corporal punishment. Use of this form of turn allocation and the requirement to produce English responses is stressful, humiliating and probably

harmful to children in the long run. On the other hand, this same form of turn allocation can be used as part of efforts to reduce language stress by allocating a turn to a learner who is almost certain to produce a correct response in English, saving the class and restoring safetalk.

## 7. Code-switching and Classroom Repair

This chapter examines how repair is involved in classroom code-switching (CS) and how CS, in turn, helps organise or accomplish classroom repair. It begins with an overview of repair in ordinary conversation and classroom talk, proceeds to discuss eight possible repair types in classroom interaction, and concludes with a summary of findings and their implications for a CA approach to bi/multilingual classroom talk.

### 7.1 Overview of Classroom Repair

Schegloff, et al (1977) claim that there is a preference organization for repair, or what Levinson (1983:341-2) calls a 'repair rank scale'. Correlational studies as well as structural/sequential evidence suggest that there is preference for self-repair over other-repair in ordinary conversation (Seedhouse, 2004; McHoul; 1990). However, things are not as clear-cut in classroom talk, as will be shown in this chapter. This is because teachers and learners play different roles in classroom talk and have an asymmetrical power relationship. Refer to chapter 3, section 3.2.3.4 for a brief review of the components of a repair sequence.

Kasper (1985:203) has schematized classroom repair sequences into eight possible types as shown in Table 7.1.

**Table 7: Types of classroom repair**

No.	Repair type	Trouble Source	Repair initiation	Repair completion	Confirmation
1	Teacher (T): self-initiation self-repair	T	T	T	-
2	Teacher (T): other-initiation self-repair	T	L	T	-
3	Teacher (T): self-initiation other-repair	T	T	L	T
4	Teacher (T): other-initiation other-repair	T	L	L/ LL	T
5	Learner (L): self-initiation self-repair	L	L	L	T
6	Learner (L): other-initiation self-repair	L	T/LL	L	T
7	Learner (L): self-initiation other-repair	L	L	T/ LL	(T)
8	Learner (L): other-initiation other-repair	L	T/ LL	T/ LL	(T)

\*T= teacher, L = learner, LL = another learner/other learners

For the present study, the analysis of repair sequences involving CS is important for three reasons.

First, CS is one way in which repair sequences are marked as troublesome in some way.

Second, as will be shown below, repair sequences are often accomplished multilingually and some varieties are associated with one component of a three-part repair sequence. For example, in general, repair-initiation is done mainly in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and repair almost invariably in English.

Third, as part of the communicative practices of a multilingual classrooms, certain recognizable actions in repair sequences, such as complaining, instructing, or disciplining/correcting of behaviour are marked linguistically through CS, in addition to the actual content of TCUs or turns. That is, CS is used in discourse- and participant-related ways in repair sequences.

A summary frequency count of repair is presented in Table 7.2. A total of 336 repairables were documented. More than half (189) involve teachers (Columns 1 to 4). This is a reflection of the fact that teachers produce the most as well as the largest turns. Nearly all (185, which is 98%) of teacher repairables are resolved through self-initiation and self-repair (Column 1). Thus, teacher repairs mirror those found in ordinary conversation, where there is a preference for self-initiation and self-repair (Levinson, 1983; Schegloff, et al 1978). In contrast, only 12 (8%) of learner repairables are resolved through self-initiation and self-repair (Column 5).

More than half of learner repairs (83, or 56%) involve other-initiation and self-repair (Column 6). That is to say, they are resolved through teacher-initiation and learner-repair. This corroborates McHoul's (1990:353) finding that in classrooms learner repairables are largely resolved through other-initiation and self-repair. However, over one-third (51, or 35%) of learner repairables are resolved through other-repair (Columns 7 and 8). As will be shown presently, the majority of learner repairables have to do with English language competence. In

contrast, it is rare in this corpus that a teacher repairable is resolved through the form self-initiation and other-repair (Column 3). Finally, there is no documented case that involves a teacher in which other-initiation and other-repair is employed.

**Table 8: Frequency of repair types**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Repair type	Teacher Self-self	Teacher Other-self	Teacher Self-other	Teacher Other-other	Learner Self-self	Learner Other-self	Learner Self-other	Learner Other-other	Total
Count	185	3	1	- -	12	83	11	41	336
% of total	55	00.8	00.2	-	4	25	3	12	
<b>Sub-total</b>	189				147				336
% of teacher/ learner repair	98	1.5	.5	-	8	56	7	28	

## 7.2 Repair Types and Code-switching

### 7.2.1 Teacher: self-initiation and self-repair (Type 1)

The form ‘teacher self-initiation, self-repair’ accounts for more than half the repairables in this corpus, or 98% of all teacher repairables. Frequent and pervasive occurrence of this repair type in the corpus is accounted for in three ways, as follows:

Because teachers control the turn-taking system, they take more turns and produce a greater number of multi-TCU turns and are therefore more likely to produce a large number of repairables. In contrast, learners produce short, single-TCU turns, and are therefore less likely to produce repairables.

Learners almost never initiate repair on teacher turns because to do so requires that a learner make a bid for a turn in which to do other-initiation and once the turn is allocated, the learner is required to initiate repair in English. In other words, interactional organization and language issues make initiating repair on a teacher turn a dispreferred act. Classroom turn organization requires a learner to engage in a time-consuming exchange of first making a bid, being allocated a turn and then performing other-initiation in a language most learners do not command. The other route open to a learner who wants to do other-

initiation on a teacher turn is to self-select as a next speaker, but this is noticeable and sanctionable.

Finally, teacher self-initiation and self-repair is often about a teachers' constant struggle to find the appropriate variety, specific genre and classroom discourse (Adler, 2000:61-66) in which to conduct interaction in English-limited English L2 and L2-medium classrooms.

In the two following excerpts, CS is involved in both signalling and resolving troubles in interaction. Excerpt 36 is from a grade 7 English lesson and Excerpt 37 from a grade 8 Social Science lesson.

***Excerpt 36: Frequency of repair types***

- 371 \*Sindi: When you are talking about a female person (TCU1). **Njengoba xa**  
372 **sisebenzisa** (.) i-:: (1.0) (TCU2). I-pronoun **ka**:-female ↑**inguba** (TCU3)? She (TCU4).  
373 %trn: When you are talking about a female person (TCU1). When we refer to (.)  
374 the:: (1.0) (TCU2) What pronoun is used to refer to a female (TCU3)? She (TCU4).

In Excerpt 36, Sindi has trouble formulating and designing her turn to elicit responses. Essentially she wants learners to produce the feminine third person 'she'. Her troubles are marked by constant language alternation. She begins her turn in English (TCU1), then switches to isiXhosa-isiMpondo (TCU2), then to a multilingual variety composed of isiXhosa-isiMpondo syntax with the insertion of English lexical items (TCU3), and finally to English (TCU4). Switching is self-facilitative.

In addition to constant switching, troubles within the turn are marked by an inability to complete TCU1 and then an unsuccessful attempt to reformulate TCU1 through a switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo as TCU2. At this point she appears to struggle to find an isiXhosa-isiMpondo equivalent for 'pronoun', or perhaps to have lost her train of thought. This is marked by a false start, a pause and finally by the abandonment of the TCU. In TCU3 and TCU4 she abandons her attempt set up a turn for elicitation and learner responses and instead tells learners what the

feminine pronoun is. She sets up the ‘telling’ in two-part question-answer format. In the first part she displays the question (TCU3) and in the second answers it (TCU4).

Before the turn shown in Excerpt 37 below, Bamba was speaking in English. The switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo is participant-related in order to accommodate learner language competence. In this turn he explains how accidental spills from offshore oil drilling operations pollute the ocean. He reckons that many learners in the class are not familiar with oil spills and the English vocabulary associated with this topic. Thus, switching from English to isiMpondo-isiXhosa can be regarded as self-initiated and self-‘medium repair’ (Gafaranga, 2011), i.e., repairing a sequentially inappropriate language choice, English, and replacing it with an appropriate one, isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

***Excerpt 37: Participant-related switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo (Lesson 8)***

- 230 \*Bamba: **Uyaw(u)::qhaphela uk(u)bana na i-Oi:L amaxhesha amaninzi eh::**
- 231 (TCU1) **Ezindawo eh::** (TCU2) **Okanye ndingay(i)beke njani** (TCU3). **Na::-** (TCU4)
- 232 **Ezi-plant okanye kwezindawo okwenziwa kuyo i-oil uyaqonda** (TCU5)? **Ziba::**
- 233 **Δzi- zi- zi-Δ zidla ngokwenziwa k(u)futshane nolwandle okanye zibe phakathi**
- 234 **olwandle, siyavana na:: madoda** (TCU6)?
- 235 %trn: You know that often eh:: (TCU1) The places eh:: (TCU2) Or how can I put it
- 236 (TCU3)? **Na::-** (TCU4). In the plants or in the sites where oil is produced, you
- 237 understand (TCU5)? In They have **Δzi- zi- zi-Δ** are often built near the ocean or in
- 238 the ocean, you understand guys (TCU6)?

Bamba’s turn (230-234) is intended to accommodate learners’ problems with English, but soon he is beset with troubles explaining oil spills in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. The turn is punctuated by various markers of trouble such as stretched vowels (TCU1, TCU4, TCU5); ‘eh::’ a marker of thinking aloud (TCU1, TCU2); false starts and reformulations (all TCUs), and explicit verbalization of the fact that he

finds it difficult to explain the point (TCU3). The turn is essentially done in isiXhosa-isiMpondo with English insertions.

The turn has two kinds of English insertions. The first insertion, 'i-oil/oil' (230, 232), is a familiar English word which has been used many times in immediately preceding turns and is used here to maintain discourse cohesion. A second insertion, 'ezi-plant/these plants' (231), is however an unfamiliar word. Plant here is not a superordinate of 'flower' and 'tree' but is linked to meanings such as 'oil rig' or 'oil refinery'. Not knowing or failing to retrieve an isiXhosa-isiMpondo equivalent for 'plant', he morphologically assimilates 'plant' TCU5 (231-2) in a self-facilitative way, that is, this helps him to complete his turn but does not help clarify for learners the meaning of this word in this context. He realizes this and in the same TCU he abandons trying to find an isiXhosa-isiMpondo equivalent and instead explains what a plant is in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. This is a case of successful pedagogical scaffolding through CS.

In summary, the central claim made in this section is that difficulties arising from teaching and learning through a relatively unfamiliar L2 are partly documented and displayed in the troubles teachers have in selecting an appropriate medium of interaction at different points in an unfolding lesson. In particular this is indicated by frequent switching within the same turn.

### 7.2.2 Teacher: other-initiation and self-repair (Type 2)

Teacher other-initiation and self-repair accounts for less than one percent of repairables in this corpus. This form of repair is quite rare, probably because it could entail momentary reversal of teacher and learner roles, placing learners in the uncommon position of initiating repair on a teacher's turn. In this corpus, repair-initiation is overwhelmingly done by a teacher and it is one of the ways in which teachers and learners produce and reproduce their classroom roles. This finding corroborates similar observations in the context of Canadian English-German bilingual classrooms (Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain, 2003).

**Excerpt 38: Discourse-related switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo (Lesson 2)**

- 28 \*L03: ((Unintelligible))
- 29 \*Sindi: **Andivanga ke.**
- 30 %trn: I didn't catch that.
- 31 \*L03: ((Unintelligible))
- 32 \*Sindi: **Andiy(i)↑gqibanga?**
- 33 %trn: I didn't complete it?
- 34 \*L03: ((Unintelligible)).
- 35 \*Sindi: O::h ((laughing)) \$**Bekuthwe**\$ Mbuyiselo is: ((writing on the board)).
- 36 %trn: O::h ((laughing)) \$She/he said\$ Mbuyiselo is: ((writing on the board)).
- 37 \*LNS: Unkind.
- 38 \*Sindi: U:nki::nd ((writing.)) (3.0) Δ**Kalok(u) ndigugile**Δ. (7.0)
- 39 %trn: U:nki::nd ((writing.)) (3.0) ΔYou know, I'm oldΔ. (7.0)

When this form of repair occurs, it involves repair-initiation on a very specific form of a teacher repairable. That is, repair-initiation on account of an 'error' in the strict sense of that word, specifically an error of omission or an error resulting from mishearing. In Excerpt 38, T01 produces an error when she omits the word 'unkind' when copying a learner's response on a chalkboard. This triggers repair initiation by L03 (28). L03's attempts at repair-initiation itself leads to production of several repairables (28, 31, 34) on account of lack of hearing.

The unusualness of the exchange is marked in several ways. It is marked linguistically through the use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo by both L03 (28, 31, 34) and Sindi (29, 32, 35, 38). Although L03's repair-initiations are not intelligible, it is clear that they are produced in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. However, they are marked by L03's persistent soft delivery (28, 31, 34), an indication of the learner's discomfort with initiating repair on a teacher's turn. The soft delivery results in repair initiation on account of a lack of hearing (29, 32). It is also marked by Sindi's laughter (35) and tongue-in-cheek remark '**Kaloku ndigugile**/ You know I am old' (36), a culturally

appropriate exaggeration routinely used by adults to explain away momentary forgetfulness or mishearing.

In summary, isiXhosa-isiMpondo is the language of interaction for this episode. It is unusual for learners and teachers to use isiXhosa-isiMpondo at the same time in a whole-class format and for learners to initiate repair on a teacher turn. In this instance, learner self-selection and use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo to do other-initiation and self-repair carries no sanctions for three reasons. First, the learner does other-initiation in a hesitant way which is marked by soft delivery. This is a culturally appropriate way of doing a potentially face-threatening act. Thus, this reproduces an asymmetrical relationship between L03 and Sindi, rather than undermining it. Second, through the other-initiation, L03 displays some virtues of a 'good' learner, that is, attentiveness and helpfulness - behaviours that are strongly encouraged in classrooms. Third, L03 only points out the error, leaving Sindi to do self-repair.

### 7.2.3 Teacher: Self-initiation and other-repair (Type 3)

Only two cases of teacher self-initiation and other-repair are found in the corpus. Both involve exchanges between teachers and the researcher. No case is documented involving learners and teachers. Although the form does not occur between learners and teachers in this corpus, I have observed it in other lessons. It occurs often in the context of a minor memory lapse by a teacher, such as when a teacher does self-initiation on account of minor troubles such as failure to remember a learner's name, to spell a word, or where to pick up a point in lesson after a digression, for instance. In such cases a learner(s) self-selects and performs an other-repair.

Part of the reason for occurrence of other-repair on a teacher turn is that the form is teacher-initiated and that the learner other-repair is brief, often comprising of a short single TCU. Teacher repairables in this case are not a comment on a teacher's competence but perhaps on her/his memory and therefore they are not face-threatening to a teacher. Note though that learner

other-repair is itself subject to teacher evaluation and can therefore itself become an object of teacher-initiated repair.

#### 7.2.4 Teacher: other-initiation other-repair (Type 4)

Instances in which learners do other-initiation and other-repair on a teacher turn do not occur in the corpus. Institutional culture, the goals of school, and the different institutional roles of teachers and learners, that is, the interactional logic of classrooms, make this form of repair unlikely. This because the form implies role reversal between teachers and learners. This finding is consistent with McHoul's (1990) Australian data.

#### 7.2.5 Learner self-initiation and self-repair (Type 5)

Twelve cases of same turn learner self-initiation and self-repair occur in this corpus. All of them occur in Anele's English lessons in which learners read aloud parts in a play. Although none of the cases involve CS, it is useful to examine what they say about the patterns of learner participation and English language competence.

Excerpt 39 and 40 are examples of same turn learner self-initiation and self-repair.

#### ***Excerpt 39: Disfluent reading in English (Lesson 4)***

109 \*L01: Lane bring me the ci:::garrette co- case which Mister Worth- Worthing le-  
110 left his last week ((reading)).

#### ***Excerpt 40: Disfluent reading in English (Lesson 3)***

69 L01: Sta- staring out the window ((Reading))

Learner self-initiation and self-repair in Excerpts 39 and 40 document disfluent reading in English. In Excerpt 39 there are three repairables: 'co- case', 'Worth- Worthing', 'le- left' (109); and in Excerpt 40 'sta- staring' (69). Learner reading aloud is shot through with this kind of self-initiation and self-repair. Pervasive disfluent reading of grade-level texts is indicative of learners' low levels of English competence.

Learner self-initiation and self-repair is about the repair of errors in the strict sense of the word. This contrasts with teacher repairables which involve

more than simple error correction. Learners produce far fewer self-initiations and self-repairs because, as shown in chapter 6, teachers set up learner turns in such a way that learners are required to produce short turns, thereby reducing chances of learners producing repairables. One of the defining features of safetalk, from the point of view of sequential organization, is the virtual absence of learner self-initiation and self-repair in whole-class interaction. In contrast, as shown in 7.2.2, teachers produce many more self-initiations and self-repairs because they produce many long and complex TCUs and turns.

#### 7.2.6 Learner other-initiation and self-repair (Type 6)

Teacher-initiation and learner self-repair (Type 6) is the most common repair type in which two parties are involved. Its features are that: (a) it involves a learner(s) and a teacher; (b) a teacher or, less commonly, another learner, initiates repair and the learner who produced a repairable self-repairs; (c) a teacher confirms or rejects the offered repair. Teachers confirm self-repairs as adequate or acceptable in various ways, including: (a) by repeating a repair; (b) explicitly, through words of approval such as 'yes', 'correct', 'okay'; (c) through gestures such as a nod; (d) or implicitly, in ways such as moving on to the next item on a list, implying acceptance. Rejection is typically done by repeating a repair in an incredulous tone, repeating an elicitation, or reformulating an elicitation.

This repair sequence is strongly associated with troubles to do with management of learner participation (Lerner, 1995), including lack of hearing (by far the most common), weak/inadequate choral learner responses, competing learner responses, and troubles with turn-taking. (See Excerpt 41 to 46 below.) In contrast, McHoul (1990) found in his Australian classroom data that this repair type was overwhelmingly used by teachers to initiate learners to self-repair errors. The difference is probably accounted for partly by the fact that his study is set in a monolingual context. In this study, compared to McHoul's, there is a relatively small number of cases of learner repairables being other-initiated but self-repaired. In other words, in this corpus learners produce very few errors because much classroom interaction is organised through safetalk practices which help ensure that learners can produce correct or acceptable answers.

### 7.2.6.1 Lack of hearing

Excerpt 41 is from a grade 7 English lesson and documents the use of CS to do a repair sequence about a lack of hearing. In this episode, learners are required to list noun objects around the classroom. The episode is conducted in English except for an isiXhosa-isiMpondo discourse marker '**hhe/Hhu**' (93, 98) used on two occasions to initiate repair.

#### **Excerpt 41: isiXhosa-isiMpondo discourse marker 'Hhe' (Lesson 1)**

- 90 \*Sindi: [What else? Yes L12. ]
- 91 \*LNS: [[[Hands and fingers clicking.]]]
- 92 \*L12: Came:ra.
- 93 \*Sindi: **HHE**:?
- 94 %trn: HHU:?
- 95 \*LNS: ((Chortle)).
- 96 \*L12: CAR:MA:RA.
- 97 %trn: Camera.
- 98 \*Sindi: Y:es \$ camera ((writing)). Where do you see a camera?\$ [[[Laughter]]] ↑**HHE**::?
- 99 %trn: Y:es \$ camera ((writing)). Where do you see a camera?\$ ((laughter)). ↑HHU::?
- 100 \*LNS: [[[Laughter]]]

The first use of '**HHE**:/HHU:?' (93) has the contextual meaning, 'what' or 'say again'. The second use (98) is jocular with the contextual meaning, 'where?' The sequence develops as follows. Sindi puts a question to learners in English (90), they bid for the turn (91), L12 (92) is selected and she makes a response. She (90) initiates repair on L12's response probably on account of a lack of hearing. To indicate a shift from doing a regular IRE to doing a repair sequence Sindi switches to isiXhosa-isiMpondo to initiate repair with the discourse marker '**HHE**:/HHU:?' (93). In this case '**hhe/hhu**' has the contextual meaning of 'what'. She delivers the repair-initiator '**HHE**:/HHU:?' (93), in a loud voice as if to model how she would like L12 to deliver her/his turn.

In addition to responding to Sindi's question, L12's response, 'camera' (92, 96), is intended to be humorous. The camera to which L12 refers is the one used to record the lesson. The episode is humorous because L12 cleverly makes the camera a subject of the lesson and thus brings momentary comic relief to anxieties caused by being recorded. Sindi (98) switches back to English to confirm L12's response and to write it out on the chalkboard. She shows her orientation to the intended humour by producing much of her turn in a smiley voice and shares in the laughter with learners (98, 100), and through a switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo with 'HHE::?/HHU::?' (99), which in this case means 'where'. This underlines the jocular nature of the moment and the discourse marker is not intended as a real question.

#### 7.2.6.2 Learner uncertainty

Excerpt 42 is from the same English lesson as the preceding excerpt. It documents another function of the isiXhosa-isiMpondo repair-initiator '↑Hhe:/What?' (399). It follows unsuccessful self-repair by L30. Sindi (395) selects L31 to do an other-repair on L30's failed self-repair.

#### **Excerpt 42: Failed self-repair and other-repair by another learner (Lesson 1)**

- 395 \*Sindi: **Mncede** L31.  
 396 (4.0).  
 397 %trn: Help him/her L31.  
 398 \*L31: ∇ He: ca:me to see the girl at Hogwar:ts∇. ((Slow and hesitant delivery)).  
 399 \*Sindi: ↑**Hhe**:?  
 400 %trn: What?  
 401 \*L31: He came to see the girl at Hogwarts.  
 402 \*Sindi: Ye:s at ho- at the Hu:gwarts.((Writing.))

The shift in footing from a regular IRE sequence to a repair sequence is marked by a switch from English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo with Sindi's '**Mncede**/Help her/him' (395). The phrasing is important. A learner (L31 in this case) doing an other-repair on another learner's turn (L30's turn in this case) is a potentially face-threatening

act for the learner whose turn is the object of an other-repair. Teachers try to mitigate this. In this case Sindi frames L31's other-repair on L30's turn as 'help' - a positive gesture - rather than as a case of being shown up, which carries a possible negative interpretation. The framing is done in a familiar 'we-code', isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

In this grammar lesson, learners are required to replace nouns with pronouns in a set of sentences on a chalkboard. Repair work is managed in isiXhosa-isiMpondo (395, 399) and once a repair sequence is concluded Sindi reverts back to English (402). In this sequential context '↑**Hhe**:?/Hhu:?' (398) can be interpreted in two ways. Firstly, it can be interpreted as implying a lack of hearing, in which case an appropriate repair is to speak up. Second, that L31's turn (396) was heard but Sindi wants to check if L31 is certain of his choice of pronoun. If he is certain of it, he can repeat it or take the opportunity to alter it.

The claim here is that the repair-initiator '↑**Hhe**:?/Hhu:?' (398) is used to establish whether or not L31 is certain of his/her response (made in 398), in contrast to its use in Excerpt 41 above, where this item is used on account of a lack of hearing. L31's uncertainty is marked by a four-second long pause (396) before he takes up the turn, as well as by a slow and hesitant delivery (398). Thus Sindi wants L31 to speak up, not because of lack of hearing, but to 'own' her/his answer. L31 does this in a clear and confident voice (401) and Sindi ratifies it as correct and displayed in English (402).

What this excerpt illustrates is that teachers use repair sequences as a pedagogical and interactional 'resource' (Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain, 2003:377) and that CS is an important resource for the organization of such repair sequences.

#### *7.2.6.3 No response*

Excerpt 43 is from a grade 7 Social Science lesson in which learners use map grid references to search for a list of places on a map. At this point in the lesson, learners are required to locate Bisho, the capital town of the Eastern Cape province.

**Excerpt 43: Failed self-repair and other-repair by another learner (Lesson 7)**

- 297 \*Bamba: **Eehe** (TCU1). **Yeyiphi enye ke** i-grid reference **esinoy(i)sebenzisa**
- 298 **Δukulokhey(i)tha iBhishoΔ** (TCU2)? **Eeha** yes mam (TCU3)?
- 299 %trn: Yes. What is the other grid reference we can use Δto locate Bhisho?Δ
- 300 Ok, yes mam?
- 301 \*L13: ((Silence))
- 302 \*Bamba: **ΔNazi** ii-grid references **mfondini** (TCU1). **Nazi** (TCU2)Δ. **NAZI** (TCU3).
- 303 **Oo-one noo-B** (TCU4).
- 304 %trn: ΔThere are the grid references guy. Here.Δ **HERE**. One's and B's.
- 305 \*L13: **li**-grid references **ngu-B**-seven.
- 306 %trn: The grid reference is B-seven.
- 307 \*Bamba: **Ngu-B::?** ((Looking at the map))
- 308 %trn: It is B::?
- 309 \*L13: Seven.
- 310 \*Bamba: B-seven (TCU1). **Ngu-B**-seven (TCU2). ((Looking at the map))
- 311 **ΔUNYAN(I)SILE?** (TCU3) **UNYAN(I)SILEΔ** (TCU4)?
- 312 %trn: B-seven. It is B-seven. IS SHE/HE CORRECT? IS SHE/HE CORRECT?
- 313 \*LNS: Yes sir.
- 314 \*Bamba: **UNYAN(I)SILE neh?**
- 315 %trn: IS SHE/HE CORRECT, YES?
- 316 \*LNS: Yes sir.
- 317 \*Bamba: ABSOLUTELY.

L13 produces two repairables (301, 304). The first repairable is silence or a failure to take up a turn, and the second is taking it up but speaking softly. Bamba initiates repair on the first (320) and second repairables (306), upon which L13 self-repairs (304, 308).

From a language point of view, the episode is conducted in the multilingual variety, except for the final adjacency pair which is conducted in English (314 and 315) which ends the repair sequence and returns to a regular IRE/F exchange. Also Bamba's (302 and 306) repair-initiation is done in a multilingual variety, and L13 self-repairs in a multilingual variety (304) and in English (308). The multilingual variety used in the episode is comprised of isiXhosa-isiMpondo grammatical items and English words. English nouns are incorporated into isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions. The nouns are key words used in the lessons, viz., 'grid references' (297, 302, 304); 'one', 'B' (302-3); 'B-seven' (304); 'B', 'B-seven' (309).

The multilingual variety used by L13 and by other learners generally in a whole-class format is distinct from that used by teachers. First, it is rare for learners to use this variety, but common for teachers. Second, learners use it in a troubled sequence such as the current excerpt. Third, learners use it when cued to do so by a teacher, as shown in relation to co-production or turn-sharing (6.3.3, Excerpt 29). Fourth, the specific structural form it takes is a syntactic assimilation of English nouns into isiXhosa-isiMpondo syntax, as in 'ii-grid references/ grid references' (304). Teachers use this form but also use structurally more complex insertions. These are discussed in 8.1. In other words, learners are not encouraged to make insertional or alternational switches in whole-class interaction.

In order to understand L13's lack of response or the first repairable (302), it is necessary to refer to previous sequences and to participant observation. This episode follows on several others in which learners have failed to correctly use map grid references to locate places on a map and Bamba's frustration with the learners is growing.

Lines 297-301 bear attest to this growing frustration. In TCU1 (297) Bamba allocates an unsolicited turn to L13 with a curt 'Eeh/yes'. As discussed in relation to Excerpt 31 (chapter 6), this kind of turn allocation is a potentially face-threatening act. In this case, it is a rather aggressive step, considering that several learners who had made bids for the turn have failed to produce a correct answer and were told off for their trouble. L13 (301) is quite distressed at having been allocated the turn and first responds with silence, i.e., fails to take it up. Bamba correctly reads this as a reluctance to take it up and produces a series of four TCUs in which he insists that L13 takes up the turn, thus conveying his frustration. TCU1 and TCU2 are delivered in rapid succession to emphasise his insistence. TCU2, TCU3 and TCU4 are shortened versions of TCU1 and serve to underline the imperative character of the turn, that is, L13 is required to take up the turn regardless of whether or not she knows the answer. In addition, Bamba uses two terms of address in an ironical way to underline his dissatisfaction. The first is 'mfondini/friend' (302) a term of endearment among peers and 'madam' a formal term of address for an older woman.

In response to Bamba's elicitation (302 and 306,) L13 produces self-repairs (304 and 308). Bamba does not immediately evaluate L13's self-repair (308,) but first allocates the evaluation slot to other learners for a choral evaluative response (311). In this way the IRE/F is modified from being a dyadic interaction between L13 and Bamba to a triadic interaction between teacher, L13, and other learners.

Bamba's prolific use of the multilingual variety (297-308) follows several episodes in which learners had great difficulty using map grid references to locate places on a map. The central claim here is that prolific use of the multilingual variety is sequentially meaningful in that it marks the exchange as especially troubled. Bamba and L13 conduct the episode largely in the multilingual variety (297-308) and once trouble is resolved, divergent language use is re-established, where a teacher switches between isiXhosa-isiMpondo and English (309-310, 312, 315) and learners stay in English only (308, 311, 314).

#### *7.2.6.4 Weak choral response*

Excerpt 44 is from a grade 8 English Lesson and documents repair initiation on account of weak learner group response. This is a transitional episode following a series of lecture sequences in which the teacher explains how comparative adjectives work. The excerpt essentially documents a series of checking-and-confirming exchanges, as shown in 6.3.2, but with the difference that Excerpt 44 is troubled.

The transitional nature of the episode is marked in two ways, that is, through CS and turn-taking. It is marked by the use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo by Sindi (160-63, 172, 176, 180) as well as by the learners (168, 174, 178) throughout the episode. Sindi phrases her question (161-163) such that isiXhosa-isiMpondo is the most appropriate language for response. Second, it is also marked by the use of a turn allocation designed for group rather than individual response.

**Excerpt 44: Weak choral response (Lesson 2)**

- 160 \*Sindi: O:kay. Hm::: **Masiy(i)tshintshe kengoku le-sentence yethu sithi,**
- 161 "Lizo is a ha:ndso:me boy: in: the: cla:ss" ((writing)). **Xa ucinga kengoku**
- 162 **le-sentence yethu,** "↑Lizo is a handsome boy in the class". **Xa ucinga lo**
- 163 **Lizo wethu simkhomperisha nabantu abanga:↑phi?**
- 164 %trn: O:kay. Hm::: Now let's change our sentence and say, "Lizo is a
- 165 ha:ndso:me boy: in: the: cla:ss" ((writing)). When you think about our
- 166 sentence, 'Lizo is a handsome boy in the class'. We are comparing our "Lizo"
- 167 with ↑how many people?
- 168 \*LNS: **Abaninzi** ((begins with a few and then more learners join in to produce the
- 169 choral response)).
- 170 %trn: With many people.
- 171 \*Sindi: **Yhe::?**
- 172 %trn: Say again.
- 173 \*LNS: **ABANINZI.**
- 174 %trn: WITH MANY PEOPLE.
- 175 \*Sindi: Ye:s **simkhompherisha nabantu aba↑theni?**
- 176 %trn: Ye:s we compare him with how many people?
- 177 \*LNS: **Abaninzi.**
- 178 %trn: Many people.
- 179 \*Sindi: **Abaninzi.**
- 180 %trn: Many people.

A weak and unsynchronized learner choral response (168) is the trouble source or the repairable in this episode. Sindi's (171) repair initiation is about repairing a weak and unsynchronized choral response (168-9). In a context like this, teachers

often interpret weakly performed choral responses as a sign that learners may not have understood the teacher's previous sequences and therefore she may have to reformulate or go over them again. Strongly performed choral responses are interpreted as giving a teacher a clear signal to move along with the lesson. Thus a response to the repair-initiation (171) is a strong and synchronised choral response (173), which demonstrates that learners, as a cohort or group, are attentive and are following the lesson. For good measure, the sequence (175-180) is repeated, to double check whether there are any learners who may not be certain about how comparative adjectives work. Through a strong choral response of this kind the class also closes the current topic and marks a transition to another.

#### *7.2.6.5 Different and competing responses*

In the following episode, the class is about to begin a task of identifying adjectives from a list of sentences on a chalkboard. Before learners work on the task, Sindi works through an example with the whole group. As with the previous excerpt, the repair work in the episode is marked through CS, a predominant use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo, and learner choral responses.

**Excerpt 45: Different and competing choral responses (Lesson 2)**

- 199 \*Sindi: Aw:right. "Mbuyiselo is unki::nd than." Monw- oh. "Mbuyiselo is unkind"
- 200 ((reading)). **Iphela apho** i-sentence **yethu**. Mbuyiselo is unkind'. That is
- 201 **Δsi- si- ay(i)denthifaya bani phayaΔ? Okanye si- si diskray(i)bha ↑ba:ni?**
- 202 %trn: Al:right. "Mbuyiselo is unki::nd than." Monw- oh. "Mbuyiselo is unkind"
- 203 ((reading)). That's where our sentence ends. 'Mbuyiselo is unkind'. That is
- 204 Δwe we who/what are we referring to thereΔ? Or who/what are we describing?
- 205 \*LNS: Unkind ((many)). **UMbuyiselo** ((some)).
- 206 \*Sindi: **Sidiskray(i)bha ba::↑ni?**
- 207 %trn: Who/what are we describing?
- 208 \*LNS: UNKIND ((many)). **UMbuyiselo** ((some)).
- 209 \*Sindi: **Hha:y(i)bo**. [**KALOKU** u-unkind **yi**-description word. **Yi**-adjective **yethu** =
- 210 %trn: No. LOOK unkind is a descriptive word. It is an adjective.
- 211 \*LNS: [**UMbuyiselo**] ((some learners)).
- 212 %trn: Mbuyiselo.
- 213 \*Sindi: = **e:descri:bha bani?**
- 214 %trn: that describes who/what?
- 215 \*LNS: **UMBUYISELO**.
- 216 %trn: Mbuyiselo.
- 217 \*Sindi: **UMbuyiselo**.
- 218 %trn: Mbuyiselo.

The episode is an example of language convergence where Sindi's (201, 206, 209, 213, 217) and the learners' (205, 208, 215) language use converges around isiXhosa-isiMpondo, but note some learners produce an English item 'unkind' (205, 208). Analysis focuses on repair work: learner repairables (205, 208), other-initiation (209, 213), self-repair (2011, 215) and explicit evaluation and

confirmation of repair (217). An initial repairable (205) arises from Sindi's elicitation in isiXhosa-isiMpondo (201). The question, '**Sidiskray(i)bha ba::↑ni?**/ Who or what are we describing?'(201) is constructed through syntactic-plus-phonological assimilation of the English 'describe' as '**diskray(i)bha**' and the isiXhosa-isiMpondo '**ba::↑ni?**'/Who or what' (201). Other assimilations that help to mark the episode as preparatory are the syntactic-plus-phonological assimilations: '**ay(i)denthifaya** /it does not describe' (201), '**sidiskray(i)bha**/ we describe' (202, 206, 213); and the syntactic assimilations: '**i-sentence**/ or sentence' (200), '**u-unkind**/ (the word) unkind' (209), '**yi-description**/ it is a description' (209), '**yi-adjective**/ it is an adjective' (209).

Turn design is the other way in which the episode is marked as distinct and it is also the reason that repair is needed in this episode. A common problem with turns designed for choral responses is the ever-present possibility for multiple, different and competing learner responses (Ko, 2009:12). This is why this form of turn-taking is used in a restricted set of sequential contexts as shown in 6.3.2. In this case, learners offer two different and competing responses: 'unkind' (205, 208) and '**UMbuyiselo**/ Mbuyiselo' (205, 208).

Sindi initiates repair by repeating her original elicitation (206), to which learners respond by repeating their different and competing responses (208). Part of the reason for the different or competing responses is that, in this context, '**bani**' could mean either 'who' or 'what'. Note that learners who respond with 'UNKIND' (208) are more numerous than those who respond with '**UMbuyiselo**/ Mbuyiselo' (208). As Sindi (209) begins to conduct other-repair, learners self-correct with the group that initially produced 'UNKIND' (208) dropping out and the remaining learners producing the alternative response '**UMbuyiselo**/ Mbuyiselo' (211, 2015). The learners' responses overlap with Sindi's other-initiation (209, 213). The learners repeat their response in a stronger voice at the end of Sindi's other-initiation (213). Finally, '**UMbuyiselo**/ Mbuyiselo' (217) is confirmed as the correct response.

The use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo, turn design for a one-word response and turn-allocation for a choral response are designed to ensure that learners can produce a correct answer in a sequentially safe environment. When the carefully set up safetalk exchange fails because of different and competitive multiple responses, both teachers and learners switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo to do repair work.

#### 7.2.6.6 Talking out of turn

In this episode, learners are required to spot adjectives in a list of sentences on the chalkboard. Except for Sindi's (508) switch to a local variety, isiMpondo, to reinstate Type 1 turn-taking (i.e., bids; refer to 6.3.1) following inappropriate learner turn-taking, much of the episode is conducted in English.

#### **Excerpt 46: Use of isiMpondo to reinstate Type 1 turn-taking (Lesson 2)**

- 505 \*Sindi: Ye:s comfortable. [Comfortable ((writing on the board)).  
]
- 506 \*LNS: [((Learners chat noisily and make bids with loud finger  
snapping.)
- 507 snapping.]
- 508 \*L21: [Horrible. ]
- 509 \*LNS: [((Learners chat noisily and bid for the turn with loud finger snapping.)
- 510 \*Sindi: *Sani ukundeya* ((In annoyed voice)). Ye:s L22.
- 511 %trn: Don't disrespect me.
- 512 \*L22: Horrible.
- 513 \*Sindi: Ye:s 'horrible' ((writing)).

The excerpt begins with the closing of a previous episode. Sindi (505) evaluates, endorses and displays a response by a previous learner. Because there are more sentences to work through on the chalkboard, learners (506) correctly interpret Sindi's (505) evaluation of a previous turn as an indication to commence bids for a next turn. Learner bids are accompanied by loud chatting and finger-snapping (506-7). In general, commencing to make bids before a teacher makes an

elicitation is oriented to as a sign of learner attentiveness and involvement in a lesson. In this case, L21 (508) is so eager to get on the teacher's participation score sheet that she/he blurts out an answer without having been allocated the turn. This is talking out of turn.

The other learners ignore L21's turn and continue to make bids in an uncharacteristically loud, chatty way, accompanied by loud finger-snapping (506-7, 509). Sindi too ignores L21's response and addresses the class. She tells them off for disrespecting her. For emphasis, she does this specifically in isiMpondo. That is, her turn is addressed to L21 for speaking out of turn and to the rest of the class for making bids nosily. Repair is about recohorting the class as a class in session and the restoration of Type 1 turn-taking. She uses isiMpondo to stress her annoyance. This is effective partly because it is rarely used and thus distinctive in her classroom.

Once classroom order is restored, the episode proceeds through Type 1 turn-taking allocation and in English only (510-513).

### **7.2.7 Learner self-initiation and other-repair (Type 7)**

In learner self-initiation and other-repair sequences, a learner indicates to other participants that she/he has some trouble producing an utterance. Troubles could be about producing a word or part of a word, or a TCU or part of a TCU. A teacher or another learner does other-repair on a learner self-initiated repair. In all eleven cases of learner self-initiation and other-repair found in the corpus, learners do not explicitly ask for help but indicate troubles in various ways, including through hesitant speech, vowel lengthening, pauses and soft delivery. Often more than one cue is used to indicate troubles or self-initiation. Sources of trouble are similar to those described in connection with Type 5 repair above. In other words, the troubles are related to English language competence. They include troubles with basic reading, pronunciation and inability to produce part or whole of an utterance in English.

### 7.2.7.1 Incomplete response

#### **Excerpt 47: Teacher-facilitated but learner-accomplished other-repair (Lesson 1)**

- 34 \*Sindi: What is a noun? [What is a noun? ]
- 35 \*LNS: [((Hands go up and fingers click)).]
- 36 \*Sindi: YE:S L02.
- 37 \*L04: Noun is the name of person o::r (2.0)
- 38 \*L05: °Place°
- 39 \*L04: Place
- 41 \*Sindi: Hm:: **uphele:le?**
- 41 %trn: Hm. Is that it?
- 42 \*L04: °Yes **misi.**°
- 43 %trn: °Yes teacher°.
- 44 \*Sindi: **Ingathi uL05 usafuna ukongeza. ΔUyongeza** ↑L05?Δ
- 45 %trn: Looks like L05 wants to make an addition. ΔAre you making an addition  
↑L05?Δ
- 46 \*L05: A noun is name of a place, person or t(h)ing.
- 47 \*Sindi: Ye:s goo:d ((writing on the board)). A NOUN is a name of a
- 48 person (.) a name of a place (.) or a na:me ↑a:: [Of a thi:ng.]
- 49 \*LNS: [Of a thing ] ((Some learners)).

Excerpt 47 was cited earlier as Excerpt 35. The excerpt is from a grade 7 English lesson. In this episode, learners are required to give a definition of a 'noun'. Sindi (36) selects L04 (37) as a next speaker. L04 (37) produces the first part of the definition but stops at 'o::r', which he produces with a lengthened vowel, followed by a two-second long pause, and in this way indicating troubles he has completing the turn. L05 (38) correctly orients to L04's vowel lengthening and pause as self-initiation and a call for help. L05 (38) provides the help by doing an other-repair.

L05 does not go through the teacher but self-selects. Note that L05's other-repair is 'off-the-record', meant only for L04's ears and hence the soft delivery.

L04 (39) takes up L05's other-repair and offers it 'on-the-record' to Sindi. Sindi (41) acknowledges L04's augmentation of his initial response and inquires in isiXhosa-isiMpondo if L04 has anything else to add. The switch, '**Uphelle:le/** Is that it?' (41), is produced with a lengthened vowel and carries the implication that L04's second response is incomplete. L04 appears to be aware of this implication in his classroom formulaic response, 'yes **misi/**yes teacher' (43), delivered without much conviction.

Until this point in the interaction, Sindi has given no indication that she heard L05's (39) self-selection and off-the-record other-repair of L04. She (44) turns to L05 to inquire in isiXhosa-isiMpondo if L05 has anything to add to L04's answer. The phrasing is interesting. '**Ingathi uL05 usafuna ukongeza/** It seems L05 wants to add something' (44), that is, L05 is addressed in the third person and she wants him to make his contribution 'on-stage'. This is simultaneously a repair of irregular turn-taking by L05 and the beginning of an other-repair of L04's answer. It appears L05 does not respond swiftly enough for Sindi's liking, and she reformulates and repeats her elicitation in a second TCU of the same turn (44) so that L05 is addressed directly, by his name and in the first person, and also in a more urgent tone marked by rapid delivery, '**ΔUyongeza ↑L05?Δ/ Δ**Are you adding something **↑L05?Δ'** (44).

From a point of view of code-switching, isiXhosa/isiMpondo is used in a discourse-related way (41, 44): firstly, in Sindi's second turn (41), to imply that L04's response is inadequate or incomplete; secondly, in Sindi's third turn (44,) in which it is used to mark a shift from addressing L04 to addressing the class and L05 (the first TCU); and thirdly, where Sindi moves from addressing the class to specifically addressing L05 (the second TCU). Once the troubles are resolved, the rest of the episode is accomplished in English (46-49).

### 7.2.7.2 Reading problems

#### **Excerpt 48: Reading problems (Lesson 3)**

- 345 \*L01: Whitney's (2.0) Whitney's::
- 346 \*Anele: Mhmh. Whitney's tried. **Ewe**.
- 347 %trn: Yes. Yes Whitney's tried. Go on.
- 348 \*L01: Whitney tried and tried to focus on her homework ((reading)).

In this excerpt L01 has trouble reading aloud the word 'tried'. The trouble is signalled by three self-initiation cues (345). First, by the repetition of 'Whitney'; second, by a two-second long pause between the first and second instance of 'Whitney'; and, third, by a stretched /s/ at the end of the second instance of 'Whitney'. Anele (346) shows orientation to L01's trouble with 'Mhmh/yes' and conducts other-repair. She first waits for L01 to figure out how to read the word 'tried' by herself and only after three self-initiation cues does Anele conduct other-repair.

The isiXhosa-isiMpondo '**Ewe/ yes**' (346) signals the end of the repair sequence and resumption of reading. As will be shown in section 8.3.1, the dominant language use in Sindi's lessons is of the divergent kind wherein, on the one hand, she uses mainly isiXhosa-isiMpondo to manage the interaction and to annotate a text, and on the other, learners read and produce responses mainly in English. However, use of '**Ewe/ yes**' in this particular case is discourse-related in that it demarcates doing repair, a momentary sequence, from doing the main business of the lesson which is to read and discuss a written text.

#### 7.2.8 Learner other-initiation and other-repair (Type 8)

Learner other-initiation and self-repair (Type 8) is more common than self-initiation and other-repair (Type 7). Learner other-initiation and other-repair has the following features. (a) Other-initiation and other-repair is usually performed by a teacher. It can be conducted by another learner but this rarely occurs in this corpus. (b) In general, other-initiation and other-repair is not conducted in an immediately adjacent turn but is delayed, that is, speakers are first given a chance to self-initiate and self-repair and when this does not occur, other learners are

allocated the turn to do an other-initiation and other-repair. Should that also fail, teachers do other-initiation and other-repair. Teachers do other-initiation and other-repair in an immediately adjacent turn in the following special cases: where a repairable or error is minor, where it is outside the focus of an episode or lesson, or when doing repair does not unduly interfere with the flow of a lesson.

#### 7.2.8.1 Omission

In Excerpt 49 the class is required to use an adjective ‘talkative’ (638) to make oral sentences.

#### **Excerpt 49: Repairing a minor omission (Lesson 2)**

- 635 \*Sindi: Aw:right. ↑ **Enye**:?
- 636 \*LNS: ((Hands raised to bid for the turn))
- 637 %trn: All right. Next (sentence)?
- 638 \*Sindi: Ye:s L26.
- 639 \*L26: Yamkela is talkative child.
- 640 \*Sindi: & ↑ **Hheh**:& ((said in an incredulous tone))? **Phinda isentensi yakho**.
- 641 %trn: ↑What? Repeat your sentence.
- 642 \*L26: Yamkela is talkative (.) child.
- 643 \*Sindi: ((Chuckle)) Oh:: **Masithi**, Yamkela is a talkative girl.
- 644 %trn: ((Chuckle)) Oh:: ((I see)). Rather let us say, Yamkela is a talkative girl.

The excerpt begins with ‘Aw:right/ All right’ (635) which evaluates and ends a previous episode. Sindi switches to isiXhosa-isiMpondo ‘**enye**/next (sentence)’ (635) to initiate a new IRE sequence. The brief isiXhosa-isiMpondo phrase shows that the episode is part of a series and therefore it is unnecessary to re-state an elicitation question in full. Learners raise their hands to bid for the turn (636), Sindi switches to English to select L26 (638) as next speaker, and L26 (638) responds in English.

Sindi (640) switches back to isiXhosa-isiMpondo to do repair work on account of an inadequate/inappropriate response. The other-initiation is done in

two TCUs. First, with ‘&↑**Hhe**:&?/ What?’ (640) delivered in a raised pitch, incredulous tone, and elongated vowel; and second, with an imperative to repeat the response, ‘**Phinda isentensi yakho**/ Repeat the sentence’ (640). Although the learner is asked to repeat the sentence, which she/he literally does (642), repair-initiation is intended to give the learner an opportunity to repair the missing article ‘a’ in her/his sentence.

Sindi (643) first chuckles and expresses mock despair with ‘oh’ (643) at L26’s inability to spot the error and only then does she (643) conduct other-initiation and other-repair on L26’s turn. She stays in isiXhosa-isiMpondo to announce repair work with, ‘**Masithi**/ Rather let us say’ (643), and does the other-repair in English. In this case Sindi deems it unnecessary to disrupt the flow of the lesson by involving other learners in the repair sequence, such as by allocating the turn to other learners to conduct other-repair or to pursue the matter further, probably because the repairable in this sequential context is minor and also falls outside of the pedagogical focus of the lesson.

From the point of view of code-switching, the following observations can be made. Sindi switches between isiXhosa-isiMpondo and English to manage the lesson and the learners use only English. Her first switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo (635) ends and separates a previous episode from a new one. The second switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo (640) initiates repair and hints that other-initiation in this case is not about a lack of hearing but about the content of L26’s turn. Her third switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo, ‘**Masithi**/ Rather let us say’ (643), announces other-repair. Use of an inclusive pronoun ‘us’ probably helps mitigate against any loss of face L26 may have suffered on account of failed self-repair (639), Sindi’s incredulity (640) and chuckle (643), as well as of the act of other-initiation and other-repair on his turn (643).

#### *7.2.8.2 Incorrect grammar*

The focus of Excerpt 50 is to transform a verb ‘enjoy’ to an adjectival form ‘enjoyable’ (777), and then use the adjective in a sentence. In using the target adjective L36 (777) produces the incorrect pronoun ‘he’ rather than ‘she’. The

resulting repair sequence involves both a teacher and learners. Sindi (778-9) does other-initiation and the learners do an other-repair (782).

**Excerpt 50: Repair of grammar (Lesson 2)**

- 776 \*Sindi: Ye:s L36.
- 777 \*L36: My mother was so enjoyable when he [( ). ]
- 778 \*Sindi: [Eh::: ] **Andik(u)vanga uk(u)ba**
- 789 **uthin(i) manje.** Eh:: 'My mother was so enjoyable when ↑he:? When ↑he?
- 780 %trn: Eh::: I don't what you are saying. Eh:: . Eh:: 'My mother was so enjoyable
- 781 when↑he:? When ↑he:?
- 782 \*LNS: SHE.
- 781 \*Sindi: When ↑she::: (1.0) **Qhubeka kaloku. Andikuvanga aph(a) ek(u)gqibeleni.**
- 782 %trn: When ↑she::: (1.0) Go on then. I didn't hear what you said towards the
- 783 end (of your sentence).
- 784 \*L36: When she sees my car.

There are two kinds of trouble in this episode and both are managed through switching to isiXhosa-isiMpondo. The first case of troubles is marked by Sindi's (778) interruption of L36's turn right after L36 (777) produces the repairable 'he' instead of 'she'. Sindi (778-9) begins repair-initiation with 'Eh::', a token for thinking; she is probably thinking about how to formulate repair-initiation and the language in which to do it. She decides to do it in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and formulates it as a complaint, '**Andik(u)vanga uk(u)ba uthini manje/** I don't understand what you are saying' (778). To narrow down the object of her other-initiation, she repeats L36's answer and twice repeats the repairable item 'he' with a raised pitch and lengthened vowel. L36 fails to self-repair fast enough and the class performs other-repair (782). In this case the learners' self-selection as next speakers invites no sanctions because it helps to move the lesson along.

The second case of trouble managed through switching to isiXhosa-isiMpondo is Sindi's turn (781). In this turn Sindi endorses learners' (782) other-repair by repeating part of L36's answer, producing the repaired item in a raised pitch and lengthened vowel. The trouble is that a raised pitch and vowel lengthening in this case is meant to prime L36 to complete her/his initial and interrupted turn (777), but L36 doesn't immediately grasp this and hence a second-long pause. Sindi switches to isiXhosa-isiMpondo to say that L36 is the next speaker and is expected to complete her/his turn. L36's inappropriate use of 'enjoyable' is repaired in a subsequent episode not shown here.

#### *7.2.8.3 Incorrect pronunciation*

Excerpt 51 documents repair in an English reading lesson. Anele initiates repair on account of non-standard pronunciation. L01 (291) reads from a book and Anele and other learners follow the reading from their own books. Note that while it is quite common to correct for grammar (for example Excerpt 50 above), it is quite uncommon to correct for pronunciation. This is probably because teacher's own English pronunciation varies a lot even within the same lesson and that correcting for pronunciation is probably more face-threatening than is correcting for grammar.

**Excerpt 51: Repair of pronunciation (Lesson 4)**

- 291 \*L01: Well, I am going to (kill) Ernest soon. Cecily is little too intu-rus-ted [in  
292 ((reading)).  
293 \*Anele: [Hhayi  
294 ma:n.  
295 %trn: No man.  
296 \*L01: Cecily is a little too inter-res-ted.  
297 \*Anele: **Hm:he**:  
298 %trn: No no.  
299 \*L05: °Interested° ((more standard pronunciation)).  
300 \*Anele: Interested **mfondini. Suthi** inter-re-sted.  
301 %trn: Interested, friend. Don't say, inter-res-ted.  
302 \*L01: [[[Chortles]. ]  
303 \*LNS: [[[Laughter)].]  
304 \*L01: Interested.  
305 \*Anele: **Ehe**.  
306 %trn: Yes.

L01 (291) reads 'interested' in a disfluent and non-standard way as 'intu-ras-ted'. Anele (293-4) interrupts L01 to initiate repair. The repair is initiated in a mixed phrase commonly used to mark irritation, '**hhayi man**/ no man' (29-34). '**Hhayi**' is isiXhosa-isiMpondo for 'no', and 'man' is Afrikaans pronounced 'mun' which in this context is a gender neutral term of address with rough meaning of 'person'. Through the phrase she does other-initiation, marks irritation with L01's reading, and evaluates and rejects L01's disfluent and non-standard pronunciation of 'interested'.

L01 (296) self-repairs and produces 'interested' as 'inter-rest-ed', a more or less standard pronunciation except that the word is read disfluently, syllable by syllable. Anele performs a second other-initiation with a curt '**Hm:he:**/ No no' (297) on L01's self-repair. L05 (299) attempts to do an off-the-record other-repair of L01's repairable, that is, essentially to help L01 without being discovered doing so. It is unclear, however, if L01 has heard the off-the-record other-repair and in any case, she does not have a chance to take it up because Anele (300) performs other-repair in her turn. In the same turn (300), she complains about L01's mispronunciation, ironically calling her '**Mfondini**/Friend'. She also repeats L01's pronunciation in a caricatured way which draws both chortles from L01 (302) and laughter from the other learners (303). This is a light moment sharing amusement at the vagaries of English pronunciation. The episode concludes with L01 (304) producing 'interested' in more standard pronunciation and more fluently and Anele (305) evaluating and endorsing of the turn. Thus correction of pronunciation is mitigated by the use of humour in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, even if it is at L01's expense. This appears to succeed in making the exchange less face-threatening.

This episode is an example of a canonical form of a parallel/divergent pattern in which a teacher manages an interaction in a multilingual variety (293) and isiXhosa-isiMpondo (297; 300, 305). The only two occasions on which Anele uses English is to offer a correct pronunciation (300) and to quote L01's non-standard pronunciation (300). Learners, however, use English for the entire episode. Thus, meaning of CS does not derive from sequential juxtaposition but from the fact that participants have different roles and therefore different rights with regard to which languages to use and when.

#### *7.2.8.4 Pre-emptive repair*

The final excerpt is from a Social Science lesson in which Bamba conducts an episode largely in isiXhosa-isiMpondo with English insertions (163-5), and learners use English (169). The repair sequence is unusual in that Bamba repairs a repairable that learners have not actually produced in the current episode or the lesson. He uses his knowledge of the speech patterns of the learners to perform an anticipatory or pre-emptive other-repair.

**Excerpt 52: Pre-emptive repair of isiMpondo pronunciation (Lesson 7)**

- 163 \*Bamba: ΔSifuna iBhisho madoda.Δ u-Eight-A uv- uvelile pha. Ivelile ne Bhisho.
- 164 Na::ntsiya iBhisho ivela pha noTyutyu. Indawo ukuth(i)wa kukwaTyutyu.
- 165 Kodwa ke nguTyutyu leyandawo xa siy(i)biza. AyingoTshutshu, are you listening?
- 166 %trn: ↑We are looking for Bhisho guysΔ. Eight-A uv- is there. Bhisho is there.
- 167 There is Bhisho near Tyutyu. A place called Tyutyu. We call it Tyutyu. It is not
- 168 Tshutshu, are you listening?
- 169 \*LNS: Yes sir.

The focal item in this episode is pronunciation of a place name called ‘Tyutyu’ (164). A relevant biographical point is that Bamba is not from the local area and speaks a variety closer to standard isiXhosa. He has observed that in the local variety the sound /tyu/ is often produced as /tshu/. A common example is ‘**ukutya**/food’, often produced as ‘**ukutsha**’.

Bamba’s pre-emptive correction of learner pronunciation is marked for three reasons. It is noticeable, first of all, precisely because it is pre-emptive. Usually other-repair follows an actual repairable. Second, it is marked because Bamba insists on precise pronunciation of an isiXhosa-isiMpondo item in what is officially an English L2-medium lesson. Third, learners routinely produce their speech with an isiMpondo inflection and Bamba does not orient to their ‘isiMpondoness’. Thus the fact that he does so in this case and particularly when learners did not in fact produce this repairable, is especially marked. This shows that while most isiXhosa and isiMpondo utterances are nearly always treated by all classroom participants as isiXhosa-isiMpondo, there are instances in which teachers orient to a distinction between the two varieties of isiXhosa in an English-language or English L2-medium classroom. Essentially, this repair produces Bamba as a competent speaker of a standard variety and learners as incompetent speakers. He could be doing this as part of role differentiation, distinguishing ‘teacher’ from ‘learner’, but it could also be a subtle way to invoke sociocultural

differences that may exist between 'amaMpondo' and 'amaXhosa' or make them relevant in this sequential context.

Three observations can be made from the point of view of codeswitching. First, Bamba's (163-5) turn is done mainly in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. Predominant use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is associated with a desire to make things clear for learners. Second, the switch probably has to do with the fact that the point under discussion is the pronunciation of an isiXhosa-isiMpondo word. Third, there are two English insertions in the turn. The one, 'U-Eight' (163), is morphologically integrated into an isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCU. Number names such as 'eight' in this speech community could belong either to isiXhosa-isiMpondo or English, and therefore 'eight' probably is not a sequentially meaningful 'switch'. The other insertion is an English tag question for checking listening, 'are you listening' (165). Bamba often uses the tag to elicit group choral responses and to obtain learner confirmation of listening/understanding. In this case, given that learners did not actually produce a repairable for which they are being pre-emptively repaired, the use of the English tag and the design of the turn for a group response (169) can be read as designed to legitimize correction of an imagined incorrect pronunciation.

## 7.3 Findings and Conclusions

### 7.3.1 Findings

First, CS is one of the resources through which a turn or episode is marked as doing repair work. Frequent language juxtaposition by teachers in certain sequential contexts is an indication of troubles they may be having in deciding on the most appropriate 'medium' in which to support learning. Having selected isiXhosa-isiMpondo as a medium in which to do a turn, for example, a number of repairables are produced because of difficulties in finding isiXhosa-isiMpondo equivalents for genre-specific English terminology used in textbooks. These actions can be described as attempts at 'medium' self-repair (Gafaranga, 2011). The presence of this type of repair is one indication that the setting in which the interaction takes place is English-limited.

Second, as correctly observed by Macbeth (2004:729), a basic difference between repair in classroom talk and in ordinary conversation is the existence in

classrooms of a “normative order of correct and correctable replies”. In multilingual classrooms this normative order is partially produced and marked through CS. Often teachers initiate repair on a learner turn in isiXhosa-isiMpondo or a multilingual variety, but a learner produces a repair in English. In contrast to what happens in monolingual classrooms such as those investigated by McHoul (1990) or Macbeth (2004), in multilingual classrooms, CS is a key way in which repair is contextualized (Gumperz, 1982) or indexed (Hanks, 2001) and repair sequences accomplished. Use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is associated with doing repair, but its use alone does not signal trouble. Other factors must also be considered, including other contextualization or indexical cues, the sequential circumstances in which isiXhosa is used, turn-taking, and the actual content of turns.

Third, there is a dual preference system for repair organization in the corpus: one for teachers, and another for learners. Preference organization for repair for teachers operates in the same way as in ordinary conversation (Schegloff, et al, 1977), that is, teachers overwhelmingly produce self-initiation and perform self-repair. For learners, the vast majority of their repairables are other-initiated and over one-third of them are resolved through other-repair. Note that even though a large number of learner-produced repairables are other-repaired, even in these classrooms, this is generally dispreferred. Other-repair is often accompanied by dispreference markers such as delays in order to give learners a chance to self-repair. In summary, while doing other-initiation on a learner turn is not necessarily dispreferred, doing other-repair can be dependent on sequential circumstances. This finding is consistent with findings of other researchers (e.g., Macbeth 2004; McHoul, 1990; Seedhouse, 2004).

Fourth, learner repairables in this corpus are overwhelmingly about the correction of ‘errors’ in the strict sense of the word. Nearly all the errors are language-related, that is, they are related to ‘incomplete learner L2 usage’ (Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain, 2003:375). Many are errors of grammar, pronunciation, disfluent reading, or production of incomplete or inadequate responses. Teacher repairables include errors but a lot more of them are about

word searches, reformulations, and difficulties arising from switching between different varieties. Thus, how participants do repair is indexical and reflective of their different institutional roles, as documented also in McHoul (1990) and Macbeth (2004). In multilingual but English L2-medium classrooms there is an added dimension, that is, how teachers and learners do repair is reflective also of their different linguistic competencies in English.

Fifth, the preponderance of other-repair on learner turns, or alternatively, a low count of learner self-repair, can be explained in terms of failure to recall an answer or to apply a correct rule or procedure. Such an explanation of course applies to monolingual as well as a multilingual classrooms. In multilingual classrooms, however, a low incidence of learner-self repair is accounted for by an additional factor, the language factor. A language normative order operating in this corpus blocks learners from using isiXhosa-isiMpondo, their stronger language, in whole-class formats to formulate, reformulate or elaborate their turns, and hence the frequent need to perform other-repair. This classroom order of language use is so powerful and internalised by participants that not a single case of 'medium repair' (Gafaranga, 2011) on a learner's turn is documented in this corpus. That is, no case is found where a teacher tells learners not to use isiXhosa-isiMpondo or a mixed variety, but they almost never do.

Sixth, the closest case to medium repair on a learner's turn is a pre-emptive repair of the isiMpondo pronunciation of an isiXhosa item in Excerpt 52. This case provides additional evidence that varieties constitutive of the hyphenized isiXhosa-isiMpondo are oriented to by participants, in certain sequential environments, as distinct varieties, viz., isiXhosa and isiMpondo. This essentially corroborates a claim made in 4.2.2.

### *7.3.2 Conclusions*

Implications of the findings for a CA approach to bi/multilingual classroom talk include the following:

First, because frequent language juxtaposition, or constant CS, along with other cues, can itself signal or index repair, it is not necessary that, in order to

generate local meanings, language juxtaposition should take place against a background of same language talk (Auer, 1995) or same medium talk (Gafaranga, 2007). In other words, the CA claim that constant language juxtaposition weakens the power of contrastive language use to generate local meanings is supported by large parts of the corpus, but is not universally valid.

Second, in addition to CS, divergent language use is one of the specific ways in which classroom participants mark sequences as troubled or as 'repair' sequences. In repair sequences teachers often switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo and/or a multilingual variety while learners use English only. This analysis, then, unlike that of Auer (1995:125), finds that divergent language use is not about language negotiation but about the way in which teachers and learners co-operate to do repair work. CS as a distinct variety can be locally meaningful.

Third, a dual system for the organization of classroom repair demonstrates that pursuit of a central goal of classroom interaction, teaching and learning, fundamentally shapes how teachers and learners do repair. That is, doing successful teaching and learning requires that participants orient to and jointly produce and reproduce a dual system for the organization of classroom repair. This contrasts with ordinary bi/multilingual talk where participants have a single system for the organization of repair and which participants manage on a turn-by-turn basis (Schegloff, et al, 1977). An adequate analysis of classroom repair in multilingual classrooms requires simultaneous reference to the sequential circumstances as well as the institutional goals, roles and actions in which repair work is embedded.

Fourth, in multilingual classrooms where there is limited access to an L2-medium, teacher repairables can either be discourse- or participant-related, but learner repairables are overwhelmingly participant-related and specifically related to language competence.

Fifth, the fact that learners never switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo or the multilingual variety to do self-repair cannot be explained through a sequential analysis, but relates to the institutional norms of language use.

## 8. Teachers' Patterns of Language Use

In contrast to previous chapters which examined patterns of language use and interaction practices across the corpus, this chapter focuses on the individual communicative practices of each of the five teachers. That is, it presents a comparative analysis of similarities and differences between patterns of language use according to subjects taught and teacher. It is comprised of two sections. The first section presents and analyses mainly quantitative comparative data and the second draws on quantitative data but presents mainly qualitative, interview data relating to each teacher.

The first section presents a comparative description and analysis of teacher language use in three learning areas/subjects, viz., English, Social Science and Technology. The section examines the extent to which each teacher's language practices can be attributed to an individual communicative style, is a function of the subject in which it used, or can be ascribed to larger institutional and social processes influencing language use. For the rationale and approach to quantification refer to 3.4.2 and 3.5.2.

The second section presents a summary profile of each teacher's language practices, drawing on both quantitative and qualitative data. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the implications of the findings for a CA approach to bi/multilingual classroom talk.

### 8.1 Patterns of Language Use

This section presents a comparative analysis of teachers' language use. Analysis is organised into four sub-sections, viz.; language of Turn Construction Units (TCUs), language of turns, language of sequence/episode, and language of classroom mode. Each sub-section begins by presenting a summary of the findings, then goes to a detailed analysis, and concludes with a discussion of findings.

#### 8.1.1 Language of Turn Constructional Units (TCUs)

Recall that a Turn Constructional Unit (TCU) can be a sentence, phrase, word, gesture or other non-linguistic action that is interactionally meaningful. A TCU is the smallest unit of interaction in Conversation Analysis (Sacks, et al, 1978).

Below is a presentation of the frequency of TCUs and varieties in which they are accomplished. Quantification enables us to describe in summary form a large corpus and establishes a basis for making comparisons between teachers and classroom types, viz., English language vs. Social Science vs. Technology lessons.

Quantitative description and analysis is based on and complements the qualitative analysis of transcripts. When one compares the proportions of multilingual TCUs in Sindi's classroom transcripts with those in Anele's, for example, they are about the same. However, this does not mean that their TCUs are put together in the same way. This makes a link between quantitative and qualitative analysis essential because qualitative analysis reveals significant differences, such as those in the composition of TCUs, that are not revealed through quantitative analysis. Refer to 3.3.2 and 3.4.2 for details about the rationale for quantification, procedures for quantification, and analytic strategies.

## 8.1.2 English Lessons

### *8.1.2.1 Summary findings*

As in chapter 4, the focus of quantitative analysis is linguistic repertoires, that is, columns 1 to 5 in Table 8.1. The proportion of English TCUs, as a percentage of total TCUs in her transcripts, is highest in Sindi's classes, and the proportion of isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCUs as a percentage of her total TCUs, is highest in Anele's. Sindi adheres more to the official medium of teaching, in contrast Anele, who sharply deviates from it and produces an overwhelming number of her TCUs in isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

Both teachers produce most of their TCUs in a monolingual rather than a multilingual pattern. As will be discussed later, language use in the English language lessons leans strongly towards language separation at the level of the TCU.

Their multilingual TCUs are produced in a similar way, except that Sindi produces many more syntactically and phonologically assimilated TCUs and she uses English discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions more frequently and pervasively.

**Table 9: English Total TCUs by Teacher (Count and %)**

Teacher	Lesson	Unit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Sindi	English	N	350	232	3	145	47	15	0	0	38	830
		%	42	28	-	17	6	2	-	-	5	100
Anele	English	N	54	781	0	114	0	12	0	3	77	1041
		%	5	76	-	11	-	1	-	-	7	100

1= English, 2 = isiXhosa-isiMpondo, 3 = isiMpondo, 4 = Multilingual variety, 5 = Classroom formulaic language, 6 = Non-Linguistic, 7 = Inaudible, 8 = Lack of hearing, 9 = Language neutral

Note that Sindi also teaches a Technology class in School A. Of all teachers in the group, Sindi produces the largest proportion of English TCUs. See Appendix I for a comparative table of teacher TCUs. Sindi produces 42% of her TCUs in English compared to Anele's 5%. Neither teacher produces the majority of their TCUs in English. Given that English is both the target language and an official medium of teaching, use of other languages is indicative of difficulties, described in detail in previous chapters, in conducting teaching and learning and in communicating through English. In other words, classroom participants have available to them other more viable varieties, through which to conduct interaction.

Sindi and Anele use classroom varieties available to them in different ways. In Sindi's classroom, a relatively small proportion of TCUs (45%) are produced in the unofficial varieties of the classroom, viz., isiXhosa-isiMpondo and the multilingual variety, whereas in Anele's classroom the vast majority of TCUs (87%) are produced in this way. Sindi appears to do a better job of producing many of her TCUs in English. The two deviate from the official medium of instruction in different ways.

In spite of these differences, the teachers have a similar pattern of language use with respect to a strong leaning towards keeping their languages apart. A small number of their TCUs are produced through intra-sentential or 'insertional' switching (Muysken, 2000:60). The vast majority of their TCUs are produced monolingually in English or isiXhosa-isiMpondo, with Sindi producing 70% of her TCUs monolingually (42% in English and 28% in isiXhosa-isiMpondo) and Anele 81% of hers (5% in English and 76% in isiXhosa-isiMpondo). Note,

though, that isiMpondo as a distinctive variety has a small role in Sindi's speech and does not occur at all in Anele's.

Only 17% of Sindi's and 11% of Anele's TCUs are produced multilingually. Participants create multilingual TCUs through syntactic and syntactic-plus-phonological transference or assimilation (Clyne, 2003:78). See, for example, de Klerk (2006:102-118) for use of similar strategies in other isiXhosa-English bilingual corpora. Syntactic assimilation is more prevalent than syntactic-plus-phonological assimilation in this corpus. Assimilation takes three forms. In the first form, English nouns and verbs are assimilated into isiXhosa-isiMpondo syntax. Note that the assimilation of common nouns and verbs only takes place in the direction of English into isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions; the converse does not occur in the speech of these two teachers. In other words, the direction of borrowing of content words is from a prestigious to a less prestigious variety. In the second form, unassimilated English discourse markers are inserted into isiXhosa-isiMpondo syntax. This, then, is a case of 'lexical transference' (ibid). In a third form, unassimilated isiXhosa-isiMpondo discourse markers are used at the beginning of English constructions.

Regarding syntactic-plus-phonological assimilation of English items into isiXhosa constructions, Sindi produces a larger proportion of such items, and a larger proportion of English discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions. Anele produces most of her multilingual TCUs as syntactic assimilations of English discourse markers into isiXhosa-isiMpondo sentences. See Excerpt 53 for syntactic assimilation, Excerpt 54 for syntactic-plus-phonological assimilation, and Excerpts 55 to 58 for assimilations of discourse markers.

***Excerpt 53: Syntactic assimilation of English nouns***

636 \* Sindi: **Ezine** i-nouns. I-sentence **yakho ke ixhomekeke kuwe**.

Four AGR-nouns AGR-sentence make up your own sentence.

638 %trn: Four nouns. Make up your own sentence.

In Excerpt 53 above, the words 'noun' and 'sentence' are syntactically assimilated into an isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCU via isiXhosa-isiMpondo affixes to mark

subject agreement. In this case, the English items are used in a discourse-related way. Through syntactic assimilation, Sindi integrates the English items with little structural alteration of their form. The effect of this is that the English items retain structural integrity, salience and Englishness, and therefore can serve as discourse cohesion devices linking the content of the current TCU, produced in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, to previous ones done in English. Syntactic assimilations are used in other ways, including for ‘self-facilitative’ purposes (Arthur, 1996), such as when a speaker is unable to retrieve or does not know an isiXhosa-isiMpondo equivalent.

In syntactic-plus-phonological assimilation, English verbs are assimilated into isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions and hence ‘to concentrate’ becomes ‘**akhonsentrey(i)the**’ in Excerpt 54 below. Thus this item is assimilated at both the syntactic and phonological level so that it functions and sounds like an isiXhosa-isiMpondo item. Thus ‘to concentrate/ **akhonsentrey(i)the**’ is assimilated via the following inflections: affixing of a subject agreement marker /a-/, and addition of two phonemes, /yi/ and /e/, to make it sound like isiXhosa-isiMpondo. Note the /e/ at the end of this word is a sounded vowel in isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

In this case Anele assimilates an English item not because she is unable to retrieve or does not know an isiXhosa-isiMpondo equivalent, but because she deems it is a safe item to assimilate in this context, that is, because learners are familiar with the meaning of the item from previous episodes. What assimilation enables her to do here is to pass off this TCU as an isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCU. Syntactic-plus-phonological assimilation here leads to ‘language convergence’ (Clyne, 2003:103), in that her languages become the same at the syntactic-plus-phonological levels. Thus the Englishness of the integrated English item is less salient after it has been ‘Xhosalised or Xhosaised’; the item does not function as a sequentially contrastive switch.

***Excerpt 54: Syntactic-plus-phonological and lexical assimilation of English verbs***

147 \*Anele: ΔAkasoze akhonsentrey(i)the (kwezo) zifundo zakheΔ.

148 %trn: ΔShe will not be able to concentrate on her studiesΔ.

Often English discourse markers are affixed to the beginning of isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCUs and work as discourse cohesion devices. For example, the conjunctions ‘although’ (Excerpt 55), ‘so that’ (Excerpt 56), and ‘because’ (Excerpt 57) serve to tie current TCUs to previous ones. ‘Although’, for instance, indicates that the current TCU is linked to something said/done in previous TCUs and signals that what was said there is about to be modified in some way. ‘So that’ culminates a turn and helps to mark it as designed for a choral response. And ‘because’ introduces a TCU that concludes an explanation begun in earlier episodes.

***Excerpt 55: English Discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions***

254 \*Sindi: Although **amanye awunokwazi ukuthi:**↑ni?

255 %trn: Although other words you won't be able ↑to:

***Excerpt 56: English Discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions***

166 \*Sindi: So that **ke ngoku igey(i)thi yakho** ↑ibe:?

167: %trn: So that then your gate is:

***Excerpt 57: English Discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions***

409 \*Sindi: BECAUSE **KALOKU KUBEKHONA UBU:SHU:SHU: PHA:YA:.**

410 %trn: ΔBECAUSE YOU KNOW IT IS HOT IN THERE.

The use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo discourse markers in English constructions is rare in this corpus. The only case occurs in Sindi’s speech. (See Excerpt 58 below.) Like English discourse markers, isiXhosa-isiMpondo ones occur at the beginning of a TCU. In the Excerpt, ‘**okanye/ or**’, is used in a discourse-related way to flag the fact that a question put to learners in a previous TCU is about to be reformulated.

***Excerpt 58: isiXhosa-isiMpondo discourse marker in English constructions***

33 \*Sindi: **Okanye** the forces that are acting in the structures?

34 %trn: Or the forces that are acting in the structures?

While it can be shown through sequential analysis that the discourse markers in Excerpts 55 to 58 are used in a discourse-related way, a different claim can also be made. Looked at from a ‘global’ of point view, that is, from that of whole lessons, it can be shown that discourse markers are a feature of teacher’s multilingual

communicative styles. Recurrent and pervasive use of a small set of discourse markers suggests that some discourse markers are an attribute of a speaker. From that point of view, it is not a primary function of some of these discourse markers to indicate shifts in conversational ‘footing’. This is because speakers do not seem to orient to the ‘linguageness’ of these items in every case. Speakers often do not treat the items as belonging to this or that language, but largely as belonging to both. In which case, the TCUs are instances of Myers-Scotton’s (1993b) CS as an unmarked choice, or Auer’s (1999) Language Mixing.

### 8.1.3 Social Science Lessons

#### 8.1.3.1 Summary findings

Only a small proportion of Thami’s and Bamba’s TCUs are produced in the official medium of teaching and learning. That is, a vast majority of their TCUs are produced in non-official varieties of the classroom, isiXhosa-isiMpondo and the multilingual variety.

Thami produces a greater proportion of multilingual TCUs than Bamba does. He also produces many more structurally-complex multilingual TCUs and uses complex TCUs more frequently and pervasively than Bamba.

Overall, most of their TCUs are produced through language separation rather than multilingualism. Though note that language separation is less pronounced in the Social Science than in the English classroom.

**Table 10: Social Science Total TCUs by Teacher (Count and %)**

Teacher	Lessons	Unit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Thami	Social Science	N	58	114	1	149	-	1	-	-	4	327
		%	18	35	0	46	-	0	-	-	1	100
Bamba	Social Science	N	220	482	-	343	5	1	-	1	7	1059
		%	21	46	-	32	0	0	-	0	1	100

1= English, 2 = isiXhosa-isiMpondo, 3 = isiMpondo, 4 = Multilingual variety, 5 = Classroom formulaic language, 6 = Non-Linguistic, 7 = Inaudible, 8 = Lack of hearing, 9 = Language neutral

An important difference between English and Social Science lessons at the level of the TCU is that in the latter classrooms, a greater proportion of TCUs are produced multilingually. That is, a greater proportion of TCUs are produced through intra-TCU or intra-sentential switching. Fewer TCUs are accounted for by English,

isiXhosa-isiMpondo, or isiMpondo. Thami produces 46% of his TCUs through intra-sentential switching and Bamba 32%. This is more than double the count for Sindi and Anele. See Appendix I for a comparative table. Non-language teachers tend to see themselves as ‘content’ rather than ‘language’ teachers (Gwee and Saravanan, 2016), even in L2-environments. Perhaps, for this reason, they are less sensitive or responsive to pressures to use English only. This is expressed partly through their greater inclination to combine varieties available to them rather than to keep them apart.

Multilingual TCUs are created through the same strategies as in English classrooms, viz., through syntactic-plus-phonological assimilation and the insertion of unassimilated discourse markers. A difference is that TCUs produced through these strategies occur more frequently and pervasively in Social Science classrooms. This is also a point of difference between Thami and Bamba. Thami produces a greater proportion of multilingual TCUs and uses them more pervasively than Bamba. In particular, he is a prolific user of English discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions. He also produces many more complex TCUs whose language dominance is difficult to ascertain, as documented in Excerpts 8.63 and 8.64.

Because syntactic-plus-phonological assimilation is produced in the same way and performs similar functions as in English lessons, it will not be discussed further.

In terms of multilingual TCUs created through the insertion of unassimilated English discourse markers into isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions, the following are the most common in Thami’s and Bamba’s speech.

***Excerpt 59: English discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions***

‘That is’, ‘like’, ‘so’, ‘but’, ‘because’, ‘now’, ‘then’, ‘and’, ‘I mean’
---

The use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo discourse markers in English constructions is as rare in Social Science as it is in English lessons. Again, only a single case is found and it occurs in Bamba's classroom. In Excerpt 60 below the isiXhosa adverbial item '**Mhlaw(u)mbi**/perhaps' follows a series of turns in which Bamba expresses frustration at a learner's repeated failure to produce an adequate answer. The isiXhosa-isiMpondo insertion signals a shift from 'doing' a reproach to beginnings of an action aimed to gently coax out of the learner a more complete answer. The switch therefore is regarded as discourse-related.

***Excerpt 60: Two-part TCU - from isiXhosa-isiMpondo to English***

318 \*BAMBA: **Mhlaw(u)mbi** what kind of gas are you talking about?

319 %trn: Perhaps what kind of gas are you talking about?

It is difficult to assign language dominance to a considerable number of TCUs in Social Science lessons on structural grounds alone. This is because different grammatical approaches to CS use different criteria to assign language dominance to structurally-complex TCUs (Muysken, 2000). For example, should the TCU documented in Excerpt 61 below be designated English-dominant because English is used first and provides the main verb and subject of the TCU? Or, rather, should it be considered isiXhosa-isiMpondo-dominant because it syntactically assimilates English items into isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions, and because the latter contributes a greater number of items to the TCU?

Structurally ambiguous TCUs occur both in Thami's and Bamba's speech but are more common and widespread in Thami's. See Excerpts 61 and 62 for examples of Bamba's speech and Excerpts 63 and 64 for Thami's. Structurally-complex TCUs come in two forms. The first are two-part TCUs that begin in language A and end in language B, or vice versa. The second are three-part TCUs that begin in language A, proceed in language B, and conclude in language A. Two-part forms are exemplified in Excerpt 61 and 62, and three-part forms in Excerpt 63 and 64.

**61: Two-part TCU - from English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo**

380 \*Bamba: Do you see i-*Buffalo River phaya emephini?*

381 %trn: Do you u see Buffalo River there on the map?

**Excerpt 62: Two-part TCU - from isiXhosa-isiMpondo to English**

231 \*Bamba:  $\Delta$ *Yenza uk(u)ba kube* possible to locate the certain place that you are

232 looking for in a map isn't it $\Delta$ ?

233 %trn: It makes it possible to locate the certain place that you are looking for in a

234 map isn't it?

In Bamba's speech the two-part is more common than the three-part pattern. The first TCU in Excerpt 61 begins in English and concludes in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. The first part is done in English and the second begins with insertion of an isiXhosa-isiMpondo affix to the proper noun 'Buffalo River'. In general, participants treat proper nouns as linguistically neutral, that is, they do not orient to their distinct 'languageness'. It will be shown presently that in this case, however, Bamba treats the proper noun 'Buffalo River' as a distinctly English item. The TCU in Excerpt 62 begins in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and concludes in English. Like the first TCU, it is conducted in two languages to communicate a single, coherent message.

After having closely examined turns and sequences in which TCUs in Excerpt 61 and 62 occur, it is not possible to say what local, sequential function is served by switches from English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo, or vice versa. This is not to say the switches have no meaning, however. As argued elsewhere, there are instances where this kind of language use has no demonstrable local, sequential function, yet it can be shown that this form of language use is interpretable and meaningful when examined against the background of linguistic inequality (e.g. Bourdieu, 1991) and teachers' preoccupation to design TCUs, turns and episodes that 'accommodate' (Giles, 2009) learner English language (in)competence.

In contrast to Bamba, Thami frequently produces three-part TCUs. In Excerpt 63 below the TCU begins in English, proceeds in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, and concludes in English. In Excerpt 64 the TCU begins in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, proceeds

in English, and concludes in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. In both cases it is not possible to establish language dominance on structural grounds alone.

**Excerpt 63: Three-part TCU - from English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo to English**

273 \*Thami: That is **phaya kuthwa** they closed the that is **ezi**-western frontiers.

274 %trn: That is it says there they closed the people living in the west frontiers.

**Excerpt 64: Three-part TCU - from isiXhosa-isiMpondo to English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo**

25 \*Thami: **Maw(u)bheka phaya e-America nalapha e-South Africa** everyone has the

26 right to sa:y **lonto afun(u) uy(i)thetha** ↑NEH?

27 %trn: In America and South Africa everyone has the right to say whatever they

28 want, ↑RIGHT?

Unlike two-part forms discussed above, switches in a three-part form have demonstrable local or sequential meaning. In both excerpts, English is used to quote fragments from a history textbook, ‘they closed the that’ (Excerpt 63) and ‘everyone has the right to sa:y’ (Excerpt 64). Quotation of fragments is done in English and comment on them in isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

As in the English class, the majority of TCUs in the Social Science class are produced monolingually in English and in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. Thami produces 53% of his TCUs monolingually (18% in English and 35% in isiXhosa-isiMpondo) and Bamba 67% (21% in English and 46% in isiXhosa-isiMpondo). Thus, language separation is the dominant pattern in which TCUs are produced.

IsiMpondo as a distinct variety plays no role in either teacher’s speech. This is not surprising because Thami and Bamba are not from the local area and speak a variety of isiXhosa that is closer to the standard.

Finally, both teachers produce the vast majority of their TCUs in non-official varieties of the classroom, with 81% of Thami’s TCUs (isiXhosa-isiMpondo 35% and multilingual variety 46%) and 78% of Bamba’s (isiXhosa-isiMpondo 46% and multilingual variety 32%) being produced in non-official varieties.

## 8.1.4 Technology Lessons

### 8.1.4.1 Summary findings

Sindi produces most of her TCUs in the official medium of teaching. Recall that Sindi is also an English teacher. Nande's pattern of language use is more distributed. Nande's pattern of language use is similar to that of teachers in the Social Science class, that is, she uses all varieties available to her to conduct lessons. The majority of her TCUs are produced through non-official varieties of the classroom.

Nande also produces many more multilingual TCUs, uses a range of complex strategies to create them, and uses them pervasively. Sindi produces a small number multilingual TCUs and these tend to be structurally simple, consisting of straightforward lexical insertions.

Overall, Sindi's and Nande's TCUs are produced monolingually rather than multilingually. Nande produces a larger number of isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCUs than Sindi.

**Table 11: Technology Total TCUs by Teacher (Count and %)**

Teacher	Lessons	Unit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Sindi	Technology	N	572	147	-	98	-	9	-	-	37	863
		%	66	17	-	11	-	1	-	-	4	100
Nande	Technology	N	356	407	-	361	2	-	-	1	9	1138
		%	31	36	-	32	0	-	-	0	0	100

1= English, 2 = isiXhosa-isiMpondo, 3 = isiMpondo, 4 = Multilingual variety, 5 = Classroom formulaic language, 6 = Non-Linguistic, 7 = Inaudible, 8 = Lack of hearing, 9 = Language neutral

Two thirds (66%) of Sindi's TCUs are produced in English and just under a third of Nande's (31%). Sindi produces the largest proportion of TCU's in English in the group: 42% in English and 66% in Technology lessons. Also she has the smallest proportion of TCUs produced in isiXhosa-isiMpondo: 28% in the English and 17% in the Technology class.

In contrast, Nande's language use at the level of TCUs shows no obvious language dominance. Her TCUs are produced in almost equal proportions - 31% in

English, 36% in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, and 32% in a multilingual variety. However, when account is taken of the fact that the kind of multilingual variety commonly used in her classroom is isiXhosa-isiMpondo-dominant, that is, similar to that documented in Excerpts 61 to 63 above, then it can be argued that the language dominance of her TCUs leans towards isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

Both teachers produce their multilingual TCUs through strategies similar to those found in English and Social Science lessons, that is, through syntactic and syntactic-plus-phonological assimilation of English words in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions, insertion of English discourse markers into isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions and of isiXhosa-isiMpondo discourse markers into English constructions.

In addition to the discourse markers documented in Excerpt 59 above, the following discourse markers are also found in Technology lessons.

***Excerpt 65: English discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions***

'so that,' 'let's say,' 'that means,' 'that's why,' 'for instance,' 'while,' 'whereby,'
---

Nande uses English discourse markers more frequently and more pervasively than Sindi. For both teachers, isiXhosa-isiMpondo discourse markers in English constructions are rarely used, and when they are, both use the isiXhosa-isiMpondo 'okanye/ and'.

Nande produces nearly three times as many multilingual TCUs as Sindi. Nande's multilingual TCUs are not restricted to any one particular 'pedagogical mode/classroom context' (Walsh, 2006) but occur across classroom contexts. She also produces a large number of structurally-complex two-part and three-part multilingual TCUs. Sindi, on the other hand, produces only a small proportion of multilingual TCUs, in particular very few TCUs created through syntactic-plus-phonological assimilation of English items into isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions.

In contrast, Sindi produces most of her multilingual TCUs through syntactic assimilation and rarely through a syntactic- plus-phonological assimilation.

However, overall both teachers produce most of their TCUs monolingually rather than multilingually. The vast majority of their TCUs are produced monolingually in English and in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. A total of 83% of Sindi's TCUs (66% English and 17% isiXhosa-isiMpondo) and 67% of Nande's (31% English and 36%) are produced monolingually. Thus Sindi's pattern of language use at the level of the TCU, in the English and Technology class, leans towards language separation rather than language mixing.

Finally, regarding the use of the official medium of teaching, the vast majority (66%) of TCUs in Sindi's speech are produced in English, in contrast to 31% in Nande's.

### 8.1.5 Discussion

#### 8.1.5.1 *English in an English-limited environment*

The frequency and pervasiveness of particular varieties tells us something about the language choices individual teachers make to address the challenge of teaching through English in an English-limited environment. Teachers can choose to produce their TCUs in English, isiXhosa-isiMpondo, isiMpondo or a multilingual variety. However the choice is not between equally valued varieties.

English is both the target language and the official medium of instruction in all these lessons. Authorities expect that most, if not all, TCUs be produced in English. English is the officially sanctioned, 'legitimate' (Martin-Jones and Heller, 1996) or unmarked variety (Myers-Scotton, 1993b) of classroom interaction. Thus, the greater the proportion of TCUs produced in English, the greater is a teacher's adherence to what curriculum decrees. In educational literature (e.g., Turnbull and Dailey-O'Cain, 2009), frequent use of an official medium or target language is generally regarded as good pedagogy and indicative of teacher language competence. Frequent and pervasive use of unofficial varieties, such as isiXhosa-isiMpondo or the multilingual variety, is often regarded as indicative of poor pedagogy and a lack of competence in the official varieties (Nel and Muller, 2010).

Although there is a lot of pressure on teachers to use as much English as possible, no teacher in this group produces all his/her TCUs in English. Only Sindi produces a large proportion of her TCUs in English. The degree to which teachers deviate from what curriculum prescribes varies across the group, as do the actions implemented through English, and reasons for using it. Quantitative analysis of TCUs only tells us about the degree to which teachers adhere to or deviate from the official medium of instruction, but little about when, how and why that happens. These issues are taken up in the section 8.2 and 8.3 below, in connection with language use to produce turns and to produce sequences, respectively.

#### 8.1.5.2 *Linguistic hierarchy*

School level language practices occur within a broader sociolinguistic and institutional environment in which English is the most prestigious and legitimate variety for conducting interaction in English language and English L2-medium content classrooms. Other classroom varieties are 'illegitimate' or, at best, valued only insofar as they facilitate or mediate acquisition of English and English L2-medium content. In spite of this, the majority of TCUs in all but one classroom are produced through the illegitimate classroom varieties.

Illegitimate varieties differ in status, some being less illegitimate than others. IsiXhosa-isiMpondo is the second most prestigious classroom variety and isiMpondo and the multilingual variety the least. Sources of the value and status of isiXhosa-isiMpondo include the fact that it is an official language, it is a widely spoken variety outside of formal lessons, it is taught as a subject, and is useful in helping learners access an English-medium curriculum.

IsiMpondo on the other hand is a low status local variety of isiXhosa. It is not an official language and has no written literature. Its use in the formal and whole-class format is often marked. It is the least-used language in the corpus, in part because teachers discourage its use, as shown in Excerpt 52.

The multilingual variety is an interesting case because even though it is used frequently, it is unnamed. As shown in previous chapters this variety is used in both sequentially contrastive ways (Auer, 1984) and as a code in its own right

(Myers-Scotton, 1993b). Overall, in this corpus, the multilingual variety is created largely through alternational (inter-sentential) rather than insertional (intra-sentential) switching.

#### 8.1.5.3 *Alternational and insertional CS*

The vast majority of TCUs across teachers are produced through a monolingual pattern. That is, they are produced discretely in English and in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. Alternational CS is therefore the most common form of switching in this corpus. Language separation is most pronounced in English language classrooms. Participant observation suggests that teachers keep their languages more separate in classroom communication than in ordinary conversation. This practice serves two functions. First, it is one of the ways in which teachers constitute classrooms as formal spaces of teaching and learning. In that sense, this pattern of language use indexes (Siverstein, 2003) or contextualizes (Gumperz, 1982) the notion that participants are doing classroom talk. Second, through language separation, teachers demonstrate their command of isiXhosa-isiMpondo and English as distinct varieties. In this way, the teachers model 'appropriate' or 'correct' language use to learners. This is especially important in this context because the learners use a local variety of isiXhosa and are L2-speakers of English. Thus teachers alter their regular language behaviour in order to accommodate the perceived language needs of their learners, making the practice a form of 'communication accommodation' (Giles, 2009:276) and 'audience design' (Bell, 2009:265).

Overall, fewer TCUs are produced multilingually or through intra-sentential switching in the corpus. Three observations can be made about TCUs produced through intra-sentential switching. Firstly, content teachers produce more multilingual TCUs than language teachers. This suggests that content teachers focus more on content and less on the forms of language used to communicate it (Gwee and Saravanan, 2016) than language teachers do.

Secondly, while distinguishing between 'language teacher' and 'content teacher' helps explain the patterns of language use of nearly all teachers in the group, it does not explain Sindi's. Sindi is both a language and a content teacher.

Her language behaviour is somewhat counter-intuitive. She produces a greater proportion of both English TCUs and monolingual TCUs in the content classroom than in the English language classroom. Thus she appears to pay more attention to language in the content classroom than in the language classroom. This suggests that in order to arrive at a correct interpretation of these patterns, account should be taken of the sequential circumstances in which language use occurs, in addition to the dimension 'content teacher' versus 'language teacher'.

Third and finally, even though Sindi produces less intra-sentential switches in her TCUs than anyone else in the group, this does not necessarily mean intra-sentential switches have a negligible role in accomplishing her lessons. Qualitative analysis shows that it is not just a question of frequency but of how, where and for what purpose intra-sentential switching is used. For instance, in Sindi's classroom, intra-sentential switches only occur following or in anticipation of difficulties learners may have with talk done in English only.

Multilingual TCUs are created in four principal ways. By far the most common way is through assimilation of English vocabulary into isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions. Often a single English item, but sometimes two or three, are assimilated. Assimilated items serve discourse-related functions such as tying together a multi-TCU turn or series of sequences, or participant-related functions such as when an isiXhosa-isiMpondo equivalent cannot be retrieved or is unknown to the speaker. Thus the predominant pattern and direction of assimilation reflects both that English is the official medium of instruction and that relations between first language of speakers English and isiXhosa-isiMpondo in society are asymmetrical.

In this corpus, no isiXhosa-isiMpondo common nouns are assimilated into English constructions. Assimilation of isiXhosa-isiMpondo common nouns into English constructions is often participant-related, aimed at accommodating low learner language competence in English. This direction of borrowing is often characteristic of learner language use. Competent L2-speakers of English do of course integrate isiXhosa-isiMpondo common nouns into English constructions in ordinary conversation outside of classrooms, for discourse- or participant-related

reasons (de Klerk, 2006); however, even in that context it is not as common as the opposite.

A second way in which multilingual TCUs are created is through syntactic-plus-phonological assimilation of English verbs into isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions. In classrooms syntactic-plus-phonological is less common than syntactic assimilation. This is probably because this form of CS is associated with speech in informal settings. The form is characteristic of the speech of bi/multilingual urban isiXhosa-isiMpondo speakers with varying degrees of competence in English.

In ordinary conversation among people who know one another well, the practice of syntactically-plus-phonologically assimilating English verbs into isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions occurs often and goes unremarked. When it is remarked upon it is referred to pejoratively as 'Xhosalising'. Many 'Xhosalised' items have no demonstrable sequential function but appear to be part of speakers' communicative styles. However, Xhosalised items can be used in a self-facilitative way such as when a speaker cannot retrieve or does not know an isiXhosa-isiMpondo equivalent. In this case, the assimilation of English verbs is an example of 'language convergence' (Clyne, 2003:103) in that speakers attempt to pass off assimilated English verbs as isiXhosa-isiMpondo items. In this corpus, this form of CS is used by teachers but never by learners. The fact that teachers use a form of CS associated with informal, relaxed interaction in a classroom, is another way in which different roles and power relations between teachers and learners is linguistically marked in the corpus.

A third pattern in which multilingual TCUs are created is through the insertion of English or isiXhosa-isiMpondo discourse markers at the beginning of English or isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCUs. English discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions are used frequently and pervasively by all teachers in the corpus, whereas isiXhosa-isiMpondo discourse markers in English constructions are rarely used. Discourse markers tie together TCUs, turns and sequences. English discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions help make less noticeable the 'isiXhosaness' of isiXhosa-isiMpondo-dominant TCUs in what, after all, are

supposedly English-medium lessons. Discourse markers are open to local interpretation in that they can be used in both a discourse- or participant-related way depending on the sequential environment in which they occur. Overall, the frequent and pervasive use of discourse markers appears to be a part of individual teachers' communicative styles.

Fourth and finally, multilingual TCUs are created through two part and three-part patterns. Two-part patterns are used most often and most are made up of English discourse markers inserted at the beginning of isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions. A small but significant number of multilingual two-part and three-part TCUs have no apparent language dominance. Such structurally-complex two-part and three-part multilingual TCUs hardly occur in Sindi's and Anele's lessons. It appears that participants who tend to keep their varieties apart at the level of the TCU produce the least structurally-complex multilingual TCUs. In this corpus, participants who produce frequent intra-sentential TCUs also produce many complex multilingual TCUs. Overall, frequent and pervasive intra-sentential switching indicates that in practice a teacher is relatively more relaxed about the use of CS in their own speech in the classroom.

## 8.2 Language of Turn

### 8.2.1 English Lessons

#### *8.2.1.1 Summary findings*

The majority of both Sindi and Anele's turns are produced through a monolingual pattern in English and isiXhosa. But the monolingual pattern is different for the two teachers, Sindi producing a large proportion of her turns in English and Anele hers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. This reflects their different practical responses to the challenge of teaching through the medium of English. That is, Sindi tries to teach English through English, but also finds herself having to resort to isiXhosa-isiMpondo to a considerable degree. Anele on the other hand, uses largely isiXhosa-isiMpondo, along with a multilingual variety, but very little English. Essentially the difference between data presented in Table 8.1 (TCUs) and Table 8.4 (Turns) is that when turns are made up of more than a single TCU,

intersentential and intra-sentential CS plays an important role in their organization and production. This is particularly the case in Sindi's classroom.

**Table 12: English Analysis by Turn (Count and %)**

Teacher	Lessons	Participant	Unit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Sindi	English	Teacher	N	168	81	1	125	13	4	-	-	7	399
			%	42	20	0	31	3	1	-	-	2	100
Anele	English	Teacher	N	13	318	2	90	-	2	-	-	60	485
			%	3	66	0	19	-	0	-	-	12	100

1= English, 2 = isiXhosa-isiMpondo, 3 = isiMpondo, 4 = Multilingual variety, 5 = Classroom formulaic language, 6 = Non-Linguistic, 7 = Inaudible, 8 = Lack of hearing, 9 = Language neutral

Sindi produces 42% of her turns in English and Anele 3%. Both teachers produce about the same proportion of English turns as English TCUs. Sindi uses English frequently and across many kinds of activities such as to do greetings, elicitation, lecturing/teaching and evaluation. A considerable number of her English turns are made up of multiple TCUs. In contrast, Anele's English turns are short, often only a single-word TCU, and perform a very limited number of actions, viz., prompting learners to go on with their reading, making quotations, or reading aloud from an English text. In other words, Anele produces very little spontaneous talk in English. Thus Sindi's and Anele's patterns of English turns are not only nominally/quantitatively different, but substantially different as well.

Both teachers produce fewer turns than TCUs in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. Sindi's use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo declines from 28% to do TCUs to 20% for turns, and Anele from 79% to do TCUs and 66% for turns. The two teachers use isiXhosa-isiMpondo in qualitatively different ways, however. The situation for isiXhosa-isiMpondo is the opposite of that for English. Sindi produces fewer and shorter isiXhosa-isiMpondo turns and uses the turns in a narrow range of contexts, whereas, with few exceptions, Anele uses her isiXhosa-isiMpondo turns as the primary vehicle for conducting interaction across classroom modes.

The use of the monolingual language pattern declines overall from TCUs to turns. From a total of 70% monolingual TCUs, Sindi is down to 62% of monolingual turns (42% English and 20% isiXhosa-isiMpondo), and Anele is down to 68%

monolingual turns (3% English and 65% isiXhosa-isiMpondo) from 81% monolingual TCUs. The decline in monolingual language use translates into a proportional increase in multilingual language use. Thus, 31% of Sindi's turns are produced in multilingual variety in contrast to 17% of her TCU's, and 19% of Anele's turns in contrast to 14% of her TCUs.

Sindi's and Anele's multilingual turns are created through different patterns. Sindi's turns are characterised by the extensive use of English TCUs, syntactic (see Excerpt 59) and syntactic-plus-phonological assimilation (refer to Excerpt 60) of English nouns and verbs into isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions, and frequent use of English discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions (refer to Excerpt 61).

On the other hand, Anele's multilingual turns are created through the extensive use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions, the syntactic assimilation of English common nouns and, less commonly, syntactic-plus-phonological assimilation of English nouns and verbs into isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions. Even less common in her speech is the use of English discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions.

## 8.2.2 Social Science Lessons

### 8.2.2.1 Summary findings

Fewer turns are produced through a monolingual pattern - that is, separately in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and English - in the Social Science than in the English language classroom. A multilingual variety is the single most common pattern through which turns are accomplished. The multilingual variety, complemented by isiXhosa-isiMpondo, is the medium of teaching and learning in Thami's classroom. In Bamba's classroom the multilingual variety is often used following, or in anticipation of, troubles in interaction.

Bamba uses English in a meaningful way to conduct classroom interaction, but Thami uses it largely to quote or echo passages from textbooks.

Thami relies much more on isiXhosa-isiMpondo to conduct interaction in the ‘curriculum mode’, whereas Bamba uses it often to manage learner behaviour or to resolve troubles in interaction.

**Table 13: Social Science Analysis by Turn (Count and %)**

Teacher	Lessons	Participant	Unit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Thami	Social Science	Teacher	N	19	37	0	59	-	-	-	-	2
			%	16	32	0	50	-	-	-	-	2
Bamba	Social Science	Teacher	N	72	113	-	223	-	-	-	1	-
			%	18	28	-	55	-	-	-	-	-

1= English, 2 = isiXhosa-isiMpondo, 3 = isiMpondo, 4 = Multilingual variety, 5 = Classroom formulaic language, 6 = Non-Linguistic, 7 = Inaudible, 8 = Lack of hearing, 9 = Language neutral

Thami and Bamba have a similar pattern of language use, viewed quantitatively. Thami’s and Bamba’s proportions of turns are 16% vs. 18% for English, 32% vs. 28% for isiXhosa-isiMpondo and 50% vs. 55% for the multilingual variety.

There are, however, important qualitative differences in terms of how they put together their multilingual turns. The multilingual variety is the single most common way in which turns are produced by both teachers. Thami produces a smaller proportion of multilingual turns, but his turns are larger, more pervasive and constructed through intra-sentential switching in TCUs, in particular through the insertion of English lexical items, including discourse markers, in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions. Bamba’s multilingual turns, in contrast, are shorter and often follow troubles in classroom communication such as occasions when learners do not follow what he says in English only. In contrast, the multilingual variety, along with isiXhosa-isiMpondo, are the de facto varieties in which Thami makes his turns.

Thami’s English turns tend to be short, single TCUs, and often consist of quotations from a textbook. Although some of Bamba’s English turns also involve reading or quotations from textbooks, the bulk of his turns comment and elaborate on English texts, initiate elicitations and conduct evaluations of learner turns. Bamba, then, uses English in a significant manner to conduct classroom interaction and not mainly to echo an English textbook.

In terms of isiXhosa-isiMpondo, Thami's turns are often associated with doing pedagogical scaffolding, including translations, reiterations and emphasis, and to elaborate on issues introduced in or read in English. Thus, isiXhosa-isiMpondo is used to conduct interaction around curriculum activities, i.e. it is used largely to construct and transmit knowledge, in a curriculum mode (Ferguson, 2009:232). IsiXhosa-isiMpondo is used for these purposes too in Bamba's lessons, but is more often associated with doing disciplining, i.e., it is largely used to manage 'interpersonal relations' (ibid).

### 8.2.3 Technology Lessons

#### 8.2.3.1 Summary findings

Sindi produces the majority of her turns in English, the official medium of instruction and Nande produces most of hers in a combination of non-official varieties.

English is used frequently and pervasively in Sindi's lessons, and in Nande's it occurs rarely and much of it involves quotation of written material.

Sindi uses isiMpondo in a distinctive way to mark boundaries between curriculum and other classroom events. Nande on the other hand, does not use isiMpondo in a distinctive way, but uses isiXhosa-isiMpondo in a pervasive way across all classroom modes.

**Table 14: Technology Analysis by Turn (Count and %)**

Teacher	Lessons	Participant	Unit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
<b>Sindi</b>	Technology	Teacher	N	168	-	40	64	-	1	1	1	2	277
			%	61	-	15	23	-	-	-	-	1	100
<b>Nande</b>	Technology	Teacher	N	38	67	1	182	5	-	-	1	1	295
			%	13	23	-	62	2	-	-	-	-	100

1 = English, 2 = isiXhosa-isiMpondo, 3 = isiMpondo, 4 = Multilingual variety, 5 = Classroom formulaic language, 6 = Non-Linguistic, 7 = Inaudible, 8 = Lack of hearing, 9 = Language neutral

Sindi and Nande use language in different ways. Sindi produces 61% of her turns in English, the largest proportion in the group. At 13%, Nande's English turns represent the smallest proportion in the group. Sindi shows the strongest alignment with curriculum requirements and Nande sharply diverges from it. Their use of English is also qualitatively different. Sindi produces both short and long

English turns and uses English to do a range of actions which include explaining core subject matter and managing classroom interaction. Nande's English turns are less frequent, brief, and often consist of quotations or echoes of English written material. Her use of English is similar to that of Thami in the Social Science class.

Sindi produces no turns in isiXhosa-isiMpondo but 15% of her turns are done in a distinctive isiMpondo variety. She uses isiMpondo in a marked way, specifically in environments where the curriculum context is temporarily suspended to do actions such as humour, discipline or to mark transitions between different events. Nande, on the other hand, produces 23% of her turns in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. The isiXhosa-isiMpondo turns are not confined to a particular interactional context but occur across classroom contexts, viz., managerial, curriculum and interpersonal.

Finally, regarding the multilingual variety, Nande produces the largest proportion of multilingual turns in the group. She uses her languages in a flexible way, similar to that of Thami in the Social Science class. That is, her multilingual turns are created through a range of strategies ranging across the insertion of single lexical items into English TCUs, complex intra-sentential switches (shown in Excerpts 63 and 64 above), and frequent inter-sentential switches between isiXhosa-isiMpondo and English. Like Thami, the multilingual variety, complemented by isiXhosa/ isiMpondo, is the de facto variety through which she conducts interaction across all classroom contexts. In contrast, Sindi's multilingual turns are brief and often occur around troubles in interaction. That is, her use of multilingual turns is similar to that of Bamba.

#### 8.2.4 Discussion

The pattern of varieties in which teachers select to do their turns reveals something about their beliefs and experiences of language teaching and learning as well as language practices in rural South African schools, and about how they position themselves in this linguistic market.

##### 8.2.4.1 *English turns*

English turns are constructed according to two patterns. First, turns are made up of multiple TCUs through which teachers do a number of complex

activities including lecturing, commenting on English texts, and managing classroom interaction. In this form, English is both the object and medium for conducting lessons. Sindi's use of English comes closest to this form and Thami's at a distant second. On the face of it, Sindi's language practice is most compliant with the requirement to use English.

The turns of the other two teachers tend to be short, often single TCUs, and often made up of quotations, readings or echoes of English written texts. In this form, English is used to name, point to or announce a topic but talk about the topic is conducted in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and/or a multilingual variety.

The ways in which teachers do their English turns tells us at least three things about teachers' different and complex relationships with English. First, it tells us something about the teacher's pedagogy. A teacher's use of a great deal of English in the English language or English L2-medium content classroom probably signals a belief that language is best taught through the target language, or that content subject matter is best taught through the official medium of instruction. This is a pedagogical approach that places emphasis on a teacher's role to provide learners with oral language input and to model the use of spoken English. Such pedagogies are associated with, for example, the communicative approach to language teaching (Nunan, 1991).

Those who use little oral English seem to regard a teacher's central role in the English and English L2-medium content classroom as that of helping learners to access or understand written English texts. That is, written materials, rather than the teacher, are regarded as the main sources of English language input and content in specific discourses. This partly reflects the fact that formal classroom assessment is heavily weighted in favour of written rather than spoken language. In this instance, teachers make use of all varieties available to them to assist learners to break through into an understanding of English-medium written materials.

Second, it tells us something about teachers' perceptions about how much English their learners can follow. This refers both to communicative English as well

as cognitively demanding academic English (Cummins, 2000). My experience is that those teachers who use a great deal of English in these kinds of English-limited environments regard themselves, in general, as upholding high academic standards and as having high expectations of learners. They believe that those who do not use a great deal of English are lowering educational standards. Differences in patterns of classroom language use can and often are construed as differences between 'good' and 'bad' teaching, from the vantage point of practice. There is therefore a great deal of pressure on teachers to use English, even when it is not sensible to do so (Probyn, 2009).

The pressure to use a lot of English has at least two consequences. First, in order to use a lot of English and still be understood by the class, teachers communicate in syntactically simple sentences in which vocabulary already known to learners is perpetually recycled. This kind of language use does not provide learners with rich English syntax and vocabulary on which to model their own utterances. Second, the practice of insisting on English-only in classroom interaction, particularly around exchanges that involve joint construction of knowledge, also contributes to the production and reproduction of a traditional and teacher-centred classroom characterised by teacher volubility and learner taciturnity (Chick, 1996). The combined effect of these consequences is that, over time, learners in such classrooms develop 'basic communicative' but poor 'cognitive and academic' (Cummins, 2000:59) skills in English.

Third, the use of English is often a marker of a teacher's own competence in and/or self-confidence in using English in this setting. By using English frequently in an 'English-limited' environment teachers present themselves to their learners, colleagues and others who come into their classrooms as English competent. Enacting oneself as English competent is important, because the public, supported by academic opinion (e.g., Nel and Muller, 2010), regard teachers serving rural schools as especially weak in English. Thus, teachers may avoid code-switching even when this is the best way to deal with a particular event or episode because use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is indexical of English language incompetence.

Teachers who use a lot of English in their classrooms or who are advocates of English-only, are in general regarded more favourably by school management as well as education officials. They are regarded as cooperative, professional and competent implementors of curriculum.

#### 8.2.4.2 *IsiXhosa-isiMpondo turns*

IsiXhosa-isiMpondo is the main variety for interaction between teachers and learners and between learners and learners outside the classroom. Except for Anele who produces most of her turns in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, the rest of the teachers use isiXhosa-isiMpondo intermittently in three ways. First, they use it in the curriculum mode as a 'pedagogical scaffold' (Vorster, 2008) to explain, elaborate on, stress, reiterate or translate utterances from English written texts.

Second, they use it in a managerial mode, that is, at the beginning of a lesson to do preparatory work such as handing out materials or cleaning a chalkboard; at the end of lessons to talk about assignments or homework; and to mark transitions between activities such as shifting from talking to doing a writing activity.

Third, they use it to manage interpersonal relationships. It is used to manage learner behaviour, to cohort and re-cohort a class and to establish and maintain classroom discipline. Teachers often express strong emotion, humour or frustration, almost exclusively in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. Refer to Excerpt 51 for an example of humour done in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and Excerpt 9 for frustration.

Thus isiXhosa-isiMpondo is used in a locally contrastive way to generate discourse- and participant-related meanings (Auer, 1984) and it is a socially indexical contextualisation cue (Gumperz, 1982), marking some classroom activities as distinct from others.

Anele uses isiXhosa-isiMpondo in a distinct way. She uses it frequently and pervasively across all classroom contexts. The use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo in this way carries several risks. For one, she could be sanctioned by authorities for not meeting curriculum requirements. Other teachers could accuse her of endangering academic careers of children by failing to teach them through an official medium.

She also risks being labelled English incompetent. Given all this, her persistent and pervasive use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is indicative of several things: the unworkability of the requirement for English only; her displayed conviction that English only is unworkable, and that the education system is unable to support, monitor and enforce a policy of English only. The question as to whether or not the extensive use of an L1 in an L2 language classroom is an effective strategy to facilitate high levels of L2 language acquisition is an important but difficult one (Turnbull and Dailey-O’Cain, 2009).

#### *8.2.4.3 Multilingual turns*

Multilingual turns present a different perspective from which to look at how teachers address the tension arising from the requirement to use the official medium of instruction on the one hand, and to communicate effectively with their learners on the other hand. Some try to use as much English as possible, resulting in an impoverished kind of English described above. Others first try to use English and when that fails switch to isiXhosa-isiMpondo and/or the multilingual variety. Yet others avoid English almost entirely and use mainly isiXhosa-isiMpondo and/or the multilingual variety.

One way in which multilingual turns are used is exemplified by Sindi. What is distinctive about her pattern of multilingual turns is that they are brief and the majority occur in a specific environment. They follow on or anticipate trouble in interaction, such as difficulty in explaining a complex point or with word retrieval. The general impression is that Sindi aims to conduct most of her turns in English and that her multilingual turns, like her isiXhosa-isiMpondo turns, are used in a strategic or episodic manner to resolve momentary troubles in conducting lessons in English only. She is not too worried, however, about inserting English discourse markers into isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions, which she often uses in a discourse-related way.

Another and different pattern of using multilingual turns is found in Anele’s lessons. That is, by and large, she avoids using the multilingual form at all. She has a strong preference for language separation rather than mixing. Not only does she produce the lowest proportion of multilingual turns, but such turns also play a

marginal role in her lessons. For example, she does not use multilingual turns to explain important or difficult points to learners. She does that in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. Many of her multilingual turns are self-facilitative and related to problems with word retrieval. She creates these turns through syntactic and syntactic-plus-phonological assimilation of English verbs into isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions. Some of her multilingual turns are discourse-related and these are created through syntactic assimilations of English common nouns into isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions. The assimilated items are used to achieve discourse coherence by linking current turns and sequences to previous ones.

Other teachers use the multilingual variety as the primary form in which to construct their turns. This pattern is found in Thami's, Bamba's, and Nande's classrooms. Here multilingual turns can be thought of as a compromise variety and an alternative to using mainly English (Sindi's path) or mainly isiXhosa-isiMpondo (Anele's path). The 'dual' character of multilingual turns makes them less visible as deviations from the official medium, English. This helps explain why the pattern is so common. However, the teachers use their multilingual turns in different ways.

On the one hand, in Thami's and Nande's classrooms, multilingual turns are used frequently and pervasively almost regardless of classroom mode. That is, multilingual turns are as likely to occur whether teachers are talking about classroom supplies and materials (managerial mode) or explaining a particularly difficult point (curriculum mode). This is a case of CS as an unmarked choice. Most multilingual turns in Thami's and Nande's classroom are made through the assimilation of English nouns, verbs and discourse markers into isiXhosa-isiMpondo-dominant constructions.

On the other hand, although a large number of Bamba's turns are constructed multilingually, the multilingual pattern is not pervasive but heavily concentrated in sequences where there is trouble. He uses it to scaffold learning when he anticipates that learners may not understand English in a particular context. Thus, although the multilingual variety accounts for a large proportion of turns in this classroom, it is not the de facto variety for communication, such as is the case in Thami's and Nande's. Bamba uses multilingual turns in a strategic or

episodic way and this kind of practice has a lot of support among educationalists (e.g., many studies reviewed in Lin, 2013).

Sindi uses multilingual turns somewhat reluctantly, suggesting a strong aversion to language mixing. This is probably because language mixing of this kind is negatively regarded, especially in a formal setting such as a classroom (e.g., Slabbert and Finlayson, 1999).

Thami and Nande use multilingual turns as a primary way of producing their turns. Thus the practical benefits of intra-sentential switching trumps the need to observe what the curriculum prescribes, or indeed, negative attitudes to language mixing. This form of language use has little support among educationalists.

Note though that across all teachers it is not always possible to say whether speakers, in the course of interaction, treat English discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo constructions or isiXhosa-isiMpondo discourse markers in English constructions as belonging to distinct varieties or as simultaneously belonging to both, that is, as 'bivalent' items (Woolard, 1998).

## 8.3 Language of Episodes

### 8.3.1 Introduction

Patterns of language use presented below are the same as those described and analysed from a CA perspective in chapter 5. Refer to that chapter for a detailed description of each pattern. This section presents a comparative quantitative description and analysis of patterns of language use with a focus on subjects taught, and similarities and differences between teachers.

Analyses at the level of TCUs and turns provide important insights about patterns of language use, but present an incomplete picture of how language is used in actual interaction. This is because these two levels examine language use only from the point of view of the teacher. In contrast, at the level of the sequence/episode, language use is examined in a relational way, that is, in terms of how teachers and learners jointly accomplish classroom sequences/episodes, in other words, how teachers and learners jointly produce an adjacency pair or a set of related adjacency pairs to accomplish recognisable classroom actions, such as

questioning-answering or lecturing-listening episodes. As will be shown presently, multilingualism is by far the most common way in which teachers and learners accomplish lessons in this corpus.

### 8.3.2 English Lessons

#### 8.3.2.1 Summary findings

Multilingualism is by far the most common code in which interaction is conducted in the English classroom. In particular, the divergent language pattern is the most commonly used multilingual pattern. A difference between the two English language classrooms is that divergent language use is more pronounced in Sindi's than in Anele's classroom. A relatively small proportion of episodes are conducted monolingually in English or isiXhosa-isiMpondo in both teachers' classrooms.

**Table 15: English Language of Sequence by Teacher (Count and %)**

Teacher	Lessons		1	2	3	4	5	Total
<b>Sindi</b>	English	Count	64	18	32	11	30	141
		%	41%	12%	21%	7%	19%	100%
<b>Anele</b>	English	Count	241	9	9	41	51	351
		%	69%	2%	2%	12%	15%	100%

1= Divergent language, 2= Convergent, 3= Mixed, 4= isiXhosa-isiMpondo, 5= English

A small proportion of episodes, only 19% of episodes in Sindi's classroom and 15% in Anele's, are conducted exclusively in English, in the English-language classroom. Episodes conducted in English often involve known information, application of a known procedure, are characterised by short learner turns, and are often IRE/F sequences. (For an example, refer to Excerpt 2). Nearly all English episodes in Anele's classroom are around exchanges in which learners read aloud from an English text and Anele manages the reading in isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

isiXhosa-isiMpondo accounts for the least proportion of episodes, 7% of episodes in Sindi's classroom and 12% in Anele's. In Sindi's classroom, isiXhosa-isiMpondo episodes tend to be short, occur outside of IRE/F sequences, and often occur at the beginning, end or major transition points in the lesson. Her turns tend to be comparatively larger than learner turns. Learner turns are often short, single TCUs. Use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo in this classroom is strongly associated with the management of transitions and English and various forms of multilingual language

use with core IRE/F sequences. For example, in Excerpt 66 below, learners and Sindi talk in isiXhosa-isiMpondo about which notebook to use to copy an assignment written out on a chalkboard. Note that English proper nouns, ‘Technology’ (598) and ‘English’ (600), are not oriented to as belonging to ‘English’ and therefore are not regarded as switches to English. Such items in classrooms are often treated as linguistically neutral or bivalent (Woolard, 1998).

***Excerpt 66: Linguistically neutral insertions***

- 596 \* Sindi: ΔUTHULE TU. UTHATHE INCWADI YAKHO UTHULE UBHALE QHA..Δ  
 597 %trn: ΔBE QUIET. ΔTAKE OUT YOUR BOOKS SILENTLY AND GET ON WITH YOUR  
 598 WRITINGΔ.  
 599 \*L45: **Eze-Technology?**  
 600 %trn: Technology books.  
 601 \* Sindi: **Hha:yi L45. Eze-English mtanam.**  
 602 %trn: No L45. English books my child.

In contrast, isiXhosa-isiMpondo episodes in Anele’s classroom occur throughout the lesson, including core IRE/F sequences. As in Sindi’s classroom, learner isiXhosa-isiMpondo turns are short, often single TCUs, whereas teacher isiXhosa-isiMpondo turns are usually much longer. Excerpt 67 below illustrates.

***Excerpt 67: Anele’s divergent language pattern***

- 103 \*Anele: **Mh:: °zenihleke°. Uyaf- udibene. Inggondo yakhe ayisekho**  
 104 **sezincwadini. Uz(i)vulile nazi phambi kwakhe. Kodwa usacinga bani?**  
 105 %trn: Mh. °You laugh. It’s not funny°. Uyaf- she has met (a boy). Now her mind is not on  
 106 her books. She is thinking of whom?  
 107 \*LNS: **ULucky.**  
 108 %trn: Of Lucky.

Overall, the proportion of episodes conducted monolingually per classroom by these two teachers is small: 26% (7% isiXhosa-isiMpondo and 19% English) of Sindi’s and 27% of Anele’s (12% isiXhosa-isiMpondo and 15% English).

The vast majority of episodes are conducted in various patterns of multilingualism (Columns 1, 2 and 3). Most episodes, 41% of Sindi's episodes and 69% of Anele's, are conducted in a parallel or divergent multilingual pattern. The divergent language pattern is by far the most common way in which interaction is conducted in Anele's classroom. Divergent language use is a pattern in which a teacher switches varieties in the course of an episode, but learners use only one variety, namely, English, for the duration of an episode. Most episodes conducted through a divergent pattern in Sindi's classroom are conducted through a pattern where the teacher switches varieties within and across turns in the course of an episode, and learners use English only. (See Excerpt 68, which was cited earlier as Excerpt 49). In contrast, in Anele's classroom the divergent pattern dominates, but in the form where the teacher uses only isiXhosa-isiMpondo and learners English.

***Excerpt 68: Sindi's divergent language patterns***

- 635 \*Sindi: Aw:right. ↑**Enye**:?
- 636 \*LNS: ((Hands raised to bid for the turn))
- 637 %trn: All right. Next (sentence)?
- 638 \* Sindi:Ye:s L26.
- 639 \*L26: Yamkela is talkative child.
- 640 \* Sindi: &↑**Hheh**:& ((said in an incredulous tone))? **Phinda isentensi yakho.**
- 641 %trn: ↑What? Repeat your sentence.
- 642 \*L26: Yamkela is talkative (.) child.
- 643 \* Sindi: ((Chuckle)) Oh:: **Masithi**, Yamkela is a talkative girl.
- 644 %trn: ((Chuckle)) Oh:: ((I see)). Rather let us say, Yamkela is a talkative girl.

**Excerpt 69: Anele's divergent language patterns**

- 33 \*Anele: **Eehehe. Hamba.**
- 34 %trn: That's right. Proceed.
- 35 \*L01: Oh yes good day Miss Pillay. [Whit]ney often speaks about you. Is
- 36 something wrong? ((Reading.))
- 37 \*Anele: [Yha.]
- 38 %trn: Yes.

Another difference between Sindi and Anele is that convergent and mixed language patterns play a greater role in Sindi's than in Anele's classroom. In convergent language use, a teacher and learner(s) begin an episode in isiXhosa-isiMpondo or a multilingual variety and once the episode is set up, both the teacher and learner(s) switch to English to complete the episode. The pattern is often found in episodes that culminate in an IRE/F sequence. For example, see Excerpts cited in the section 5.3 'convergent multilingualism'.

Mixed language patterns are those patterns in which teachers and learners make intra- or/ and intersentential switches in the course of an episode. Typically, learner multilingual TCUs are brief, often occurring as choral learner responses rather than in individual learner turns, as in Excerpt 70 below. The switches can be discourse- or participant-related, or have no demonstrable sequential function.

**Excerpt 70: Sindi's mixed language patterns**

- 676 \*Sindi: ↑**Niyamvumela uthi i-softball i-attractive? Masiy(i)bhale.**
- 677 %trn: Do you agree with him when he says softball is attractive? Let's
- 678 write it.
- 679 \*LNS: [I-soccer i-soccer] ((some)).
- 680 [No no no ] ((others))
- 681 \*trn: [Soccer soccer] ((some))
- 682 [No no no ] ((others))

### 8.3.3 Social Science

#### 8.3.3.1 Summary findings

As in the English language classroom, a majority of episodes in the Social Science class are conducted multilingually. Again, divergent multilingualism is the most common pattern through which episodes are accomplished. English is the second most common way in which episodes are conducted, closely followed by isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

**Table 16: Social Science Language of Sequence by Teacher (Count and %)**

Teacher	Lessons		1	2	3	4	5	Total
Thami	Social Science	Count	104	6	10	12	19	151
		%	69%	4%	7%	8%	13%	100%
Bamba	Social Science	Count	102	16	19	8	16	161
		%	63%	10%	12%	5%	10%	100%

1= Divergent language, 2= Convergent, 3= Mixed, 4= isiXhosa-isiMpondo, 5= English

Monolingualism accounts for only 21% of episodes in Thami's classroom (13% English and 8% isiXhosa-isiMpondo) and 15% in Bamba's (10% English and 3% isiXhosa-isiMpondo). English accounts for only a small proportion of episodes per classroom for these two teachers. Teacher and learner turns in English-only episodes tend to be short and often occur in the context of an IRE/F curriculum sequence. A difference between Thami's and Bamba's classrooms is that a couple of Bamba's English turns are slightly longer but learner turns are short. Excerpt 71 illustrates typical English language use in Thami's classroom and Excerpt 72 typical English use in Bamba's.

#### **Excerpt 71: Thami's English turns**

32 \*Thami: Everyone has a freedom of move:[ment. ]

33 \*LNS: [Movement].

#### **Excerpt 72: Bamba's English turns**

911 \*Bamba: Silent killer. WHY WHY it is said it is silent killer? Why is eh:: drought called

913 drought is called a silent killer what may be the reason? YES SIR.

914 \*L42: Because it does not make noise.

915 \*Bamba: BECAUSE IT DOES NOT MAKE NOISE.

IsiXhosa-isiMpondo-only episodes account for a small proportion of episodes in Thami's and Bamba's classrooms. As discussed in relation to the 'language turn-taking' above (sub-section 8.2.2), isiMpondo/isiXhosa in Thami's classroom is used in all pedagogical modes, whereas in Bamba's classroom it is strongly associated with troubles and doing disciplining.

The bulk of episodes in Thami's and Bamba's classroom are conducted in various forms of multilingualism. Most of the multilingual episodes are conducted in the divergent pattern. The divergent pattern used most often by Thami and Bamba is similar to that used by Sindi above, that is, in the course of an episode, teachers make intra- and/or inter-turn switches and learners use only English to produce their turns.

### 8.3.4 Technology

#### 8.3.4.1 Summary findings

Multilingualism is the main language practice through which episodes are accomplished in both classrooms. This is more so in Nande's than in Sindi's classroom. As in the English and Social Science classrooms, the majority of episodes in the Technology classroom are accomplished through the divergent pattern. In addition, in Nande's classroom, a mixed language pattern is used to a considerable degree to conduct interaction. A significant proportion of episodes in Sindi's classroom are conducted in English. Only a small proportion of episodes in both classrooms are conducted exclusively in isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

**Table 17: Technology Language of Sequence by Teacher (Count and %)**

Teacher	Lessons		1	2	3	4	5	Total
Sindi	Technology	Count	47	9	8	3	39	106
		%	44%	8%	8%	3%	37%	100%
Nande	Technology	Count	74	4	28	7	2	115
		%	64%	3%	24%	6%	2%	100%

1= Divergent language, 2= Convergent, 3= Mixed, 4= isiXhosa-isiMpondo, 5= English

By far the largest proportion of English monolingual episodes in the group occur in Sindi's (37%) and the lowest proportion in Nande's classroom (2%). IsiXhosa-isiMpondo plays a minor role in both classrooms, with only 3% of episodes in Sindi's classroom and 6% in Nande's conducted in this variety. Thus, in Nande's

classroom English and isiXhosa-isiMpondo monolingualism play a minor role in accomplishing episodes, accounting for a combined total of only 8% of episodes. In contrast, in Sindi's classroom, English and isiXhosa-isiMpondo monolingualism plays a significant role, accounting for a combined total of 40% of episodes. However, the majority of episodes in both classrooms are accomplished multilingually.

Sindi's pattern of English use in Technology class is similar to that in her English language classroom. That is, English episodes are characterised by many short teacher turns, and even shorter learner turns, an overwhelming proportion of which occur in IRE/F sequences.

IsiXhosa-isiMpondo episodes are brief in both Sindi's and Nande's classroom. In Sindi's classroom they are about doing disciplining and managing learner behaviour, and in Nande's they occur across classroom contexts.

Most episodes in both classrooms are conducted multilingually, with 60% in Sindi's classroom and 92% in Nande's. Most of the multilingual episodes are produced through divergent language use, 44% in Sindi's and 64% in Nande's classroom.

In addition to the divergent language pattern, it is significant that 24% of episodes in Nande's classroom are conducted in a mixed language pattern. A mixed language pattern occurs where both a teacher and learner(s) switch languages in the course of an episode. The switches can be intra- or inter-turn or both. This suggests that learners have some flexibility in language choice. Precisely where and how this pattern is used by learners is discussed in 8.4 below.

### 8.3.5 Discussion

The overall finding from the descriptions and analyses presented above is that, in this corpus, meaningful differences in patterns of language use exist only at the level of the individual teacher rather than the classroom type (i.e., English Language vs. Social Science vs. Technology). That is, the language use of English language teachers is not necessarily different from that of content teachers.

Following is a discussion of how episodes are accomplished in classes taught by different teachers.

*8.3.5.1 English - Teacher volubility and learner taciturnity*

A relatively small proportion of episodes across all classrooms are conducted in English. This underscores three things. The first is that learners' competence in English is relatively low, the second, that some teachers are not confident speakers of English, and the third, that teachers and learners have little need for English in their everyday face-to-face communication. Thus, a low proportion of English-only episodes reflects that it is largely impractical to conduct classroom interaction in this variety, rather than speaking to the prestige value or desirability of English fluency, or its converse.

Although most episodes are conducted through multilingual patterns across the classrooms, a considerable proportion of episodes in Sindi's classroom are accomplished in English. Classroom observation, interview data and analysis suggest that Sindi's use of English differs quantitatively and qualitatively from that of other teachers. It reflects her beliefs about classroom language use, that is, that English ought to be taught in English. Some of her English turns are frequent, long and multiclausal.

She uses multilingual patterns largely in order to set up or make possible the production of English-only episodes, whereas for the rest of the teachers a divergent multilingual pattern is a de facto 'medium' (Gafaranga, 2011) of classroom interaction. Other teachers appear less concerned with conducting classroom oral communication in English but more concerned with supporting learners in accessing English written texts through use of the multilingual variety and isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

The non-viability of English-only as a medium of interaction is shown by its infrequency as well as by the kinds of contexts in which it occurs. For example, English episodes either focus on revision activities, call for the application of a simple or known procedure, or consist of lecture-listening formats where learners listen and teachers speak for long stretches, or of brief exchanges between

teachers and learners. Thus the relative inaccessibility of English and the pressure to use it as a medium contribute to producing and reproducing a well-documented culture of rote learning.

#### 8.3.5.2 *Multilingual patterns - Staging the lesson for learners to act English-competent*

Three types of multilingual pattern are found in the corpus, namely, divergent, convergent and mixed language pattern. The most common multilingual pattern across classrooms is the parallel or divergent language pattern. In this pattern a teacher switches between English, isiXhosa-isiMpondo or, less often, isiMpondo in the course of an episode. Learners do not switch languages; they use only English throughout an episode. Learner turns consist of short responses to teacher elicitation. Use of this pattern achieves two things. First, it supports learners to produce English turns. That is, learners complete response slots carefully constructed by their teachers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo or a multilingual variety. In this way, learners appear more English competent than they actually are. Thus, multilingual turns are involved in the production of safetalk.

Second, through the divergent language pattern, teachers and learners partly enact their institutional roles. Teachers enact their roles by switching languages to support student learning. On the other hand, learners enact the role of 'a good learner' by using English only. Learner language behaviour is largely teacher- rather than self-directed and therefore divergent patterns can also be understood to be an expression of what teachers regard as appropriate classroom language behaviour, notwithstanding what the curriculum mandates.

Only a small proportion of episodes are conducted through the convergent language pattern. In this pattern, a teacher begins an episode in isiXhosa-isiMpondo or the multilingual variety and concludes it in English to converge with learners' language. Learners do not alter varieties in the course of an episode. A convergent pattern is often used to cue learners to produce a choral response or a simultaneous response (i.e., a choral response co-produced with a teacher). Such episodes are often used to confirm listening/understanding, agreement with the contents of a teacher's turn, and to elicit group responses to routine and review

questions. This pattern is also used as a mechanism for learners to act English-competent, and for teachers and learners to linguistically delineate their different classroom roles.

Finally, there is the 'mixed' language pattern. It is not used widely, but a significant proportion of episodes in Sindi's and Nande's classrooms is conducted in this pattern. In this pattern, both teachers and learners switch languages in the course of an episode. Such episodes are brief and often occur outside curriculum mode, as will be shown in the next subsection. When this pattern occurs in the curriculum context, it often occurs in episodes in which learners complete a teacher's turn, in which case if learners were to use English-only, this would make their utterances ungrammatical. Thus learners avoid using any variety other than English in the plenary format of a lesson.

#### *8.3.5.3 IsiXhosa-isiMpondo – marking actions as distinct*

An even smaller proportion of episodes are conducted in only isiXhosa-isiMpondo, across all classrooms. When teachers and learners use isiXhosa-isiMpondo to accomplish an episode, this often marks the episode as doing something distinct in some way. This issue is discussed further in the next section in relation to how different varieties are used to realise different classroom contexts.

Although Anele produces the vast majority of her turns in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, only a small proportion of episodes are conducted in this variety in her classroom. That is, the vast majority of her isiXhosa-isiMpondo episodes occur in the context of a divergent pattern where she uses this variety and learners English. Thus her use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo supports learners to produce English turns and access English written texts.

In summary, English is the normative classroom variety even though a relatively small proportion of total episodes are conducted in English only. The presence and relevance of the other varieties is, by and large, judged and justified in terms of how well they enable acquisition and displays of English and L2-medium content competence.

Teachers and learners partly accomplish their different and asymmetrical roles through their differing patterns of language use. Teachers can move between languages, while learners use almost only English in the whole-class or plenary format of the classroom.

#### **8.4 Language and Classroom Contexts**

The previous section examined how episodes are accomplished through different patterns of language use. This section describes and analyses the relationship between patterns of language use and classroom modes/contexts. That is, it seeks to examine how teachers use classroom varieties to accomplish episodes in three classroom pedagogical contexts or pedagogical functions, viz., managerial, curriculum and interpersonal (Lin, 2013; Walsh, 2006). A managerial context refers to the use of CS for classroom management, which includes the signalling of shifts in activities or topics, or from teaching to managing learner behaviour. A curriculum context refers to exchanges about access to the content of lessons and switches to translate, annotate or elaborate spoken or written texts. An interpersonal context includes using CS to index roles, to negotiate identities or humanise the classroom. Sometimes switches implement more than one function and therefore are coded under more than one classroom mode.

A sub-research question in this study seeks to investigate whether teacher language use patterns according to whether they are teaching English, Social Science or Technology, in particular, to examine whether differences in language use are apparent in the curriculum context.

The expectation was that English lessons would have the least code-switched speech and that CS would be used in a less pervasive way. This is because in these lessons English is both the target language and the medium of teaching and learning. This against the background that language acquisition specialists support strategic or limited use of CS in the L2 or Foreign Language classroom (e.g.; Swain, Kirkpatrick and Cummins, 2011; Voster, 2008).

Regarding Social Science classrooms, it was expected that the greatest and most pervasive form of CS between English and isiXhosa or isiMpondo would occur

in this classroom context, because teaching and learning in Social Science classrooms is conducted, overwhelmingly, through talk between learners and teachers. Thus, given learners' limited competence in English, it was thought that teachers and learners would draw more on all their varieties to accomplish lessons. Also, based on ethnographic knowledge of the setting, it was known that Social Science and Technology teachers generally do not see themselves as language teachers and therefore were less likely to be inhibited about code-switching.

It was expected that patterns of language use in Technology lessons would fall somewhere in between those observed in English and Social Science lessons. Initial observation suggested that teaching and learning in Technology lessons was less 'talk-oriented' but a lot more 'practice-oriented' and that therefore there would be less reliance on CS to accomplish episodes in this classroom type than in the Social Science classroom, but more than in the English language classroom.

The data analysis suggests, however, that differences in patterns of language use in various classroom types and contexts can be largely attributed to individual differences between teachers' communicative styles and to lesson topics, rather than to differences in classroom types or learning areas.

#### **8.4.1 English Lessons**

##### *8.4.1.1 Summary findings*

Most episodes in the two classrooms are accomplished through multilingual patterns across classroom contexts. In Anele's classroom, the vast majority of episodes are done in the divergent multilingual pattern. While a large proportion of episodes in Sindi's classroom are also done in the divergent pattern, other patterns too are used to a considerable extent. Anele's frequent and pervasive use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo can be partly explained by the kind of topics addressed in her classroom and which are best dealt with in a familiar 'we-code'. Sindi's language use is more distributed than Anele's, that is, it occurs across classrooms contexts and with significant frequency.

**Table 18: English - Language of Classroom Context (Count and %)**

Teacher	Contexts		1	2	3	4	5	Total
Sindi	Managerial	Count	19	9	11	10	18	67
		%	28%	13%	16%	15%	27%	100%
Anele	Managerial	Count	12	-	1	-	7	20
		%	60%	-	5%	-	35%	100%
Sindi	Curriculum	Count	45	15	22	-	26	111
		%	41%	13%	23%	-	23%	100%
Anele	Curriculum	Count	216	8	7	17	52	300
		%	72%	3%	2%	6%	17%	100%
Sindi	Interpersonal	Count	4	-	2	3	-	9
		%	45%	-	22%	33%	-	100%
Anele	Interpersonal	Count	81	7	5	37	2	132
		%	61%	5%	4%	28%	2%	100%

1= Divergent language, 2= Convergent, 3= Mixed, 4= isiXhosa-isiMpondo, 5= English

As expected, most episodes in the whole-class format of lessons comprise of exchanges around the curriculum context. The majority of episodes in Sindi's (111) and Anele's (300) classrooms are teaching and learning exchanges. However, a large proportion of episodes in Anele's (132) classroom occur in an interpersonal context in contrast to a small proportion in Sindi's (9). The difference is accounted for in two ways. First, Anele's class discusses literature in an animated way characterised by frequent spontaneous chortles and laughter. This results in Anele's having to initiate many exchanges to reinstate classroom 'order' or to '(re)cohort' (Icbay, 2011) the group as a class-in-session following spontaneous chatter, chortles and laughter. Second, the interpersonal episodes are frequent but brief which accounts for the high count.

Overall, the pattern of language use shown in Table 8.10 is similar to that shown in Table 8.7 in that most episodes are conducted in various multilingual patterns. In the managerial context, 57% of episodes in Sindi's classroom and 65% in Anele's are done in various forms of multilingualism, which are also used in the curriculum context (77% of both Sindi's and Anele's), and in the interpersonal mode (67% in Sindi's and 76% in Anele's).

Language use is more distributed in Sindi's than in Anele's classroom. In Sindi's classroom, a range of language patterns is used to accomplish episodes across classroom contexts. While the divergent pattern occurs most often, other

language patterns are used to a considerable degree across classroom modes. Patterns of language use are more diverse in Sindi's classroom and can be described as instances of 'flexible bilingualism' (Creese and Blackledge, 2014).

Anele's classroom language use is much more focused. The vast majority of episodes in her classroom are conducted in a divergent pattern in which she uses isiXhosa-isiMpondo and the learners use English. This pattern is less flexible and can therefore be described as an instance of 'parallel bilingualism' (Ibid).

In terms of English, although Sindi's (26) count of English episodes in the curriculum context is much lower than that in Anele's classroom (52), Sindi's English turns are longer and she uses them to make extended contributions. This contrasts with Anele's English turns which are more numerous but are usually brief, one-word continuers.

In Anele's classroom, some episodes in the curriculum context are conducted in isiXhosa-isiMpondo only. In contrast, no episodes are conducted in isiXhosa-isiMpondo in Sindi's classroom, this variety being used only in the managerial mode.

Anele's classroom has a large number of interpersonal episodes because of the kind of topics dealt in her lessons. These include sexuality, pregnancy and HIV and AIDS. As a result, she continually alternates between her formal role and identity as a teacher and that of a concerned adult/parent.

Also, in Sindi's classroom a considerable proportion of episodes in the managerial and curriculum contexts are conducted through the convergent and mixed multilingual patterns. In the convergent pattern she begins an episode in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and ends it in English, to converge with learner language use. In the mixed pattern, both she and learners switch languages in the course of an episode. This supports the claim that her language use is more distributed or flexible than that of Anele.

## 8.4.2 Social Science Lessons

### 8.4.2.1 Summary findings

As in the English language classroom, most episodes in the Social Science classroom are accomplished through multilingual patterns across classroom contexts. Again, the divergent pattern is the most common way in which episodes are conducted. A difference between Thami and Bamba is that Thami appears to be more relaxed about language mixing than Bamba. Overall, Social Science classrooms differ from English language classrooms in that in the former a much greater proportion of teacher turns, in divergent and convergent episodes, are produced through language mixing, lending some support to the premise that Social Science teachers are more relaxed about language use.

**Table 19: Social Science - Language of Classroom Context (Count and %)**

Teacher	Contexts		1	2	3	4	5	Total
Thami	Managerial	Count	24	2	5	-	6	37
		%	65%	5%	14%	-	16%	100%
Bamba	Managerial	Count	19	2	1	2	4	28
		%	68%	7%	4%	7%	14%	100%
Thami	Curriculum	Count	84	5	7	12	13	121
		%	69%	4%	6%	10%	11%	100%
Bamba	Curriculum	Count	92	14	18	8	13	145
		%	63%	10%	12%	6%	9%	100%
Thami	Interpersonal	Count	27	2	3	12	1	45
		%	60%	4%	7%	27%	2%	100%
Bamba	Interpersonal	Count	12	-	-	1	1	14
		%	86%	-	-	7%	7%	100%

1= Divergent language, 2= Convergent, 3= Mixed, 4= isiXhosa-isiMpondo, 5= English

As in English language classrooms, the vast majority of episodes across classroom contexts in the Social Science classrooms are accomplished through multilingual patterns. The divergent pattern here too is the most common way in which episodes are done. This is more so in Bamba's classroom than in Thami's.

Overall, multilingual language use accounts for a total of 84% of Thami's and 79% of Bamba's episodes in the managerial context; 79% of Thami's and 85% of Bamba's in the curriculum context; and 71% of Thami's and 86% of Bamba's in the interpersonal context. That is, only a small number of episodes are conducted monolingually in English or isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

The pattern of language use in Thami's and Bamba's classroom has the same distribution. That is, about the same proportion of divergent, convergent, isiXhosa-isiMpondo and English episodes are observed in the two classrooms.

Behind the quantitative similarities there are differences, however. For instance, while Thami produces proportionally fewer multilingual turns in the divergent and convergent patterns, the size of his turns are much larger than that of Bamba's. That is, Bamba uses multilingual turns more frequently but keeps them short. This probably reflects different attitudes to language mixing in the classroom. With regard to isiXhosa-isiMpondo, Thami appears to have a more relaxed attitude to its use in the classroom, while Bamba appears to treat it as a necessary evil to be kept to a minimum. Also, Bamba's turns in English episodes are much larger than Thami's.

### **8.4.3 Technology Lessons**

#### *8.4.3.1 Summary findings*

The majority of episodes in the Technology class are conducted through various multilingual patterns. As in English language and Social Science classrooms, the divergent pattern accounts for a large proportion of multilingual patterns. However, in the Technology class the divergent pattern is not as dominant as it is in Social Science classrooms. A difference between this classroom and the English and Social Science classroom is that the pattern of language use is more distributed.

**Table 20: Technology - Language of Classroom Context (Count and %)**

Teacher	Contexts		1	2	3	4	5	Total
Sindi	Managerial	Count	2	-	1	1	2	6
		%	33%	-	16%	16%	33%	100%
Nande	Managerial	Count	22	1	15	4	1	43
		%	51%	2%	35%	9%	2%	100%
Sindi	Curriculum	Count	43	9	7	1	38	98
		%	41%	13%	23%	-	23%	100%
Nande	Curriculum	Count	58	4	26	5	1	94
		%	62%	4%	28%	5%	1%	100%
Sindi	Interpersonal	Count	3	-	-	2	-	5
		%	45%	-	22%	33%	-	100%
Nande	Interpersonal	Count	4	-	2	1	-	7
		%	57%	-	29%	14%	-	100%

1= Divergent language, 2= Convergent, 3= Mixed, 4= isiXhosa-isiMpondo, 5= English

In the curriculum context, most episodes are conducted through multilingual patterns, with 77% of episodes in Sindi's classroom conducted multilingually and 94% in Nande's. Once again similar to the Social Science class above, most multilingual episodes are done in the divergent language pattern. A considerable proportion of episodes, 23% in Sindi's and 28% in Nande's classroom, are done in the mixed language pattern. That is, teachers and learners switch languages in the course of an episode.

Sindi's and Nande's language use shows more distribution across classroom contexts than Thami's and Bamba's. Even so, Sindi's language use tracks more closely the official medium of teaching and learning in the curriculum context. Her English language pattern is similar to that in her English language lessons.

In both Sindi's and Nande's classrooms, divergent language use accounts for the single largest proportion of episodes across classroom contexts. In Nande's classroom there is greater reliance on the divergent language pattern than in Sindi's.

Sindi exhibits greater flexible language use in the curriculum context with episodes in her lessons implemented through a variety of patterns including the divergent, convergent, mixed and English patterns. Overall, Sindi and Nande use a

wider range of patterns than Anele, Thami and Bamba, particularly in the curriculum context.

#### 8.4.4 Discussion

##### *8.4.4.1 Curriculum context*

The vast majority of episodes in the curriculum mode, across all lessons, are conducted through multilingual patterns, namely, divergent, convergent and mixed patterns. However, there are differences in how the multilingual patterns are constructed. While the divergent pattern is the single most common way in which episodes are conducted, Sindi relies much less on this pattern than the other teachers in the group. Also, teachers construct the divergent pattern in different ways. In Anele's classroom the divergent pattern consists of the teacher using mainly isiXhosa-isiMpondo and learners English. In contrast, in the rest of the classrooms the pattern consists of teacher multilingual turns produced through intra-sentential and inter-turn switching and learner English turns.

The convergent pattern is used to a considerable degree only in Sindi's and Bamba's classrooms. Two forms of the pattern are used often. One form is more common in Sindi's classroom and involves teacher and learner multilingual turns. It is often used to culminate a series of related episodes and typically involves simultaneous production/turn-sharing where a teacher and learners co-produce final bits of a teacher's turn. The other form involves a teacher beginning an episode in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and/or the multilingual variety and learners using English throughout. Once the episode is set up in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and/ or the multilingual variety, the teacher switches varieties in the course of an episode to match learner language use.

The mixed language pattern is uncommon in a whole-class format of lessons. The pattern occurs most often in Sindi's and Nande's classrooms. It involves teachers and learners switching between languages in the course of an episode. Note though that learner turns are quite short when this form occurs in classroom plenary. A large proportion of this form in Nande's classroom occurs in learner-to-learner talk in small group discussions.

Only a small proportion of episodes is done in isiXhosa-isiMpondo or English across the lessons. There are some important differences between teachers. There are almost no isiXhosa-isiMpondo episodes in Sindi's lessons in the curriculum context and it is also in this classroom that teacher turns in English episodes are substantial. This lends support to the claim that Sindi avoids the use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo, particularly in the curriculum context. English-only episodes in the other classrooms consist of short turns or involve the reading of English texts. IsiXhosa-isiMpondo, in all classrooms except Sindi's, is used to conduct interactions in the curriculum context.

Thus, the vast majority of episodes across all classroom types are conducted in divergent patterns regardless of classroom type. Second, teachers construct the divergent patterns in different ways. Anele uses largely isiXhosa-isiMpondo, and the rest of the teachers make intra- and inter-sentential switches. While there is some evidence that 'language' teachers are more mindful of language use than are 'content' teachers, they show this in different directions. Sindi tries to use English only in the curriculum context, but Anele uses largely isiXhosa-isiMpondo. Sindi tries to use English only in both the English language and Technology class. This is indicative of her beliefs about classroom language use, a matter taken up in the next section. Third, Sindi's intra-sentential and inter-sentential switches are often sequentially contrastive, whereas a considerable number of Bamba's, Thami's and Nande's are not. In the latter teachers' classrooms, the multilingual variety is dominant in classroom interaction.

#### *8.4.4.2 Managerial and interpersonal contexts*

Overall, the pattern of language use in managerial and interpersonal contexts is similar to that in the curriculum context in that the vast majority of episodes are conducted in various patterns of multilingualism. Overall, teachers use more isiMpondo-isiXhosa than English in the managerial context. Other varieties are used too in this context. For example, in Sindi's lessons a considerable number of episodes are accomplished in English. Classroom contexts on their own do not explain patterns of language use observed in the managerial pattern. This is because even though use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo by teachers is associated with

interaction in the managerial context, other patterns of language also occur in this mode. In other words, an explanation of language use that depends on the functional relationship between language choice and classroom context is not sufficient to explain observed patterns of language use. A more adequate analysis needs to combine analysis of the functional relationship between language use and classroom context, on the one hand, with sequential and ethnographic sensibility (as adopted in chapters 5, 6 and 7), on the other.

As far as language use in the management of interpersonal relationships is concerned, there is a stronger case to be made about a functional relationship between isiXhosa-isiMpondo and this classroom context. This is particularly the case with respect to Anele's classrooms, in which a large number of her turns in this context, but also across other classroom contexts, are implemented in the isiXhosa-isiMpondo variety. Here too a qualification must be made about the functional relationship between classroom context and language choice. Anele's lessons deal with sensitive topics such as sexuality and teenage pregnancy and therefore culturally appropriate ways for young girls and boys to behave. Such topics require careful (re)negotiation of roles, identities and values and therefore they cannot be discussed in a meaningful way in an unfamiliar variety, English.

## **8.5 Summary of Individual Teacher Practices and Views**

This subsection presents a holistic summary of each of the five teacher's patterns of language use. It draws on the analysis of transcripts and quantified data presented in previous chapters and sections, but also includes some analysis of interview data on teachers' views of language in the classroom. Note that interview data is available for all teachers except Bamba. For details see 3.5.1.3.

### **8.5.1 Sindi**

#### *8.5.1.1 English*

Sindi produces the largest proportion of English TCUs and turns in this group. She produces a greater proportion of English turns in the Technology (61%) than in the English language class (42%). This finding is counter-intuitive, in that a greater use of English is expected in the language classroom than in the content classroom. It can, however, be explained as follows. Her English lessons deal with new,

unfamiliar and complex material relating to English grammar which requires a greater reliance on unofficial classroom varieties, viz., isiXhosa-isiMpondo and the multilingual variety, for explanation. Her Technology lessons, on the other hand, deal with more familiar topics and therefore accomplishing these lessons requires less reliance on unofficial varieties. Thus, apart from individual differences, patterns of language use are influenced by circumstantial and sequential factors.

Although Sindi produces a large number of English turns, only a small proportion of episodes between her and the learners are conducted in English, with only 19% of episodes in the English and 37% in the Technology classroom conducted in this variety. Thus, most of her interactions are accomplished through unofficial varieties.

All episodes conducted in English occur in the curriculum and managerial modes. No episodes in the interpersonal context are done in English. In fact, Sindi partly marks interaction to do with the management of interpersonal relationships as distinct from curriculum or managerial episodes, by conducting them in isiXhosa-isiMpondo rather than English. Thus, her use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo contextualizes or indexes that she is operating out of a curriculum context.

She deals with practical problems arising from using English as an official medium of learning and teaching in her classroom in the following ways. She speaks English in a slow and deliberate way. She produces a series of simple and often single clause sentences. She stays very close to the focus of the lesson and makes very few digressions. Her turns end in a series of elicitations to which learners respond by producing short or one-word utterances. A downside to this carefully constructed but restrictive pedagogical practice is that learners have too few opportunities to produce 'comprehensible output' (Swain, 1985 cited in Ellis, 2008:261), and therefore the teacher provides little corrective feedback which learners can use to produce their own multicausal English utterances and multi-TCU turns.

A significant number of episodes in her classroom are conducted in English because she is successful in setting up a series of IRE/F sequences. That is, she is

successful at simplifying her lessons such that it is possible for learners to produce correct responses. She is the most successful at producing and reproducing safetalk. By comparison, Bamba also has a lot of IRE sequences in his lessons, but a large number of these are unsuccessful and often end in a 'war of frustration' between him and learners, as shown in Excerpt 9.

In Sindi's classroom, learners are not encouraged to produce multilingual or codeswitched turns unless they are specifically elicited. On occasion, she designs her turns such that learners can respond with brief multilingual choral and turn-shared turns, as shown in chapter 7. However, the majority of exchanges between her and the learners are conducted in the divergent multilingual pattern. In the main, they are conducted through a multilingual pattern where learners use only English and she moves between the other classroom varieties. The language flexibility that Sindi allows herself makes possible the scaffolding of learning and enables learners to produce appropriate English turns when elicited to do so.

She believes that many teachers in her school and in surrounding schools use too much isiXhosa-isiMpondo. She would like to see teachers and learners use more English in classroom interaction because she believes this would promote acquisition. (See Excerpt 73.) Also note that she responded to interview questions in English with little CS, an indication of her confidence in using this variety.

***Excerpt 73: Teachers and learners need to use more English***

\*Sindi: I think they [i.e. other teachers] have to use [the English] language (.) they have to use language throughout their lessons and eh encourage learners to speak English almost all the time.

*8.5.1.2 IsiXhosa-isiMpondo*

Sindi produces the lowest proportion of isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCUs and turns in the group, and the lowest proportion of episodes in her classroom are accomplished in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. When she uses isiXhosa-isiMpondo, she does so differently from the rest of the teachers. Her isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCUs and turns are brief and episodic and are strongly associated with attempts to resolve troubles in interaction. Almost no curriculum mode episodes in her classroom are conducted

exclusively in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. Her substantial use of English in the curriculum mode is consistent with her views about the need for more English in the classroom.

She believes that while some teachers try to stick to English in class others use mainly the home language (i.e., isiXhosa-isiMpondo).

***Excerpt 74: 'They are teaching using Home Language'***

**\*Sindi:** Mhmmm I think eh we most of the time here at school we are encouraging them to speak English every time when they speak. Some are reluctant in doing it. They are teaching the learners using home language. I think they [i.e. teachers] have to use [the English] language (.) they have to use language throughout their lessons and eh encourage learners to speak English almost all the time.

Her use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is confined to specific environments and to do certain actions. IsiXhosa-isiMpondo TCUs and turns occur at the beginning, end, or at transition points in a lesson to perform actions such as: getting a class ready to begin a formal part of a lesson, ending a class, to transition from oral communication to writing activities, to confirm listening and understanding of a series of teacher turns in lecture mode, and to manage interactional troubles such as learner behaviour and turn-taking problems.

She regards her own use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo as purposeful, brief and helpful to students. There is some tension between her beliefs about language use and classroom realities, partly documented in Excerpt 75 below.

***Excerpt 75: 'I try to switch a little bit but not the whole lesson.'***

**\*Sindi:** when I see that the thing I'm teaching is too difficult for them I try to switch a little bit but not the whole lesson, yes.' Mhm. I think it helps because sometimes the learner is not understanding the the (.) a certain word. So if you try to code-switch telling the learner what it is (.) has in his language (.) he can now be able to understand or hear the question (.) If you was asking the question. Yes.

*8.5.1.3 Multilingual patterns*

A small proportion of Sindi's TCUs are produced through intra-TCU or intra-turn switching. She produces the least number of intra-sentential switches in the group. However, a significant proportion of her turns are put together through inter-

sentential switching. The vast majority of Sindi's TCUs and turns are produced monolingually in English and isiXhosa-isiMpondo. In contrast, the vast majority of exchanges between her and learners are conducted in various forms of multilingualism. Like other teachers in this group, Sindi relies heavily on the divergent language pattern to conduct episodes in her lessons. A distinctive feature of multilingualism in her classroom is that a significant proportion of episodes are done through convergent and mixed language patterns. This is partly because she often uses choral and turn-sharing systems of turn allocation as a classroom participation strategy.

Her multilingualism shows a leaning towards parallel/ divergent language use, but she is less reliant on this pattern than others, precisely because she uses comparatively more English. Thus Sindi's overall pattern of language use at the level of accomplishing episodes is more distributed, pointing to greater responsiveness to the demands of unfolding lessons. Her multilingual turns are much more pedagogically-oriented than those of Thami, for example.

#### *8.5.1.4 IsiMpondo*

Sindi is a native of Bizana and speaks the local variety of isiXhosa, isiMpondo. Although her pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary, like that of learners, is distinct from standard isiXhosa from an etic point of view, she rarely ever shows orientation to 'isiMpondoness' in her utterances. She and learners treat nearly all their utterances as isiXhosa and hence the hyphenated isiXhosa-isiMpondo. This matter is discussed in detail in section 4.2.2.

Sindi enacts and re-enacts her role as a teacher by using as much English as is possible, avoiding intra-sentential CS, foregrounding isiXhosa-isiMpondo and backgrounding isiMpondo. She wants learners to replace isiMpondo with isiXhosa, at least in the context of school. This reflects dialect 'eradicationism' (Nomlomo, 1993).

#### ***Excerpt 76: IsiMpondo - 'No. we are changing it here at school'***

**\*Sindi:** No we're changing it [i.e. isiMpondo] here at school. It is not allowed. Even in the..  
in the papers that the learners usually write there is nothing which is said about those

words that they are using at home. Yes. So we have to train the learners to learn the correct the correct words.

She rarely uses isiMpondo in a distinctive way. When used at all it is used in a marked way, to underline humour or strong emotion such as frustration, as shown in Excerpt 46. Her attitude to the use of isiMpondo in school is negative, even though her own speech is shot through with isiMpondo pronunciation, as well as grammatical and lexical items.

## 8.5.2 Anele

### 8.5.2.1 *English*

Anele produces the lowest proportion of English TCUs and turns, with only 5% of her TCUs and 3% of her turns done in English. Although the proportion of teacher and learner exchanges done in English is similar to that in Thami's, Bamba's and Nande's lessons, English episodes in her classroom are qualitatively different. They consist mainly of brief adjacency pairs in which learners read aloud an English text and she produces short continuers in English. Nearly all English episodes in her lessons are of this kind.

### 8.5.2.2 *IsiXhosa-isiMpondo*

Anele produces by far the most isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCUs and turns in the group. Her use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is pervasive rather than concentrated in a particular interaction type or classroom context. It is the primary variety in which she communicates in her classroom. However, learners hardly ever use isiXhosa-isiMpondo in the curriculum mode in this classroom. Thus, Anele's exclusive use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo in this mode is one of the ways in which she linguistically accomplishes her role of teacher and marks it as different from that of learners.

Anele, like Sindi above, largely confines learners to the use of English only, but unlike Sindi, she uses little English herself. Unlike Sindi, she does not present herself as an English language model for learners and a source of oral language input. At least insofar as the lessons documented in this corpus are concerned, she conceives the challenge of learning English through an L2 in an English-limited environment differently from Sindi. Overall, in her English literature lessons, she orients more to the challenge of helping learners to access and construe the

meanings of English texts, in particular, deriving ‘appropriate’ moral and cultural meanings from them, than to the direct acquisition of English grammatical forms or pronunciation through interaction.

In other words, extensive use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo in this classroom aims to ensure that learners develop a deep understanding of texts, even if it is often from the point of view of the teacher, as shown in Excerpt 13. Therefore, while many of the exchanges that take place between Anele and learners through a divergent isiXhosa-isiMpondo/English pattern cannot be considered exploratory talk (Mercer, 1995), they are not ‘safetalk’ either.

The challenge of teaching English in an English-limited environment is approached differently, then, by Sindi and Anele. Sindi attempts to teach English in English, whereas Anele teaches English in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. Sindi’s lessons focus on ‘performing’ English and Anele’s on ‘talking about’ English texts in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. While these two approaches are indicative of different conceptions of language learning, neither is ‘good’ or ‘bad’ in itself because, in the long-term, instructed L2 acquisition depends on a whole lot of other factors.

Anele speaks a variety of isiXhosa-isiMpondo that is closer to standard/written isiXhosa. Thus, the frequent and pervasive use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo in an English language classroom can be read, in addition, as an attempt to model, or give learners access to, a ‘legitimate’ variety of isiXhosa-isiMpondo, even if this variety is not the medium of instruction. If this is true, this would be another way in which a distinction between isiXhosa-isiMpondo and isiMpondo is pointed to, even if it is not quite made ‘demonstrably relevant’ (Li Wei, 1998:163) in interaction.

#### 8.5.2.3 *Multilingual patterns*

Anele produces a relatively small proportion of her TCUs through intra-sentential switching and the lowest proportion of turns through inter-sentential switching; that is, she leans strongly towards language separation at the level of the TCU. This is evident in the fact that she is the most frequent and pervasive user of the divergent language pattern to conduct nearly all episodes in managerial,

curriculum and interpersonal classroom contexts. The particular divergent pattern she uses is one in which she uses isiXhosa-isiMpondo and learners use English. This is different from Sindi above, whose turns in divergent patterns are largely made up of intra-sentential switches.

Paradoxically, although on the one hand Anele produces the smallest proportion of English TCUs and turns in the group, a comparatively large proportion of episodes in her classroom are conducted in English. Ironically, this is because very little substantial English is used in her classroom. Episodes in this variety comprise of only a series of a brief adjacency pairs. Qualitative analysis shows that in fact Anele uses much less English, and in a far less meaningful way, than quantitative summaries suggest.

Asked to describe her concerns regarding the learners' English language skills she focused mainly on the literacy aspect of the issue, providing additional evidence that she values English literacy over oracy.

***Excerpt 77: Problems with learner English - reading, spelling and writing***

**\*Anele:** Yi-reading, spelling. Hhyoooo spelling siyababetha kakhulu. Senditshoba nobhala. Andisathethi ke kwindaba ye-essay.

**%trn:** Reading, spelling. Spelling is a big problem. Writing too. Not to mention essay writing.

Asked what her learners' strengths were in English, she singled out listening skills. She says learners are good at listening, but poor at speaking English.

***Excerpt 78: Learner English language strengths - listening***

**\*Anele:** Hayi kwi-listening noko ndiyabancoma. Then ke baphinde babe poor kwi-speaking. Kwi-listening hay(i) hay(i). Then kengoku xakufuneka beyithethile lento hey kuvela kubenzima kakhulu. But ke bakhona abazamayo.

**%trn:** They have good listening skills. But then they have poor speaking skills. Listening is really good. But then they have great difficulty speaking. But others try a lot.

Given that she believes that learners have good listening comprehension in English, we would expect frequent and pervasive use of English in her classroom. However, in her practice, she appears to approach the medium of instruction issue in a different way, that is, she avoids the use of English.

Even though she is well aware of her learner's struggles with spoken English, as documented in the excerpt above, her classroom practice suggests she is orienting more to literacy (reading and writing) and less to the oral and aural dimensions of English language learning. As mentioned before, this is not surprising given that formal examinations focus primarily on literacy rather than on speaking and listening skills.

She regards her primary pedagogical role, therefore, as that of supporting learners to read fluently and understand English materials. To do this effectively and efficiently, she uses isiXhosa-isiMpondo to translate, annotate and link texts to interests, cultural backgrounds and the moral worlds of her learners. Her use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo could thus be described as participant-related in that she uses it to address learners' real and perceived difficulties in English lessons.

Anele's use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo displays her command of both English and isiXhosa-isiMpondo. That is, by her extensive and animated translation and annotations of English passages in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, she both demonstrates a deep understanding of the English texts and displays extremely competent displays of isiXhosa-isiMpondo. The artful use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo in Anele's lessons does create lessons in which learners get emotionally involved with English texts, as demonstrated in the way learners chortle, laugh and make spontaneous and unsolicited comments on her annotations. In this respect, her lessons are very different from Sindi's.

As shown in Excerpt 79 below, she believes that discussing literature in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and/or a multilingual variety creates a good emotional climate for learning, scaffolds learning and prepares learners to take written examinations in English.

### **Excerpt 79: 'They really get it'**

**\*Anele: Hhey hhayi kakhulu futhi. Uyabona nakwi-story The Importance of Being Ernest hhayi number one. Bayi andastenda kakhulu. Kubamnandi kengoku xasiyenza sonke aphe eklasini siyithetha siyi diskhasa bayibone. But into emnandi yoyoba la Whitney's Kiss uyafundisa. Ufundisa bona into enje ayenziwa. Xa uyenzile uzofumani i-HIV once ungaba mameli abazali. So bavela ngokuufumanisi bana oooh xa ndiba testa ufumanise baya bhala. Ngoku besiba testile apha ku term-four bapasile because siyayithetha sonke. Kumnandi njeng(a)ba sithetha sonke kuyahlekwa.**

**%trn:** Yes indeed. For example the Importance of Being Ernest [i.e., a set work used in the class], they like it. They really get it. It works really well when we work through and discuss the book together in class. What is great is that books like Whitney's Kiss [another set work] teach learners important moral lessons. It teaches them about what things to avoid. If you don't listen to your parents and do things you are not supposed to you may be infected with HIV. So that when I give them an exam about the book they do really well. They did very well in the fourth term examinations because we talk through the books together. It works well to talk through books together and we have a lot of fun.

## **8.5.3 Thami**

### *8.5.3.1 English*

The proportion of Thami's TCUs and turns produced in English is considerable but not large. A large number of his English turns, however, are comprised of short and single-word TCUs and often are quotations from or direct references to textbooks. Only a small proportion of episodes, across classroom contexts, are conducted in English. Unlike Anele above who appears to consciously and systematically avoid using English in favour of isiXhosa-isiMpondo, classroom observation and personal knowledge suggests that a low incidence of English in Thami's speech can partly be attributed to the fact he is not a confident user of English.

### *8.5.3.1 IsiXhosa-isiMpondo*

Thami produces the second largest proportion of isiXhosa-isiMpondo turns in the group, and a large proportion of his TCUs are also produced in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. His use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is pervasive; TCUs and turns in this variety occur across all classroom contexts and activities. He uses it in participant- and discourse related ways. A significant proportion of isiXhosa-isiMpondo episodes in his class occur in the interpersonal context, suggesting that the variety is important in managing classroom roles and identities.

Like Anele, he speaks a variety of isiXhosa-isiMpondo close to the standard and in addition, he is also an isiXhosa language teacher. Thus the prolific use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo in his classroom could also be modelling the use of standard isiXhosa. Also because he is a 'content' teacher rather than an English language teacher, he does not see his role as that of modelling the use of English.

The Social Science curriculum and materials used in the school assume that learners have a certain amount of general knowledge about society, acquired through sources such as English-language mass media. Learners in Thami's school live in remote rural villages, with almost no access to mass media in any language, including English. He ascribes his pervasive use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo to this.

***Excerpt 80: The children have great difficulties with English***

**\*Thami: Ndafumanisa ukuthi abantwana bakwelacala isiNgesi kakhulu bayabethakala kuso. Into ezininzi ke ezibabethayo kwisiNgesi abazimameli ii-radio, abazimameli ii-TV, abazimameli nee-newspaper abazifundi nee-newspaper**

**%trn: I found that children over there [i.e. in Bizana] have great difficulties with English. This is because they don't have access to radio, TV and newspapers.**

Overall, the majority of Thami's TCUs' are produced monolingually in isiXhosa-isiMpondo and English, but the majority of his turns and teacher and learner exchanges are conducted in multilingual patterns.

*8.5.3.2 Multilingual patterns*

A distinctive feature of Thami's pattern of language use is that he produces the most multilingual TCUs in the group. Also he uses multilingual turns more pervasively than any other teacher, that is, his multilingual turns occur across classroom contexts. He produces the second largest proportion of multilingual turns, and the largest and most structurally-complex of the multilingual turns, that is, turns made up of a series of complex TCUs (e.g. Excerpt 64). He conducts classroom interaction primarily in this variety.

*IsiMpondo*

His attitude to isiMpondo is rather negative; he refers to it disparagingly as a 'mix' of isiZulu, isiXhosa and isiMpondo. He sees his role as that of supporting learners

acquire 'correct' isiXhosa. He regards the local variety as especially inappropriate in written language.

***Excerpt 81: '...their isiXhosa is mixed'***

**\*Thami:** Kakhulu into endiyifumanisileyo pha esiXhoseni isiXhosa sabo sinayo i-mix. InesiMpondo nesiZulu nesiXhosa. Siqhubile ke nabafundi kunjalo but trying. Uthi no mabasi andastende kakuhle isiXhosa. No ababhali ngoluhlobo bathetha ngalo. Babhala exactly isiXhosa. Yha but kakhulu ingumahluko ke ngoku apha ekuthetheni.

**%trn:** I find that their isiXhosa is mixed. It has isiMpondo, isiZulu and isiXhosa elements. I worked with this challenge trying to teach them. I would tell learners to use correct isiXhosa. Learners don't write how they speak. They write correct isiXhosa. Yes the big difference is in speaking.

Although Thami takes a dim view of language mixing, as shown above, his own speech is produced through the most structurally-complex language mixing seen in the group. That is, he produces the largest number of 'mixed' TCUs, the second largest proportion of mixed turns, and the longest and most structurally-complex multilingual turns and TCUs in the group. Also, he unconsciously uses isiMpondo items in his own speech.

## **8.5.4 Bamba**

### *8.5.4.1 English*

Although Bamba's English TCUs and turns are few, in fact not many more than Thami's, he uses this variety in a different way. His English TCUs and turns do more than quote/echo English texts. He does substantial work, such as managing interaction and conducting explanations, in English. Only a small proportion of episodes are conducted in English in his class, however. In fact the second smallest proportion of English episodes occur in this classroom.

Bamba tries to introduce new topics or make initial elicitations in English, then switches to isiXhosa-isiMpondo and/or a multilingual variety to accommodate learners' language competence, using these varieties to translate or reformulate, to stress this or that point, and to coax learners to take part in a whole-class session. In other words, in contrast to Thami and Nande, it is clear that

he intends to make English the primary language of conducting lessons, but often finds that it is not feasible to do so, given learners' language (in)competence.

#### *8.5.4.2 IsiXhosa-isiMpondo*

Bamba produces the largest proportion of isiXhosa-isiMpondo TCUs after Anele. However, only a small proportion of his turns and episodes are conducted in this variety. His isiXhosa-isiMpondo turns tend to be brief and are used to conduct short lecture and IRE/F sequences. Like his multilingual turns and episodes below, Bamba uses isiXhosa-isiMpondo in the curriculum context following, and in order to resolve, troubles with understanding and to facilitate access to the curriculum. His use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is different from Anele's and Thami's, both of whom use it as one of the main ways in which to conduct classroom interaction. In Bamba's classroom, isiXhosa-isiMpondo is used in a strategic/episodic way rather than as a regular strategy.

Bamba uses isiXhosa-isiMpondo in two other distinctive ways. Apart from doing pedagogical scaffolding, his use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is strongly associated with doing disciplining or management of learner behaviour. Second, he is the only teacher who asks learners, on occasion, to produce their response in isiXhosa-isiMpondo in order to demonstrate understanding of oral presentations or written texts.

#### *8.5.4.3 Multilingual patterns*

His pattern of language use at the level of TCU leans towards language separation, that is, the vast majority of Bamba's TCUs are produced monolingually in English and isiXhosa. But at the level of turns he produces the majority of his turns through the multilingual variety. In fact he produces the second largest proportion of multilingual turns. The majority of his multilingual turns are created through inter-sentential rather than intra-sentential CS.

He uses multilingual turns across classroom contexts but in a less pervasive way than Thami above. Even though a majority of his turns are produced multilingually, in his classroom this variety is not a de facto variety for making turns. As mentioned above, he uses this variety following, or in anticipation of, troubles in interaction.

Beyond the level of the turn, however, the vast majority of episodes in his classroom, across classroom contexts, are conducted through multilingual patterns, in particular the divergent pattern.

#### *8.5.4.4 IsiMpondo*

Bamba also speaks a variety of isiXhosa fairly close to the standard variety. He is the only teacher who made negative comments about isiMpondo in the course of a lesson. His comments are remarkable first because they are made in an English L2-medium Social Science class where, ordinarily, 'correct' English is foregrounded and 'correct' isiXhosa is backgrounded. Second, unlike Thami, he does not have the additional role of being an isiXhosa-isiMpondo teacher and therefore it is not his institutional role to monitor the use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo in classroom interaction.

His negative remarks about isiMpondo notwithstanding, his own speech contains items of isiMpondo grammar, for example: he says 'ngaloyo lessons' (isiMpondo) instead of 'ngaleyo lesson' (isiXhosa) for '[about] that lesson', and 'nanyiya imizekelo' (isiMpondo) instead of 'nantsiya imizekelo' (isiXhosa) for 'there are the examples'.

### **8.5.5 Nande**

#### *8.5.5.1 English, isiXhosa-isiMpondo and multilingual TCUs*

Nande's TCUs are produced in almost equal proportions in English, isiXhosa-isiMpondo and a multilingual variety. It may appear from this that there is no clear language dominance in her pattern of language use, but qualitative analysis suggests that, overall, isiXhosa-isiMpondo is the dominant variety. The vast majority of her multilingual TCUs are isiXhosa-isiMpondo-dominant, that is, they are constructed through the syntactic and syntactic-plus-phonological assimilation of English nouns and verbs into isiXhosa-isiMpondo structures.

While there is overlap in the functions of TCUs produced in different varieties, the following patterns can be discerned in her language use: English is often used to introduce/state topics, and isiXhosa and the multilingual variety are often used to translate or develop topics. Also, elicitation of confirmations of

understanding are initiated overwhelmingly in isiXhosa-isiMpondo, thus keeping open the option for learners to ask complex/difficult questions in isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

She believes that learners understand more English than they can speak and cites as evidence learner writing. She says learners use very little English because they are 'lazy'. (See Excerpt 82 below.) She herself uses very little English in her classroom, producing one of the lowest proportion of English TCUs and turns. In fact, she produces the largest proportion of multilingual turns in the group of five teachers.

***Excerpt 82: 'I think our learners they are lazy to to speak'***

\*Nande: They do follow. But I think our learners they are lazy to to speak; they prefer writing. Sometimes you can see in their classwork that they are doing better. **Bak(u)vile**. But when it comes to questioning orally; they are lazy and they end up folding their arms. So it's better if ( ) they write(.) You can see **kengoku**.

%trn: They do follow. But I think our learners they are lazy to to speak; they prefer writing. Sometimes you can see in their classwork that they are doing better. They've heard you. But when it comes to questioning orally; they are lazy and they end up folding their arms. So it's better if ( ) they write (.) You can see that they've understood what you said.

*8.5.5.2 English and IsiXhosa/ isiMpondo turns*

At the level of turns there is a clear pattern of language use. Only a small proportion of her turns are conducted monolingually in English or isiXhosa-isiMpondo. She produces the least English turns, after Anele. She also conducts the least English-only episodes in her classroom.

She attributes widespread use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo by teachers in rural classrooms - and includes herself in this - to teachers' failure to comply with curriculum requirements and to misguided efforts to accommodate perceived learner (in)competence in English. This kind of misdiagnosis/misrecognition of learner problems (Excerpt 82), teacher self-blame (Excerpt 83) and inadequacy in terms of remedies (Excerpt 84) is a familiar theme in teacher talk about the state of language and literacy in these classrooms. Also note in the excerpt below that

she attributes the success of (often) middle class English-medium schools to the use of English-only.

***Excerpt 83: 'The problem thina (us) we are sympathising with learners'***

\*Nande: The teachers are not sympathising with them **hahaha** [no no]. The problem **thina** [i.e., 'us', teachers] we are sympathising with learners. When they are not hearing you and then you switch on to another language. I think that's another problem. In those model C schools [i.e., in middle class, former White and in particular English-medium schools] I once do my practise teaching in the Coloured school. When arriving in that school we were just told its English. Even if its Grade 1 learner; it's English not Xhosa in these premises. And we talk to a grade 1 learner in English and he understands you. So I think here in our schools we do sympathise with learners as if they are not understanding you. They feel sorry in the classroom I don't know.

She concedes, though, that isiXhosa-isiMpondo has role in the classroom, but maintains that its use ought to be kept to a minimum. She believes that immersion of learners in English talk only, accompanied by non-verbal cues would, over time, enable learners in rural non-English environments to become competent users of English. (See Excerpt 84.) The excerpt documents the gap between what she believes is good pedagogical practice and what occurs in her classroom.

***Excerpt 84: 'if you look at my face you can understand what I'm saying'***

\*Nande: I think it's better when it's [i.e., isiXhosa-isiMpondo] used (.) when it's needed just to explain more. But I always said to my learners (.) say to my learners (.) we you must always look at me. Because when sometimes I try to explain a certain word I can use gestures. So if the child is looking at me it would be easy for the child to understand what I'm saying. Even if he does not understand the English word. Even the facial expression can tell more (.) what I'm saying (.) Even if you don't understand the English word (.) if you look at my face you can understand what I'm saying.

*8.5.5.3 Multilingual Patterns*

The largest proportion of episodes conducted through multilingual patterns occur in Nande's classroom. Multilingual patterns are concentrated in the curriculum and the managerial contexts but a couple also occur in the interpersonal context. As mentioned above, her multilingual turns are largely isiXhosa-isiMpondo-based and are constructed through syntactic assimilation of English content words and discourse markers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo structures.

The pattern of her language use is similar to that of Thami in the sense that her multilingual turns are not just supportive of English turns, but are in fact the primary way in which she produces her turns and conducts classroom interaction. This contrasts with what she says she wants to do in her classroom.

Unlike other classrooms in the group, however, a small but significant proportion of the episodes are conducted in a complex multilingual pattern in which both teachers and learners switch languages in the course of an episode. The reason for this difference is that one of two lessons from Nandé's classroom involve learner small group discussion. This is an indicator that outside of a whole-class format teachers and learners code-switch freely.

### 8.5.6 Discussion

#### *8.5.6.2 English-only instruction desired and desirable, but unattainable*

The position of English in the South African linguistic market is firmly established. Teachers and learners take it for granted that educational success means competence in English and English L2-medium content. Despite an official policy of additive bilingualism, an English-dominated 'habitus' (Bourdieu, 1991) ensures that English is produced and reproduced as the most desirable but unattainable target and medium of instruction for most poor urban and rural learners.

The dominant position of English in the classroom is buttressed by institutional-level mechanisms, principally curriculum statements, English monolingual materials, and English-only formal assessment. While the position of English as the pre-eminent target language is 'unassailable' (Alexander, 2000), it is not possible to conduct classroom interaction only in English without risking losing learners' attention, interest, and, eventually, motivation to learn, particularly in curriculum contexts of classroom interaction.

Thus, much of the linguistic behaviour of classroom participants is designed to work through or around the challenges of teaching and learning through English in an English-limited environment. Learners as well as teachers in this community speak little English in and outside of school. Because of this, and as demonstrated throughout this chapter, participants' language behaviour deviates from that required by curriculum policy. The deviations can be regarded as examples of

participants, teachers in particular, “interpreting, negotiating, resisting and (re)creating” a defacto language policy (Menken and Garcia, 2010:2), and a demonstration of the absurdity of an English-only curriculum at these grade levels in this sociolinguistic setting.

English monolingual materials are the primary way in which a policy of English only is enforced. That is, learners reading (often, aloud) English texts, on the one hand, and teachers and learners doing talk around the texts in an impoverished, classroom English is one way in which concrete expression is given to an English-only curriculum. Also, because English monolingual materials are both the tool and the object of learning, talk in and around the materials - in any variety - is viewed through the prism of what it contributes to the acquisition of English and subject content. Thus, even when participants, teachers in particular, use very little English in a classroom curriculum context, the acceptability or defensibility of their talk is judged according to its contribution to the assimilation, annotation, or animation of English texts.

As shown throughout this study, a fundamental consequence of an English-only orientation is that talk for learning or dialogic learning (Barnes, 2010) does not occur because it cannot occur through the use of this variety only in this sociolinguistic setting.

Formal assessment is another powerful mechanism for imposing an English-only orientation. Policing language use through formal assessment does not of course guarantee exclusive or frequent use of English in actual classroom interaction, but, like the use of English language materials, it ensures that talk in other varieties is largely valued insofar as it supports learners to succeed with taking English-medium written assessments. Formal assessments are conducted almost entirely in writing, reinforcing the idea that written English skills are more important than spoken language, which in turn reinforces classroom practices that favour the use of varieties other than English in interaction.

In summary, in an English-limited environment, education is often mistakenly equated with a pursuit of English language competence. In such settings, the linguistic behaviour of classroom participants can often be explained in terms of how it is designed to work through or around the challenge of teaching and learning in English in an English-limited environment. Authorities enforce a policy of English only at classroom level through the provision of English monolingual materials and textbooks and monolingual written assessment practices. Crucially, assessment is primarily conducted in writing rather than in spoken language, which helps to ensure that learners are spared the indignities attendant upon trying to communicate orally in an unfamiliar language. Thus, the education system is implicated in the (re)production of English-language safetalk.

#### *8.5.6.3 IsiXhosa-isiMpondo*

Some teachers use isiXhosa-isiMpondo briefly and largely as a pedagogical scaffold. Others use it much more freely, or as much as it is needed in a particular classroom context. All teachers are in agreement, however, that some use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is justified in the English-language or English L2-medium classroom, if it helps learners to access English talk and texts.

In practice, the use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo is not confined to curriculum contexts, however. It is used frequently in interpersonal and managerial contexts. It is also widely used in the curriculum context for actions that cannot be described as doing pedagogical scaffolding or supporting access to the curriculum. In such cases, its use is an attribute of a teacher's communicative style rather than a teaching strategy or contextualisation cue. That is, it is not necessarily intentional, planned or strategic in the Gumperzian sense.

#### *8.5.6.4 IsiMpondo*

All teachers in the corpus take for granted that one of the roles of school is to *replace* isiMpondo with isiXhosa. That is, they do not regard the role of school as *adding* isiXhosa to isiMpondo. This confirms that isiXhosa and isiMpondo are treated as distinct varieties in some contexts and that in the context of the school in particular, although isiMpondo, in general, is not an actively stigmatised variety in this (local) sociolinguistic setting, its existence goes unacknowledged.

Teachers exhibit different degrees of orientation to the distinctness of isiXhosa-isiMpondo and isiMpondo in classroom interaction. Teachers who speak a variety of isiXhosa that is closer to the standard (Anele, Bamba and Thami), even though they sometimes incorporate isiMpondo items in their speech, tend to orient more to a distinction between isiXhosa and isiMpondo. Those who speak a variety closer to isiMpondo (Sindi and Nande) tend not to orient to it in actual interaction.

However, post-hoc interviews show that negative attitudes towards the use of isiMpondo in the classroom exist among both groups of teachers. That is to say, one of the ways in which school is accomplished is by suppressing the use of isiMpondo.

In actual English-language and L2-medium content classroom interaction, a distinction between isiXhosa and isiMpondo is rarely explicitly made or implicitly oriented to. The distinction between isiXhosa and isiMpondo is most salient in the isiXhosa classroom, but even there the difference is made most relevant in the context of writing. This again confirms the observation that teachers in particular have different standards/ideologies/expectations for written, compared to spoken, language.

#### *8.5.6.5 Multilingual patterns*

Teachers regard CS and language mixing in general as a legitimate use of language as long as it supports learning. The kind of switching teachers have in mind is from English to isiXhosa-isiMpondo, that is, inter-sentential CS. As shown in practice, all teachers produce a considerable proportion of their TCUs through intra-sentential CS, with Nande producing the most. On aggregate, a smaller proportion of TCUs are produced through insertional CS. However, the insertional CS occurs across classroom contexts, that is, it is used pervasively.

The dominant way in which teachers put together their multilingual turns is inter-sentential CS. This reflects at least three things. First, that language mixing is stigmatised and often regarded as a sign of language incompetence in formal settings such as classrooms. English speech with isiXhosa items is often referred to

derisively as Xhosalised/ Xhosaised English. Second, speech with frequent and pervasive intra-sentential switching is characteristic of relaxed, informal talk in non-institutional settings. That is, keeping varieties relatively separate is one way in which participants contextualize that they are doing formal classroom talk. Third, teachers regard it as their job to model the use of English to L2 learners and isiXhosa to vernacular speakers of isiMpondo. This is one of the reasons for teachers' keeping their languages apart, at least at the level of the turn.

There is significant variation in terms of how much individual teachers keep their languages separate in practice. While at the level of TCUs and turns, teachers keep their languages apart on aggregate, episodes are overwhelmingly accomplished in multilingual patterns. In other words, only a small proportion of episodes in these classrooms are accomplished monolingually, in English or in isiXhosa-isiMpondo.

## 8.6 Conclusions

The following major conclusions arise from the findings. First, in spite of a variety of interactional strategies invented by teachers to support learning, an assimilationist, English-only curriculum (Heugh, 2000; 1995) generally undermines effective communication between teachers and learners and makes it almost impossible for teachers to enact the progressive and child-centred pedagogies espoused by education authorities (NCCRD, 2000).

Second, teachers explain the presence of varieties other than English in their classrooms in terms of pedagogical scaffolding (Finnema-Blom, 2010, Voster, 2008). However, CS is not confined to the curriculum context, but occurs across classroom contexts. This is indicative of the fact that CS is an established practice in this community and that it is an aspect of teachers' communicative repertoires and styles both inside and outside the classroom. That is to say, it is not useful to describe some CS practices as strategies under the direct control and manipulation of speakers, because there are times when switches appear to be an aspect of their identities (Bailey, 2000).

Thirdly, even though any language pattern can and does occur in any classroom context, the patterns have indexical meanings. The combination of English only and a divergent pattern (i.e., a teacher code-switches but learners use English only) is the normative or unmarked pattern in which classroom interaction is conducted, whereas use of other patterns is marked, particularly in a curriculum context. In other words, varieties and patterns of multilingualism used in the classrooms are not not equally valued or 'symmetrical alternatives' (Schegloff, 2007); there is a local 'indexical order' to CS (Blommaert, 2010; Silverstein, 2003).

Finally, the differences between the language patterns of the five teachers described in sections 8.3 and 8.4 have little to do with the subjects/learning areas they teach. They can better be accounted for by differences in their attitudes to CS in classroom interaction, their assessment of learners' needs, their confidence in using English, and individual bi/multilingual communicative styles and identities.

Quantified data and interview transcripts have the following major implications for a CA approach to bi/multilingual classroom interaction. First, teachers who produce a similar proportion of English or multilingual turns may put them together and use them in very different ways. This is revealed by a sequential analysis. Quantitative analysis alone would not have revealed this kind of fundamental difference. On the other hand, without quantification, it would have been difficult to pick up significant differences between teachers with regard to the degree to which they use this or that variety, so that further sequential analysis could be undertaken.

Second, distinguishing between the curriculum, managerial and interpersonal functions/contexts of CS in whole-class interaction is essential to understanding how varieties are used in this or that classroom context and why they occur at all. This is because these concepts are derived from over three decades of research into classroom CS (Lin, 2013) and therefore are grounded in the realities of multilingual classrooms across many classrooms, worldwide. They are important 'sensitising concepts' (van den Hoonaard, 1997) in the qualitative and quantitative analysis of data. While these contexts do not determine language use, their occurrence in this or that context carries indexical meanings. For

instance, the frequent use of isiXhosa-isiMpondo between learners and teachers in a curriculum context often carries the implication that participants are engaged in doing something new, complex and potentially troublesome. The use of English, on the other hand, signals that something easy, routine, or known is being accomplished. As argued in this study, 'pure' CA concepts such as adjacency pairs, turn-taking, repair, preference organization and so on, are very productive but need to be complemented by concepts developed in the context of classroom CS in order to explain classroom multilingualism.

Finally, interviews, together with ethnographic knowledge and participant observation, shape how transcripts are interpreted. As participants' own accounts of language use, interviews are not merely an additional source of data. They provide insight into participants' motives about and attitudes to the varieties used in interaction. Sequential analysis is committed to inferring meanings of CS only from practices documented in transcripts, i.e., to an empiricist and behaviourist project. To say that participants' accounts are central to the analysis of classroom multilingual talk does not mean that the accounts are accurate, or that there is always alignment between participants' accounts and practices. It means that the way participants construe institutional goals, their roles and those of learners, as well as the role of different classroom varieties, is relevant and essential to the interpretation of their practices. The use of interview data in this is a departure from pure sequential CA approaches which, at best, regard interviews as supplementary (e.g., Auer, 1995).

## 9. Conclusion

The central conclusion of this study is that, although CA is a powerful approach for discovering how participants orient to isiXhosa-isiMpondo, isiMpondo and English, and therefore for establishing what counts as language and CS in classroom interaction, it is not, on its own, an adequate methodological and theoretical framework with which to explain language practices in multilingual classrooms. This is because the language practices of classroom participants cannot be interpreted by reference to sequential analysis alone. In order to explain classroom multilingual talk, one also needs to make reference to extra-sequential factors, in particular institutional goals, the roles of participants, and the broader sociolinguistic context in which classroom language practices are embedded. To investigate extra-sequential factors involves the use of other data production and analytic techniques including participant observation, interviews, basic quantification and an ethnographic sensibility.

This chapter begins with a summary of findings and conclusions. It then discusses their implications for a CA-based approach to multilingual classroom talk and for education. It concludes with issues for further research.

### 9.1 Summary Findings and Conclusions

#### 9.1.1 Patterns of language use in multilingual classrooms

##### *9.1.1.1 Summary findings*

This section summarises findings and conclusions about the first three research sub-questions stated in the introductory chapter, that is, at the end of section 1.4.

- (i) What is the pattern of isiMpondo, isiXhosa, and English use in classroom interaction?
- (ii) Can the patterns of language use documented in (i) above be explained in terms of a bi/multilingual sequential approach?
- (iii) In what ways is bi/multilingual classroom talk similar to and different from bi/multilingual ordinary conversation?

There are two major findings about how participants orient to and use varieties in classroom multilingual interaction. First, that a CA/ sequential approach to bi-/multilingual talk, complemented by an ethnographic sensibility, is a robust approach to determining what constitutes 'language' or a 'code' from the point of view of participants. The close study of the talk exchanged between teachers and learners and interrogation of the way they oriented to different language resources led to the identification of four major 'linguistic' codes or varieties in the corpus, viz., isiMpondo, isiXhosa-isiMpondo, English and a multilingual variety. These varieties are discussed throughout the data description and analysis chapters, in particular in chapter 4 and 8.

The second finding is that differences in language practices between 'classroom' and 'ordinary' bi-/multilingual talk are largely accounted for by the fact that a single party to the interaction, a teacher, has control over the systems of turn-taking and repair. That is, the system of conversation management in whole-class interaction is not locally managed by parties to the conversation. Through a combination of classroom turn-taking and repair organization, teachers set up or corral learners to take part in classroom interactional practices that result in the production and reproduction of particular kinds of patterns of language use.

These bi-/multilingual patterns are different from those predicted by Auer (1995) in relation to ordinary conversation. The latter patterns are described in chapter 3, section 2.3.3. Bi-/multilingual patterns of language use in ordinary conversation depend fundamentally on the principle of 'language negotiation on a turn-by-turn basis between parties to the interaction. In contrast, in bi-/multilingual classroom talk, patterns of language use are orchestrated by a teacher through her/his direction of turn-taking and repair organization. The following five patterns of language use were discovered in classroom interaction. The first three patterns are analysed in chapter 5 and 8, and the last two in chapter 8.

(a) Parallel/divergent bi/multilingualism. This is by far the most common pattern. In this pattern, teachers switch languages but learners use only English. Although this pattern is envisaged in Auer's (1995) model for ordinary conversation, he argues that it is uncommon, often occurs at the beginning of an interaction, before a 'language of interaction' has been established, and that when this pattern is sustained in interaction, it is an expression of conflicting language choices. In multilingual classrooms, on the contrary, this pattern is the predominant one in which the majority of episodes are conducted across teachers and subjects/learning areas. In terms of 'local scales' or 'norms' (Blommaert, 2010:35), after English-only, this pattern is the most 'preferred' way in which to conduct whole-class interaction.

Asymmetrical power relations and role differences between teachers and learners are linguistically reflected in and enacted primarily through the multilingual divergent pattern. Teachers can and do switch varieties to support learners and/or for self-facilitative reasons. The fact that teachers can do this in whole-class interaction marks them as teachers and as doing teaching. Learners' role as learners is marked by the fact that they have much less room to switch languages in a whole-class format and by their use of English or attempts to do so. Learners show that they are learners and learning by displays of English talk. This pattern is one of the key features that marks the fact that a whole-class interaction is in progress. In that sense, the pattern is indexical of teaching and learning in these bi/multilingual classrooms.

(b) Convergent bi/multilingualism. This pattern begins life as divergent bi/multilingualism. Language convergence can be teacher- or learner-initiated. In whole-class interaction, language convergence is often teacher-initiated. In teacher-led language convergence, learners are allowed to use varieties other than English. Learner-initiated language convergence in a variety other than English, such as isiXhosa-isiMpondo or a multilingual variety, is often noticeable and sanctionable.

(c) Mixed/flexible bi/multilingualism. In this pattern, teachers produce multilingual TCUs and turns, but learners overwhelmingly use English. Teacher

turns are characterised by frequent intra-sentential and inter-sentential switches such that it is difficult to assign sequential or local functions to the turns. Although it is difficult to assign sequential meanings to switches in this form of CS, the switches may have classroom and socially indexical meanings (Silverstein, 2003), when account is taken of conversation-external contexts and interpretive frames participants bring along and use in interaction (Gumperz, 1982). For example, it is common for teachers and learners to use this pattern rather than the divergent pattern, in teacher-and-learner and teacher-and-small group interaction. What this means is that use of this pattern often helps contextualize that a whole-class interaction is momentarily suspended. I concur with Bailey (2000), however, that not every case of CS can be shown to be or need be 'strategic' or intentional in Gumperz's (1982) sense, nor need it be about the maximisation of psychological or material rewards as argued by Myers-Scotton and Bolanyai (2001). In such instances, the bi/multilingualism or CS itself is an 'unmarked choice' (Myers-Scotton, 1993b), or is a form of 'language mixing' (Auer, 1999) and therefore is an attribute of speakers' communicative styles and identities.

(d) English-only. This pattern is not common in this corpus. This underscores the fact that English is a relatively unfamiliar variety that learners, and sometimes also teachers, lack confidence in using. It also indicates that there are other and more viable varieties available through which teachers and learners can accomplish lessons. English-only exchanges occur most often in episodes that do revision or something routine or familiar to learners. English often occurs in the form of 'safetalk' (Chick, 1996) and English episodes are often preceded by or set up by divergent or isiXhosa-isiMpondo patterns.

Although little English is used in interaction, it is ever-present because it is the target language, the official medium of teaching, and the exclusive language for written texts. English is at the top of the classroom and social 'orders of indexicality' (Silverstein, 2003) and it is the single most desired and desirable variety (Alexander, 2000).

(e) IsiXhosa-isiMpondo. While teachers use isiXhosa-isiMpondo to perform a variety of actions in different classroom contexts, learners rarely use isiXhosa-

isiMpondo in whole-class interaction. In terms of local scales, the relative prestige between isiXhosa and isiMpondo in interaction is invoked largely by teachers who are themselves speakers of varieties that are closer to standard isiXhosa. Part of the way in which whole-class interaction and school talk is indexed, is by backgrounding isiMpondo and foregrounding isiXhosa. Attention is not often drawn to the 'isiMpondo-ness' of learner speech, probably because of the long exposure to standard isiXhosa by learners at the grade levels considered in this study, i.e., Year 7 to 9. It is therefore easier for them to self-police and self-censure for the use of 'illegitimate' isiMpondo lexical or grammatical items, and less necessary for teachers to make explicit language repair (Gafaranga, 2011).

#### *9.1.1.2 Conclusions*

Summary conclusions include the following: In general in this research context, Auer's patterns of language use do not occur in multilingual whole-class interaction. Multilingual classroom talk is often not interpretable outside of considerations of institutional goals, the roles of participants, and the kind of activities they are involved in. That is, classroom language practices are not interpretable on the basis of sequential analysis alone and therefore a sequential approach is not an adequate approach to explain multilingual classroom talk.

Teachers and learners are able to produce the multilingual patterns described above because they orient to the same norms (Seedhouse, 2004) of language use. These norms have been acquired through long histories of membership and talk between teachers and learners in classrooms (Mercer and Dawes, 2014). Part of the way we know that these norms exist is that when they are occasionally transgressed, repair work ensues to restore the patterns of language use described above. This supports an ethnomethodology-based approach to CA which regards norms as constitutive of or a part of how utterances and social actions are produced and interpreted. Refer to section 3.3.1.

Auer's (1995) claim that sequentially or locally meaningful CS occurs mainly in speech communities in which there is preference for one language at a time is not supported by this study. As demonstrated in chapters 5 to 8, sequentially meaningful CS in this corpus occurs both against one language at a time and against

the background of bi/multilingualism. In particular, CS occurs, overwhelmingly, against the background of divergent bi/multilingualism. The conclusion therefore is that this tenet of CA is probably applicable only to ordinary conversation in specific speech communities.

Finally, for CS to have local functions, it is not necessary for turns to be locally or jointly managed by parties to the interaction. As shown in this study of CS, in a classroom and teacher-led system of turn-taking, participants rely both on sequential analysis of each other's turns as well as locally relevant orders of indexicality of language use to produce utterances and to interpret those of others. The conclusion is that joint management of turn-taking is not a necessary condition for the production and interpretation of switches in bi/multilingual classroom interaction.

## 9.1.2 Patterns of language use: classroom types and individual differences

### 9.1.2.1 Findings and conclusions

This section summarises findings and conclusions about the last two research questions in section 1.4.

- (iv) To what extent can patterns of language use be explained in terms of classroom type, viz., English-language vs. English L2-medium Social Science vs. English L2-medium Technology classroom?
- (v) To what extent can patterns of CS be explained in terms of individual differences in teachers' communicative styles and attitudes to CS?

At first glance, it appears that English-language teachers orient more to a distinction between isiXhosa-isiMpondo and English than English L2-medium content teachers, because they tend to keep their languages apart when producing TCUs and turns. In comparison, English L2-medium content teachers produce many more multilingual turns. However, the English-language teachers produce monolingual TCUs and turns in different and opposite directions: Sindi produces most of hers in an expected way, that is, in English, and Anele in contrast produces most of hers in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. Also unexpected is that Sindi produces many more English TCUs and turns in the English L2-medium content classroom than in

the English language classroom. Pedagogical common-sense and research (e.g., Gwee and Saravanan, 2016; Calteaux, 1996) suggests that the opposite would be the case. For these reasons, a conclusion of this study is that patterns of language use in this corpus are better explained by reference to individual differences between teachers than to differences in classroom types or subjects taught.

In addition to individual differences between teachers, it also turns out that classroom modes/contexts or the types of activities implemented in an episode (Lin, 2013; Ferguson, 2009; Martin-Jones, 1995), explain patterns of language use better than classroom types/subjects do. For example, frequent language code-switching by teachers in a curriculum context is often indicative of troubles they have with an episode, or of troubles that they anticipate learners may have with what is said/done in an episode. In contrast, frequent use of English to accomplish episodes is indicative of 'safetalk', that is, that something established, simple or routine is in progress. Thus language use makes relevant particular interpretive frames. Having said that, there is, however, is no one-to-one correspondence between the use of this or that variety and a particular classroom context. That is, indexical meanings signalled or projected by the use of this or that variety/varieties, are confirmed or rejected by participants in the course of actual interaction/exchanges (Gumperz, 2001:218). Thus, meanings generated through the kind of CS or multilingualism observed in these classrooms depends on shared histories of talk between teachers and learners (Mercer and Dawes, 2014) as well as on the sequential circumstances of the talk.

In terms of teachers' individual communicative styles and their views about what is appropriate classroom language use, Sindi strongly favours the use of English-only in her classrooms and there is some convergence between her views about language use and her practices. Anele, on the other hand, predominantly teaches English in isiXhosa-isiMpondo. She appears to orient more to the task of supporting learners in accessing the meanings of English written texts than to language acquisition. Thami, Bamba and Nande use multilingual turns to a considerable degree, but in different ways. Thami and Nande use these turns much more as part of their communicative styles and less as a pedagogical scaffold. In

contrast, Bamba tends to use multilingual turns in a strategic way to scaffold learning. Teacher classroom language practices are shaped by a number of complex factors, which sometimes reinforce one another and at other times are in conflict with one another (Ferguson, 2009:234). In this corpus, these include the need to use other varieties to accommodate learners' English language competence, to comply with the requirements of the curriculum, their attitudes to classroom CS, their own pedagogical strategies, and their individual multilingual communicative styles. The conclusion therefore is that if intervention programmes that seek to maximise CS to support teaching and learning processes are to stand any chance of success, they have to take into account these individual differences.

## 9.2 Implications

### 9.2.1 Implications for a CA-based Approach to Multilingual Classroom Interaction

A CA or sequential approach which seeks to produce a situated account of language use in multilingual classrooms that are embedded in complex sociolinguistic and educational systems, needs to draw on ethnographic knowledge of sites, participant observation and participants' accounts. As shown in chapter 8 (8.5) in particular, participants' accounts are essential to a rich understanding of what is going on in multilingual classrooms (e.g., Ferguson, 2009:240). This is not to argue that teacher accounts are complete or accurate. Participants' accounts are emic data that can provide researchers with insight into how participants' construe the sociolinguistic situation, institutional goals, the needs of their learners, and their own roles, and therefore can help explain motives behind observed practices. A purist interpretation of CA or sequential analysis restricts itself to analysis of displayed behaviour or language practices, and consequently it can produce only a limited account of what is going on and tell us even less about why it is going on.

Without quantification it would have been difficult to describe and analyse a large corpus such as that examined in this study. While clearly not every CA-based study can benefit from use of quantitative techniques, this study benefitted greatly from it. Without use of these techniques it is unclear to me if, for example, the importance and pervasive use of a divergent bi/multilingual pattern in this corpus would not have been as apparent. Also, it is unclear to me if similarities, differences and overlaps in the use of different language patterns in various classroom contexts and by different teachers, would have been as clear. Of course quantitative data alone can mislead as shown, for example, in relation to Thami's, Bamba's and Nande's multilingual turns (8.2.2 and 8.3). All three produce the same proportion of multilingual turns, but construct and use them in different ways. Thus, from a methodological point of view, a CA-based approach to classroom multilingual talk approach must first proceed on the basis of detailed production and sequential analysis of transcripts (Heritage, 2004).

Finally, the interpretation of language use in post-colonial classrooms such as the ones described in this study, requires adopting an ethnographic sensibility and thus bringing to bear to analyses knowledge of the institutional and social settings and histories in which interaction occurs. As argued in chapter 2 and demonstrated in chapters 4 to 8, this is because classroom language practices are subject to "institutional processes, and to the political and economic foundations of symbolic domination" (Heller, 2008:205-206) and to "several layers of historicity some of which are within the grasp of participants while others remain invisible but nevertheless present" (Blommaert, 2005:130).

## 9.2.2 Implications for Education

### 9.2.2.1 *Language Policy and Curriculum*

As shown in chapter 8 in particular, the South African schooling system operates according to two contradictory language 'policies'. On the one hand, the official language in education policy (DoE, 1997) supports an additive multilingual approach, and on the other, curriculum requires and only makes provision for English (largely) and Afrikaans beyond the fourth year of school. In other words, official policy is negated in practice by curriculum planning and provisioning. The

effect of this is that the apartheid-era English- and to a lesser extent Afrikaans-dominated 'field' (Bourdieu, 1991:57) is largely unchanged. As a result, language-based educational and socio-economic inequality persists (Alexander, 2014). A starting point to resolve this is to re-open the debate about the relationship between language and learning and therefore between curriculum and language policy. Discussions should take the form of series of inclusive debates involving students, parents, teachers, curriculum planners and language-in-education specialists.

#### *9.2.2.2 Teacher education and development*

Initial teacher education and professional development programmes require a fundamental review. Teacher training programmes need to review their assumptions about who the learners and teachers are and what the context of language is. Despite protestations to the contrary, many South African teacher programmes appear to take ('Black' or 'White') middle class, English speaking children and teachers as the norm (Ramadiro and Porteus, 2011). That is, these programmes assume that learners are middle class, speak English and live in English-rich environments. Thus teacher training and development programmes are conducted almost only in English, with a few in Afrikaans. However, after several decades of recruiting and training teachers to run an English-based education system, South African higher education has failed to produce a corps of teachers that can succeed in making the mass of poor urban and rural African-language speaking children highly literate in English, as shown, for example, by learners grade scores in English and English L2-medium content subjects (see Table 2 and Fleisch, 2008). Such programmes must proceed from the reality that the vast majority of learners and teachers in the schooling system are African-language speaking and have varying degrees of access to and competence in English - hence the pervasive use of CS in the classroom - and that therefore African languages are important resources for classroom communication, teaching and learning. Teacher programmes in the future need to be designed with multilingualism as a foundation of the education system rather than as a remedial 'problem' to be excised from it.

### *9.2.2.3 Classroom practice*

There is a need to normalise and valorise some of the forms of spontaneous classroom bi/multilingualism documented in chapters 5 to 8. This will entail, among other things, language awareness campaigns aimed at learners, parents, teachers and teachers and local education officials, in order to promote the acceptance and valuing of bi/multilingualism and multilingual classroom communicative and pedagogical practices. This is consistent with ideas such as ‘heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy’ or ‘translanguaging as pedagogy’ (Blackledge and Creese, 2014).

The interpretation of heteroglossia or translanguaging I have in mind is that which is closest to Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester’s (2003) continua of biliteracy or Cen William’s original conception of translanguaging as described in Baker (2003), that is, the approach to translanguaging that recognises that while, in principle, all languages are equally valid semiotic systems, in society they occupy different positions and fetch different value in the linguistic market. The role of school in post-colonial settings, therefore, is to teach for as long as possible through varieties in which children are spontaneous and creative - their home languages/ L1’s - while ensuring quality access and learning to and through prestigious and gate-keeping ex-colonial varieties.

Precisely what combinations of factors produce the highest levels of L1 and L2 language and content acquisition is an intervention research question that can be properly examined in the light of such things as: teacher individual communicative and pedagogical styles and competences in the classroom varieties; learner access to classroom varieties; and accumulated theory, research and practice about language and content acquisition (Ellis, 2008).

## **9.3 Issues for Further Research**

There are three main perspectives through which this study can be taken further, viz., the pedagogical, interventionist, and theoretical-comparative perspectives. Firstly, the existing corpus could be analysed in more detail through a pedagogical lens, in particular, through the lens of dialogic pedagogies (e.g., Barnes, 2010). This could focus in particular on how opportunities for exploratory talk are created

through language in general and CS in particular. Secondly, the current study could be used as part of baseline data to design, implement and evaluate an intervention aimed shifting teachers' beliefs, practices and attitudes. This would respond to repeated calls for research in this direction (Lin, 2013; Ferguson, 2009). Thirdly, a systematic and comparative study could be made of how CA and MM/RC account for the CS documented in the corpus.

## References

- Adendorff, R. 1993. Codeswitching Amongst Zulu-speaking Teachers and their Pupils: Its Functions and Implications for Teacher Education. *Southern African Journal of Applied Language Studies* 2(1), 3-26
- Adler, J. 2001. *Teaching Mathematics in Multilingual Classrooms*. NY: Kluwer Academic Publishers
- Alexander, N. 2014. *Interviews with Neville Alexander: The Power of Languages Against the Language of Power*. PMB: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press
- Alexander, N. 2006. Language and Culture in a Post-colonial State. *Pambazuka, Issue 278, 2006-11-16* (<http://pambazuka.org/en/category/comment/38360>)
- Alexander, N. 2005. *Language, Class and Power in Post-apartheid South Africa*. Harold Wolpe Memorial Lecture, 27 October 2005, T H Barry Lecture Theatre, Iziko Museum, Cape Town
- Alexander, N. 2003. *The African Renaissance and the Use of African Languages in Tertiary Education*. Praesa Occasional Papers, No. 13, CA: UCT
- Alexander, N. 1999. *English Unassailable but Unattainable: The Dilemma of Language Policy in Education in South Africa*. Praesa Occasional Papers, No. 3. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.
- Alexander, N. 1992. South Africa: Harmonising Nguni and Sotho. In N. Crawhall (ed.) *Democratically Speaking: International Perspectives on Language Planning*. CA: National Language Project. 56-68
- Alexander, N. 1989. *Language Policy and National Unity in South Africa/Azania*. CA: Buchu Books
- Alvarez-Cáccamo, C. 2001. Codes. In A. Duranti (ed.) *Key Terms in Language and Culture*. MA: Blackwell Publishers. 23-26
- Alvarez-Cáccamo, C. 1998. From 'Switching Code' to 'Code-switching': Towards a Reconceptualisation of Communicative Codes. In P. Auer (ed.) *Code-Switching in Conversation*. London: Routledge. 29-48.

- Armstrong, J.C. Worden, N. 1989. The Slaves, 1652-1834. In R. Elphick and H. Giliomee (eds.) *The Shaping of South African Society, 1652-1840*. CA: Maskew Miller Longman. 109-183
- Arthur, J. 1996. Code-switching and Collusion: Classroom Interaction in Botswana. *Linguistics and Education*, 8:17-33
- Arthur Shoba, J. Chimbutane, F. 2013. (eds.) *Bilingual Education and Language Policy in the Global South*. NY: Routledge
- Arthur, J. Martin, P. 2006. Accomplishing Lessons in Postcolonial Classrooms: Comparative Perspectives from Botswana and Brunei Darussalam. *Comparative Education*, 42(2): 177-202
- Atkinson, D. 1987. The Mother Tongue in the Classroom: A Neglected Resource? *ELT Journal*, 41(4): 241-247
- Auer, P. 2009. Bilingual Conversation. In Nikolas Coupland and Adam Jaworski (eds.) *The New Sociolinguistics Reader*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan. 490-511
- Auer, P. 2007. The Monolingual Bias in Bilingualism Research, or: Why Bilingual Talk is (still) a Challenge for Linguistics. In M. Heller (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. 319-339
- Auer, P. 2000. Why Should We and How Can We Determine the Base Language of Bilingual Conversation? *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 1 (1): 129-144
- Auer, P. 1999. From Code-switching via Language Mixing to Fused Lects: Toward a Dynamic Typology of Bilingual Speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 3(4):309-332
- Auer, P. 1998. Introduction: Bilingual Conversation Revisited. In Peter Auer (ed.) *CS in Conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge. 1-28
- Auer, P. 1996. From Context to Contextualization. *Links & Letters*. 3:11-28
- Auer, P. 1995. The Pragmatics of Code-switching: A sequential Approach. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.) *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 115-135

- Auer, J.C.P. 1984. *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Auerbach, E.R. 1993. Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1): 9-32
- Bailey, B. 2007. Heteroglossia and Boundaries. In M. Heller (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. 257-274
- Bailey, B. 2000. Social/Interactional Functions of Code-switching among Dominican Americans. *Pragmatics*. 10 (2): 165-193
- Baker, C. 2011. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 5<sup>th</sup> Ed.*, Bristol: Multilingual Matters
- Baker, C. 2003. Biliteracy and Transliteracy in Wales: Language Planning and the Welsh National Curriculum. In N.H. Hornberger (ed.), *Continua of Biliteracy: An Ecological Framework for Educational Policy, Research and Practice in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 71-90
- Baker, C. Hornberger, N.H. (eds.) 2001. *An Introductory Reader to the Writings of Jim Cummins*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters
- Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas
- Barnes, D. 2010. Why Talk is Important. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 9(2):7-10
- Beinart, W. 1994. *Twentieth-Century South Africa*. CA: Oxford University Press
- Bell, A. 2009. Language Style as Audience Design. In N. Coupland and A. Jarwoski (eds.) *The New Sociolinguistics Reader*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan. 265-275
- Blackledge, A. Creese, A. 2014. *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy*. London: Springer

- Bloch, C. Guzula, X. Nkence, N. 2010. Normalizing South African Classrooms. K. Menken O. Garcia (eds.) *Negotiating Language Policies in Schools: Educators as Policymakers*. NY: Routledge. 88-106
- Blom, J. Gumperz, J.J. 1986/1972. Domains and the Relationship between Micro- and Macrosociolinguistics. In John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Blommaert, J. 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Blommaert, J. 2005. *Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Blommaert, J. Rampton, B. 2011. Language and Superdiversity. In J. Blommaert, B. Rampton and M. Spotti (eds.), *Diversities*, 13(2):1-18
- Bonacina, F. Gafaranga, J. 2011. Medium of Instruction vs. Medium of Classroom Interaction: Language Choice in a French Complementary School Classroom in Scotland. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 14 (3): 319-334.
- Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press
- Braam, D. 2012. A Boost for Mother-Tongue Learning. Mail and Guardian, 16 March, (<http://mg.co.za/article/2012-03-16-a-boost-for-mothertongue-learning>)
- Brock-Utne, B. Desai, Z. Qorro, M.A.S. Pitman, A. 2010. (eds.) *Language of Instruction in Tanzania and South Africa – Highlights from a Project*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers
- Brown, D. 1992. Language and Social History in South Africa: A Task Still to be Undertaken. R.K. Herbert (ed.) *Language and Society in Africa: The Theory and Practice of Sociolinguistics*. JHB: University of the Witwatersrand. 71-92
- Brown, P. Levinson, S.C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Bundy, C. 2014. *Short-Changed? South Africa Since Apartheid*. JHB: Jacana

- Bunyi, G. 2001. Language and Educational Inequality in Primary Schools in Kenya. In M. Heller and M. Martin-Jones (eds.) *Voices of Authority: Education and Linguistic Difference*. Westport: Ablex Publishing. 77-100
- Busch, B. 2014. Building on Heteroglossia and Heterogeneity: The Experience of Multilingual Classroom. In A. Blackledge and A. Creese (eds.) *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy*. NY: Springer. 21-40
- Calteaux, K. 1996. *Standard and Non-Standard African Language Varieties in the Urban Areas of South Africa*. Pretoria: HSRC
- Canagarajah, S. 2015. Negotiating Mobile Codes and Literacies at the Contact Zone: Another Perspective on South African Township Schools. In C. Stroud and M. Prinsloo (eds.) *Language, Literacy and Diversity: Moving Words*. London: Routledge. 34-54
- Canagarajah, S. 2011a. Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3): 401-417
- Canagarajah, S. 2011b. Translanguaging in the Classroom: Emerging Issues for Research and Pedagogy. *Applied Linguistic Review*, 2:1-28
- Cazden, C.B. 1988. *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning*. Portsmouth: Heinemann
- Chick, J.K. 1996. Safetalk: Collusion in Apartheid Education. In H. Coleman (ed.), *Society and the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 21-39
- Chimbutane, F. 2011. *Rethinking Bilingual Education in Postcolonial Contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters
- Chitera, N. 2009. Code-switching in a College Math Classroom. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 6(4): 426-442
- Clyne, M. 2003. *Dynamics of Language Contact: English and Immigrant Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- Coetzee- van Rooy, S. 2014. Explaining the Ordinary Magic of Stable African Multilingualism in the Vaal Triangle Region in South Africa. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(2): 121-138
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. 2009. Prosody. *The Pragmatics of Interaction*. D'hondt, S., Östman, J-O. Verschueren, J. (eds.). Antwerp: John Benjamins Publishing Co.174-189
- Creese, A. Blackledge, A. 2011. Separate and Flexible Bilingualism in Complementary Schools: Multiple Language Practices in Interrelationship. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43: 1196-1208
- Creese, A. Blackledge, A. 2010. Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1):103-115
- Creese, A. Martin, P. 2003. (eds.), *Multilingual Classroom Ecologies: Interrelationships, Interactions, and Ideologies*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters
- Cromdal, J. 2001. Overlap in Bilingual Play: Some Implications of Code-switching for Overlap Resolution. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 34(4): 412-451
- Cummins, J. 2000. *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Dane, F. C. 1990. *Research Methods*. CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- de Klerk, V. 2006. *Corpus Linguistics and World Englishes: An Analysis of Xhosa English*. London: Continuum
- Department of Education (DoE). 1997. *Language-in-Education Policy*. Pretoria: Government Printers
- Deumert, A. 2010. Tracking the Demographics of (Urban) Language Shift: An Analysis of South Africa Census Data. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1(1): 13-35

Dewalt, K.M. Dewalt, B. R. Wayland, C.B. 1998. Participant Observation. In H. R. Bernard (ed.) *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. CA: AltaMira Press. 259-299

Drew, P. 2013. Turn Design. *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. In J. Sidnell and T. Stivers (eds.). Sussex: Wiley Blackwell. 131-149

Drew, P. Heritage, J. 1992. Analyzing Talk at Work. In P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds.) *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3-65

du Plessis, T. 2006. From Monolingual to Bilingual Higher Education: The Repositioning of Historically Afrikaans-Medium Universities in South Africa. *Language Policy*, 5: 87–113

Ellis, R. 2008. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*, 2<sup>nd</sup>. Ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press

Elphick, E. Malherbe, V.C. 1989. The Khoisan to 1828. In R. Elphick and H. Giliomee (eds.) *The Shaping of South African Society, 1652-1840*. CA: Maskew Miller Longman.3-65

ENCA. 2016. <https://www.enca.com/south-africa/university-stellenbosch-retains-afrikaans-medium-instruction> (16 February 2016)

Evans, R. Cleghorn, A. 2012. *Complex Classroom Encounters: A South African Perspective*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Ferguson, C. 2000. Diglossia. In Li Wei (ed.) *The Bilingualism Reader*. Oxon: Routledge. 65-80

Ferguson, G. 2009. What Next? Towards an Agenda for Classroom CS Research. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(2), 231-241

Ferguson, G. 2006. *Language Planning and Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

- Ferguson, G. 2003. Classroom Code-switching in Post-Colonial Contexts: Functions, Attitudes and Policies. In S. Makoni and U. Meinhof (eds.) *Africa and Applied Linguistics: AILA review 16*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 38-51
- Finlayson, R. Slabbert, S. 1997. "We Just Mix": Code Switching in a South African Township. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 125 (1): 65-98
- Finnema-Blom, J.R. 2010. Code-scaffolding: A Pedagogic Code-switching Technique for Bilingual Content Instruction. *Journal of Education*, 190(3): 27-35
- Fleisch, B. 2008. *Primary Education Crisis: Why South Africa Schoolchildren Underachieve in Reading and Mathematics*. Cape Town: Juta
- Franceschini, R. 1998. Code-switching and the Notion of Code in Linguistics: Proposals for a Dual Focus. In Peter Auer (ed.) *CS in Conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.51-72
- Gafaranga, J. 2011. Transition Space Medium repair: Language Shift Talked into Being. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 43:118-135
- Gafaranga, J. 2007. *Talk in Two Languages*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan
- Gafaranga, J. 2005. Demythologising Language Alternation Studies: Conversational Structure vs. Social structure in Bilingual Interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37: 281-300
- Garcia, O. 2013. From Diglossia to Transglossia: Bilingual and Multilingual Classrooms in the 21st century. In C. Abello-Contesse, P. M. Chandler, M. D. López-Jimenez, and R. C. Beltrán (eds.). *Bilingual and Multilingual Education in the 21st Century: Building on Experience*. Bristol: Multilingual Matter. 155-175
- Garcia, O. Flores, N. Woodley, H. H. 2012. Transgressing Monolingualism and Bilingual Dualities: Translanguaging Pedagogies. In A. Yiakoumetti (ed.), *Harnessing Linguistic Variation to Improve Education*. Oxford: Peter Lang. 45-76
- Garcia, O. Li Wei. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. England: Palgrave Macmillan
- Gardner-Chloros, P. 2009. *Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- Gardner-Chloros, P. 1995. Code-switching in Community, Regional and National Repertoires: The Myth of Discreteness of Linguistic Systems. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.), *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 68-89
- Gardner-Chloros, P. Moyer, M. Sebba, M. 2007. The LIDES Corpus. In J. C. Beal, K. P. Corrigan and H. Moisl (eds.), *Models and Methods in the Handling of Unconventional Digital Corpora. Vol. 1: Synchronic Corpora; Vol.2: Diachronic Corpora*. London: Palgrave. 91-121
- Garfinkel, H. 1996. Ethnomethodology's Program. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59(1), 5-21
- Giles, H. 2009. The Process of Communication Accommodation. In N. Coupland and A. Jarwoski (eds.) *The New Sociolinguistics Reader*. NY: Palgrave MacMillan. 276-286
- Gilomee, H. 2012. The Rise and Possible Demise of Afrikaans as a Public Language. *Praesa Occasional Papers, No. 14*, CA: UCT
- Gough, D. 1996. Black English in South Africa. In V. de Klerk (ed.) *Varieties of English Around the World: Focus on South Africa*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co. 55-77
- Greer, T. 2007. *Accomplishing Identity in Bilingual Interaction: Codeswitching Practices among a Group of Multiethnic Japanese Teenagers*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation: University of Southern Queensland
- Gumperz, J.J. 2001. Interactional Sociolinguistics: A Personal Perspective. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, H. Hamilton (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. NY: Blackwell
- Gumperz, J.J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Gumperz, J. J. (1992b). Contextualization and Understanding. In A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds.). *Rethinking Context: Languages as Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 229-252

- Hadebe, S. 2009. From Standardisation to Harmonisation: A Survey of the Sociolinguistic Conditions for the Creation of Nguni in Southern Africa. In B. Brock-Utne and I. Skattum (eds.) *Language and Education in Africa: A Comparative and Transdisciplinary Analysis*. Oxford: Symposium Books. 275-285
- Hakulinen, A. 2009. Conversation Types. In S. D'hondt, J. Östman and J. Verschueren (eds.) *Pragmatics of Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Co. 55-65
- Hammersley, M. 2003. Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: Methods or Paradigms? *Discourse in Society*, 14(6): 751-781
- Hanks, W.F. 2001. In Duranti, A. (ed.) *Key Terms in Language and Culture*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing
- Heller, M. 2008. Language Choice and Symbolic Domination. In M. Martin-Jones, A. de Meija and N.H. Hornberger (eds.), *Discourse and Education, Vol. 3: Encyclopaedia of Language and Education*. NY: Springer. 201-209.
- Heller, M. 2007. Bilingualism as Ideology and Practice. In M. Heller (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. 1-22
- Heller, M. 2001. Legitimate Language in a Multilingual School. In M. Heller and M. Martin-Jones (eds.) *Voices of Authority: Education and Linguistic Difference*. Westport: Ablex Publishing. 381-402
- Heller, 1995. Language Choice, Social Institutions and Symbolic Domination. *Language in Society*, 24(3): 373-405.
- Heller, M. 1988. Strategic Ambiguity: Code-switching in the Management of Conflict. In M. Heller (ed.) *Code-switching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 77-96
- Heller, M. Martin-Jones, M. (eds.) 2001. *Voices of Authority: Education and Linguistic Difference*. Westport: Ablex Publishing.
- Hellerman, J. 2003. The Interactive Work of Prosody in the IRF Exchange. *Language in Society*, 32(1): 79-104

- Herbert, R.K. 1992. Languages in a Divided Society. In R.K. Herbert (ed.) *Language in Society in Africa: Theory and Practice of Sociolinguistics*. Johannesburg: University of Witwaterand Press. 1-19
- Heritage, J. 2004. Conversation Analysis and Institutional Talk. In R. Sanders K. Fitch (eds.) *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlaum. 103-146
- Heritage, J. 1997. Conversation Analysis and Institutional Talk. In D. Silverman (ed.) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. London: Sage
- Heritage, J. Clayman, S. 2010. *Talk in Action: Interactions, Identities and Institutions*. Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell
- Heugh, K. 2003. *Language Policy and Democracy in South Africa: The Prospects of Equality Within Rights-Based Policy and Planning*. Sweden: Stockholm University
- Heugh, K. 2002. The Case Against Bilingual and Multilingual Education in South Africa: laying Bare the Myths. *Perspectives in Education*, 20(1): 171-196
- Heugh, K. 2000. Multilingual Voices - Isolation and Crumbling of Bridges. *Agenda*, 46:2133
- Heugh, K. 1995. Disabling and Enabling: Implications of Language Policy Trends. In R. Mesthrie (ed.) *Language and Social History: Studies in South African Sociolinguistics*. CA: David Philip. 329-350
- Hibbert, L. van der Walt, C. (eds.) 2014. *Multilingual Universities in South Africa: Reflecting Society in Higher Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- HIS Global Insight (2014) Regional Explorer  
[\(http://www.ihsglobalinsight.co.za/Products/ReX/\)](http://www.ihsglobalinsight.co.za/Products/ReX/)
- Hornberger, N.H. 2003. Continua of Biliteracy. In N.H. Hornberger (ed.), *Continua of Biliteracy: An Ecological Framework for Educational Policy, Research and Practice in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 1-34
- Hornberger, N. Chick, J.K. 2001. Co-Constructing School Safetime: Safetalk Practices in Peruvian and South African Classrooms. In Heller, M. Martin-Jones, M.

(eds.) *Voices of Authority: Education and Linguistic Difference*. London: Ablex Publishing. 31-55

Hornberger, N. Link, H. 2012. Translanguaging and Transnational Literacies in Multilingual Classrooms: A biliteracy Lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3): 261-278

Hornberger, N.H. Skilton-Sylvester, E. 2003. Revisiting the Continua of Biliteracy: International and Critical Perspectives. In N. H. Hornberger (ed.), *Continua of Biliteracy: An Ecological Framework for Educational Policy, Research and Practice in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 35-67

Hutchby, I. Wooffitt, R. 1998. *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Içbay, M. A. 2008. *The Role of Classroom Interaction in the Construction of Classroom Order: A Conversation Analytic Study*. Unpublished PhD Thesis: Middle East Technical University

Irvine, J. Gal, S. 2009. Language-ideological Processes. In N. Coupland and A. Jarwoski (eds.) *The New Sociolinguistics Reader*. NY: Palgrave MacMillan. 374-377

Jacobs, P. Hart, T. 2014. Pro-poor Rural Development in South Africa? In Meyiwa, T. Nkondo, M. Chitiga-Mabugu, M. Sithole, M. Nyamnjoh (eds.) *State of the Nation 2014: South Africa 1994-2014, A Twenty-Year Review*. Cape Town: HSRC. 158-170

Jørgensen, J.N. 2003. Language Among Fifth Grades: Code-switching in Conversation 501 of the Køge Project. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 24(1): 126-148

Kamwangamalu, N.M. 2001. The Language Planning Situation in South Africa. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 2(4), 361-445

Kasper, G. 1985. Repair in Foreign Language Teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7: 200-215.

Ko, S. 2009. Multiple-Response Sequences in Classroom Talk. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 32(1): 4.1-4.18

- Koch, E. London, J. Jackson, M. Foli, C. 2009. First Brushstrokes: Initial Comparative Results on the Additive Bilingual Education Project (ABLE). *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 27(1): 93-111
- Lass, R. 1995. South African English. In R. Mesthrie (ed.) *Language and Social History: Studies in South African Sociolinguistics*. CA: David Philip. 89-106
- Lerner, G. H. 2002. Turn-sharing: The Choral Co-production of Talk in Interaction. In C. Ford, B. Fox and S.A. Thompson (eds.), *The Language of Turn and Sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 225-256
- Lerner, G. H. 1995. Turn Design and the Organization of Participation in Instructional Activities. *Discourse Processes*, 19: 111-131
- Levine, G. 2011. *Code Choice in the Language Classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters
- Levinson, S.C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Liebscher, G. Dailey-O'Cain, J. 2005. Learner Codeswitching in the Content-Based Foreign Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89 (ii): 234-247
- Liebscher, G. Dailey-O'Cain, J. 2003. Conversational Repair as Role-defining Mechanism in Classroom Interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87 (iii): 375-390
- Lin, A. 2013. Classroom Code-switching: Three Decades of Research. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4(1): 195-218
- Lin, A.M.Y. 2008. Code-switching in the Classroom: Research Paradigms and Approaches. In K. King and N.H. Hornberger (eds.) *Research Methods in Language Education: Encyclopaedia of Language and Education, Vol. 10*. US: Springer. 273-286
- Lin, A.M.Y. 1996. Bilingualism or Linguistic Segregation? Symbolic Domination, Resistance and Code-switching in Hong Kong Schools, *Linguistics and Education*, 8: 49-84

Li Wei. 2011. Li, Wei (2011) Moment Analysis and Translanguaging Space: Discursive Construction of Identities by Multilingual Chinese Youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(5): 1222-1235

Li Wei. 2002. 'What Do You Want Me to Say?' On the Conversation Analysis Approach to Bilingual Interaction. *Language & Society*, 31(2): 159-180

Li Wei. 1998. The 'Why' and 'How' Questions in the Analysis of Conversational Code-Switching. In Peter Auer (ed.) *CS in Conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge. 156-176

Li Wei. 1994. *Three Generations, Two Languages, One Family: Language Choice and Language Shift in a Chinese Community in Britain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Li Wei, Wu, C. 2009. Polite Chinese Children Revisited: Creativity and the Use of Codeswitching in the Chinese Complementary School Classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(2): 193

Macaro, E. 2001. Analysing Student Teachers' Code-switching in Foreign Language Classroom: Theories and Decision Making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4): 531-548

Macbeth, D. 2004. The Relevance of Repair for Classroom Correction. *Language in Society*, 33: 703-736

Macdonald, C.A. 1990. *Crossing the Threshold into Standard Three: Main Report of the Threshold Project*. Pretoria: HSRC

Mæhlum, B. 1996. Code-switching in Hemnesbergt: Myth or Reality. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25: 749-761

Mafela, L. 2009. Code-switching in Botswana History Classrooms in the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development. *Language Matters*, 40(1): 5679

Makoe, P. McKinney, C. 2014. Linguistic Ideologies in Multilingualism South African suburban Schools. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(7): 658-673

Makoni, S. Mashiri, P. 2007. Critical Historiography: Does Language Planning in Africa Need a Construct of Language as Part of its Theoretical Apparatus? In S. Makono and A. Pennycook (eds.) *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 62-89

Martin-Jones, M. 2015. Multilingual Classroom Discourse as a Window on Wider Social, Political and Ideological Processes: Critical Ethnographic Approaches. In N. Markee (ed.) *The Handbook of Classroom Discourse and Interaction*. MA: Wiley Blackwell. 446-460

Martin-Jones, M. 2007. Bilingualism, Education and the Regulation of Access to Language Resources. In M. Heller (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. 161-182

Martin-Jones, M. 2000. Bilingual Classroom Interaction: A Review of Recent Research. *Language Teaching*, 33: 1-9

Martin-Jones, M. 1995. Codeswitching in the Classroom: Two Decades of Research. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.), *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 90-111

Martin-Jones, M. Gardner, S. 2012. Introduction: Multilingualism, Discourse and Ethnography. In S. Gardner and M. Martin-Jones (eds.) *Multilingualism, Discourse and Ethnography*. London: Routledge. 1-15

Martin-Jones, M. Heller, M. 1996. (eds.) Special Issue on Education in Multilingual Settings: Discourse, Identities and Power. *Linguistics and Education*, 8(1):3-23

Maynard, D.W. Clayman, S.E. 2003. Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis. L.T. Reynolds, N.J. Herman-Kinney (eds.) *Handbook of Symbolic Interactionism*. 173-202

McKinney, C. 2014. Moving Between *Ekasi* and the Suburbs: The Mobility of Linguistic Resources in a South African De(re)segregated School. In M. Prinsloo and C. Stroud (eds.) *Educating for Language and Literacy Diversity: Mobile Selves*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan. 97-115

- McKinney, C. 2013. Orientations to English in Post-apartheid Schooling. *English Today*, 113(29:1): 22-27
- Masondo, D. 2015. Post-apartheid Tribalism, Language and the National Question. *African Communist*, Issue 189, 135-155
- Mazrui, A.A. Mazrui, A.M. 1998. *The Power of Babel: Language and Governance in the African Experience*. Oxford: James Currey
- McCabe, R. 2013. Scaffolded Code-switching: A Resource for Achieving Academic Literacy. *Journal of Language Teaching*, 47(2):159-194
- McGlynn, C. Martin, P. 2009. 'No Vernacular': Tensions in Language Choice in a Sexual Health Lesson in The Gambia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(2):137-155
- McHoul, A.W. 1990. The Organization of Repair in Classroom Talk. *Language in Society*, 19: 349-377
- McHoul, A.W. 1978. The Organization of Turns at Formal Talk in the Classroom. *Language in Society*, 7: 182-213
- Mehan, H. 1979. *Learning Lessons*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Menken, K. Garcia, O. 2010. (eds.) *Negotiating Language Policies in Schools: Educators as Policymakers*. NY: Routledge
- Meeuwis, M. Bloammaert, J. 1998. A Monolectal View of Code-switching: Layered Code-switching among Zairians in Belgium. In Peter Auer (ed.) *CS in Conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge. 76-98
- Mercer, N. 1995. *The Guided Construction of Knowledge*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters
- Mercer, N. Dawes, L. 2014. The Study of Talk between Teachers and Students, from the 1970s until 2010s. *Oxford Review of Education*, 40(4):430-445
- Moerman, M. 1988. *Talking Culture: Ethnography and Conversation Analysis*. PA: University of Pennsylvania Press

- Molteno, F. 1984. The Historical Foundations of the Schooling of Black South Africans. P. Kallaway (ed.) *Apartheid and Education: The Education of Black South Africans*. 45-107
- Moodley, V. 2010. J Code-switching and Communicative Competence in the Language Classroom. *Journal of Language Teaching*, 44(1): 7-22
- Moore, D. 2002. Case Study: Codeswitching and Learning in the Classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5: 279–293.
- Msimang, T. 1998. The Nature and History of Harmonisation of South African Languages. In K.K. Prah (ed.) *Between Distinction and Extinction: The Harmonisation and Standardisation of African Languages*. JHB: University of the Witwatersrand. 165-172
- Muysken, P. 2000. *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Myers-Scotton, C. 2009. Code-switching. In N. Coupland and A. Jarwoski (eds.) *The New Sociolinguistics Reader*. NY: Palgrave MacMillan. 473-489
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993a. Elite Closure as a Powerful Language Strategy: The African Case. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 103:149-163
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993b. *Social Motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Myers-Scotton, C. Bolonyai, A. 2001. Calculating speakers: Codeswitching in a Rational Choice Model. *Language in Society*, 30, 1-28
- National Centre for Curriculum Research and Development (NCCRD). 2000. *Language in the Classroom: Towards a Framework for Intervention*. Pretoria: Department of Education
- Ndayipfukamiye, L. 1996. The Contradictions of Teaching Bilingually in Postcolonial Burundi: From Nyakatsi to *Maisons en Etages*. *Linguistics and Education*, 8: 35-47

- Nel, N. Muller, H. 2010. The Impact of Teachers' Limited English Proficiency on English Second Language Learners in South African Schools. *South African Journal of Education, 30*:635-650
- Ngwaru, J.M. 2011. Transforming Classroom Discourse and Pedagogy in Rural Zimbabwe Classrooms: The Place of Local Culture and Mother Tongue Use. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 24*(3): 221-240
- Nomlomo. V. S. 1993. *Language Variation in the Transkeian Xhosa Speech Community and its Impact on Children's Education*. Unpublished M. Ed Dissertation: University of Cape Town
- Nunan, D. 1991. *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers*. NY: Prentice Hall
- Orman, J. 2008. *Language Policy and Nation-Building in Post-apartheid South Africa*. PA: Springer
- Obanya, P. 2004. *Learning in, with and from the First Language*. PRAESA Occasional Paper No. 19. Cape Town: UCT
- Ochs, E. 1979. Transcription as Theory. In E. Ochs and B. Schiefflin (eds.) *Developmental Pragmatics*. NY: Academic Press. 43-72
- Palmer, D.K. 2009. CS and Symbolic Power in a Second-grade Two-way Classroom: A Teacher's Motivation System Gone Awry. *Bilingual Research Journal, 32*(1), 42-59
- Perry. T. 2005. Language Rights, Ethnic Politics: A Critique of the Pan South African Language Board. *Praesa Occasional Papers, No. 12*, CA: UCT
- Plüdderman, P. Mati, X. Mahlalela-Thusi, B. 1998. *Problems and Possibilities in Multilingual Classrooms in the Western Cape: Final Research Report Compiled for Joint Education Trust for National Depart of Education*. UCT: PRAESA
- Polio, C.G. Duff, P.A. 1994. Teachers' Language Use in University Foreign Language Classrooms: A Qaulitative Analysis of English and Target Language Alternation. *The Modern Journal, 78*(3): 313-326

- Pomerantz, A. Heritage, J. Preference. 2013. In J. Sidnell and T. Stivers (eds.) *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Sussex: Wiley Blackwell. 210-228
- Poplack, S. Meecham, M. 1995. Patterns of Language Mixture: Nominal Structure in Wolof-French and Fongbe-French Bilingual Discourse. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.) *One Speaker Two Languages: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 199-232
- Prinsloo, M. Stroud, C. 2014. Introduction. In M. Prinsloo and C. Stroud (eds.) *Educating for Language and Literacy Diversity: Mobile Selves*. London: Plagrove Macmillan. 1-19
- Probyn, M. 2012. Learning Science in Eastern Cape Schools. In L. Wright (ed.) *South Africa's Education Crisis: Views from the Eastern Cape*. NISC: Grahamstown. 49-71
- Probyn, M. 2009. 'Smuggling' the Vernacular into the Classroom: Conflicts and Tensions in Classroom Code-switching in Township and Rural Schools in South Africa. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(2): 123-136
- Probyn, M. 2001. Teachers Voices: Teachers Reflections on Learning and Teaching through the Medium of English as an Additional Language in South Africa. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 4(4): 249-266
- Radio 702. 2016. <http://www.702.co.za/articles/12230/free-state-university-drops-afrikaans-from-2017> (15 March 2016)
- Ramadiro, B. 2012. Reading in Two Languages: Evidence from Miscue Analysis. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*, 2(2): 74-93
- Ramadiro, B. Porteus, K. 2011. The Role of the University in Rural Development. *Journal of Educational Studies: Special Issue - Social Justice: 45-70*
- Ramadiro, B. Sotuku, N. 2011. *Lessons from the University of Limpopo's Dual-Medium Degree. Bilingual Education Project: Bulletin 1, June, 2011. East London: University of Fort Hare*

- Ramani, E. Joseph, M. 2002. Breaking New Ground: Introducing an African Language as Medium of Instruction at the University of the North. *Perspectives in Education, Vol. 20*: 233-240
- Ramirez, J.D. 2005. *Ebonics: The Urban Education Debate*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Rampton, B. 2006. *Language in Late Modernity: Interaction in an Urban School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Rampton, B. 1998. Language Crossing and Redefining Reality. In Peter Auer (ed.) *CS in Conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge. 290-317
- Rampton, B. 1995. *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London: Longman
- Raschka, C. Sercombe, P. Chi-Ling, H. 2009. Conflicts and Tensions in Codeswitching in a Taiwanese EFL Classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12(2)*:157-171
- Republic of South Africa (RSA). 2013. *The Incremental Introduction of African Languages in South African Schools*. 96. Government Printers: Pretoria
- Republic of South Africa (RSA). 2011. *Languages Bill 2011*. Government Printers: Pretoria
- Republic of South Africa (RSA). 1996. *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108*. Government Printers: Pretoria
- Republic of South Africa (RSA). 2002. *Language Policy for Higher Education*. Government Printers: Pretoria
- Republic of South Africa. 2011. *Languages Bill 2011*. Government Printers: Pretoria
- Republic of South Africa (RSA). 1979. *Education and Training Act of 1979*. Government Printers: Pretoria

Rymes, B. 2014. Marking Communicative Repertoire through Metacommentary. In A. Blackledge and A. Creese (eds.) *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy*. NY: Springer.

Sacks, H. Schegloff, E.A. Jefferson, G. 1978. A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn Taking for Conversation. In J. Schenkein (ed.). *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*. New York: Academic. 7-55

Satyo, S.C. 1998. Soft Harmonisation and Cross-fertilising of Vocabularies: The Case of Nguni Languages. In K.K. Prah (ed.) *Between Distinction and Extinction: The Harmonisation and Standardisation of African Languages*. JHB: University of the Witwatersrand. 223-228

Schegloff, E.A. 2009. One Perspective on Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives. In J. Sidnell (ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press 357-406

Schegloff, E.A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Schegloff, E.A. Jefferson, G. Sacks, H. 1977. The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Language (53) (2)*: 361-82

Sebba, M. Wootton, T. 1998. We They and Identity: Sequential versus Identity-related Explanation in Code-switching. In Peter Auer (ed.) *CS in Conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge. 262-286

Seedhouse, P. 2004. *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing

Seedhouse, P. 1998. CA and the Analysis of Foreign Language Interaction: A Reply to Wagner. *Journal of Pragmatics, 30 (1)*: 80-102

Setati, M. Adler, J. 2000. Between Languages and Discourses: Language Practices in Primary Multilingual Mathematics. *Educational Studies, 43(3)*: 243-269

- Sinclair, J. Coulthard, M. 1975. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: the English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Silverstein, M. 2003. Indexical Order and the Dialectics of Sociolinguistic Life. *Language and Communication*, 23: 193-229
- Simango, S.R. 2015. "Amaphi Ama-subjects Eniwa-enjoy-ayo Esikolweni?: Code-switching and Language Practices among Bilingual Learners in the Eastern Cape. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 234: 77-91
- Sinclair, J.M. Coulthard, R.M. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Slabbert, S. Finlayson, R. 1999. The Future of the Standard African Languages in the Multilingual South African Classroom. In R. Finlayson (ed.) *African Mosaic: Festschrift for J.A. Louw*. Pretoria: UNISA. 235-249
- Spofana, D. G. 2011. *Learners' Texts: A Portrayal of the Influence of Certain Varieties of isiXhosa on English Texts and Vice Versa*. Unpublished D. Litt et Phil. Dissertation: University of South Africa
- Spolsky, B. 2009. *Language Management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Statistics South Africa (StatsSA). 2011.  
<http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/SASStatistics/SASStatistics2013.pdf>
- Stroud, C. 1998. Perspectives in Cultural Variability of Discourse and Some Implications for Code-switching. In Peter Auer (ed.) *CS in Conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge. 321-348
- Stroud, C. Heugh, K. 2003. Language Rights and Linguistic Citizenship. In K. Heugh *Language Policy and Democracy in South Africa: The Prospects of Equality within Rights-Based Policy and Planning*. Sweden: Stockholm University
- Swain, M. Kirkpatrick, A. Cummins, J. 2011. *How To Make a Guilt-Free Life Using Cantonese in the English Class: A Handbook for the English Language Teacher in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Hong Institute of Education

- ten Have, P. 2007. *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.*, London: Sage
- Thompson, L. 1995. *A History of South Africa*. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Truill, A. 1995. The Khoesan Languages of South Africa. In R. Mesthrie (ed.) *Language and Social History: Studies in South African Sociolinguistics*. CA: David Philip. 1-18
- Tuomi, S.K. Gxilishe, S. Matomela, L. 2001. The Acquisition of Xhosa Phonemes. *Per Linguam* 17(1):14-23
- Turnbull, M. Dailey-O’Cain, J. 2009. (eds.) *First Language Use in the Second and Foreign Language Learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters
- UNDP. 2015. *Human Development Report 2015*. NY: United Nations Development Programme
- Union of South Africa, 1953. *Bantu Education Act of 1953*. Government Printers: Union of South Africa
- Üstünel, E. Seedhouse, P. 2005. Why That, in That Language, Right Now? Code-switching and Pedagogical Focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(3): 302-325
- Uys, D. van Dulm, O. 2011. The Functions of Classroom Code-switching in the Siyanda District of the Northern Cape. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 29(1):67-76
- Vail, L. 1991. *The Creation of Tribalism in Southern Africa*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- van den Hoonaard, W.C. 1997. *Working with Sensitising Concepts*. NY: Sage
- van der Walt, C. 2009. The Functions of Code-switching in English Language Learning Classes. *Per Linguam*, 25(1):30-43
- van Dijk, T. 2008. *Discourse and Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Voster, H. 2008. Investigating a Scaffold to Code-switching as Strategy in Multilingual Classrooms. *Pythagoras*, 67:33-41

Walsh, S. 2006. *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. NY: Routledge

Woolard, K. A. 1998. Simultaneity and Bivalency as Strategies in Bilingualism. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 8(1):3-29

Worden, N. 1994. *The Making of Modern South Africa*. UK: Blackwell Publishers

Wright, L. 2012. (ed.) *South Africa's Education Crisis: Views from the Eastern Cape*. Grahamstown: NISC

Zentella, A. C. 1997. *Growing Up Bilingual*. MA: Blackwell Publishing

## Appendix A: Transcription Conventions

[ ]	(overlap)
ALL CAPS	(loud delivery)
=	(latched talk)
:	(syllable lengthening)
( ) said)	(brackets without text indicate talk. Brackets with text indicates uncertainty about was said)
(( ))	(Researcher's comments)
Δ	(Fast talk)
∇	(Slow talk)
°	(Soft talk)
\$	(smiley voice)
&	(Ventriloquizing)
↑	(High pitch)
↓	(low pitch)
%trn:	(translation)
%glo:	(gloss)
(.)	(micro pause, usually less than 0.2 seconds)
(0.4)	(Pause in tenths of seconds)
L01:	(Learner 01)
LNS:	(Learners)
VST1	Visitor1 (A colleague of mine)
Regular typeface	(English)
<b>Bold typeface</b>	(isiXhosa-isiMpondo)
<i>Italics</i>	(isiMpondo)
<u>Underlined</u>	(depending on the context, it refers too classroom formulaic language, Afrikaans, slang)

## Appendix B: Teacher Interview Guide

1. How are learners coping with learning in English in your classroom?
2. How much access to English do learners have outside the classroom?
3. How do you deal with the challenge of teaching through English?
4. How do other teachers in your school deal with the challenge of teaching in English?
5. What is the role of isiXhosa in your classroom?

## Appendix C: Information Sheet (English)

Dept of Applied Linguistics and Communication

BIRKBECK

University of London

Malet Street,

London WC1E 7HX

020 7631 6000

**Title of Study:** Language use in South African rural classrooms

**Name of researcher:** Brian Ramadiro

The study is being done as part of my PhD degree in the Department of Applied Linguistics and Communication, Birkbeck, University of London. The study has received ethical approval.

This study aims to document students' and teachers' language use in the classroom. It will document where and when different languages are used in the classroom among students as well between teachers and learners.

If you agree to participate in this study you will agree to have me audio and video record your speech and interaction with learners in the classroom. You will also be asked to participate in an individual interview and a focus group discussion about language use in the classroom. You are free to refuse to take part in the interview and/or the focus, or to withdraw from the focus or interview at any time.

A code will be attached to your data so it remains totally anonymous. The analysis of our interview will be written up in a report of the study for my degree. You will not be identifiable in the write up or any publication which might ensue.

The study is supervised by Prof Penelope Gardner-Chloros who may be contacted at the above address and telephone number.

Brian Ramadiro

PhD Student

Birkbeck College, University of London

## Appendix D: Information Sheet (isiXhosa)

Isebe lokusetyenziswa kwelwimi nonxulumano

BIRKBECK

kwidyunivesiti yase London

Malet Street,

London WC1E 7HX

020 7631 6000

**Isihloko soluphando:** Ukusetyenziswa kweelwimi kumagumbi okufundela asemaphandleni eMzantsi Afrika

**Igama lalowo oqhuba olupando:** Brian Ramadiro

Oluphando luqhutywa njengxenye yokufezekisa izifundo zam kwisidhanga sobuNjingalwazi kwisebe lelwimi nokusetyenziswa kwazo kwakunye nonxulumano, kwi dyunivesiti yase Birkbeck eLondon. Oluphando lufumene imvume yeenqobo ezisesikweni.

Oluphando lujoliswe ekushicileleni ukusetyenziswa kwelwimi ngabafundi notishala kumagumbi okufundela. Luzokushicilela indlela ekusetyenziswa ngayo iilwimi ezahlukeneyo, phakathi kwabafundi kumagumbi okufundela kanti naphakathi kotishala nabafundi.

Xa uvuma ukuthatha inxaxheba koluphando, uzakube uyavuma ukuba ndishicilele ilizwi lako kwakunye nemifanekiso ebhanyazayo ye-video yakho kwinxaxheba oyithathayo kwigumbi lokufundela. Uyakucelwa futhi ukuba uthathe inxaxheba kudliwano-ndlebe uwedwa, kanti nakwiqela eliquka nabanye apho niyokuxoxa ngokusetyenziswa kweelwimi kumagumbi okufundela. Ukhululekile ukuba wale ekuthathani inxaxheba kudliwano-ndlebe kwakunye nakwiqela lengxoxo, kanti ukwakhululekile ukuba urhoxe nagaliphi ithuba.

kuzukufakelwa ikhodi kwingcombolo yakho ukwenzela kuhlale kuyimfihlo. Uhlalutywa kodliwano-ndlebe nawe luyokubhalwa njengengxelo yoluphando, olubhalelwa esisidanga sifundelwayo. Awusoze uvele ukuba ungubani kubhalo okanye kuphaphasho onothi uvele.

Oluphando longanyelwe ngu Njingalwazi Penelope Gardner-Chloros onothi kuqhakamishelwane naye kwidilesi kunye nemfono-mfono engentla.

Ngu Brian Ramadiro

Umfundi wesidanga sobuGqirha

KwiDyunivesithi yase Birkbeck College eLondon

# Appendix E: Caregiver Consent Form

**Title of Study: Language use in South African rural classrooms**

*Name of researcher: Brian Ramadiro*

I have been informed about the nature of this study and willingly consent to taking part in it.

I understand that the content of classroom recordings and interviews will be kept confidential.

I understand that I may choose to withdraw my child from the study at any time.

I am over 18 years of age.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Relationship to participant:

Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Isihloko Sophando: Ukusetyenziswa kwelwimi kumagumbi okufundela asemaphandleni eMzantsi Afrika**

*Igama lalowo oqhuba oluphando: Brian Ramadiro*

Ndazisiwe ngentlobo yoluphando kwaye ndizimisele ukunika imvume yokuthatha inxaxheba.

Ndiyaqonda ukuba ushicilelo lwengcombholo yamagumbi okufundela kwakunye nodliwano-dlebe kuzokugcinwa kuyimfihlo.

Ndiyaqonda ukuba ndingakwazi ukumrhexisa nanini na ndifuna umntana wam koluphando.

Ndineminyaka engetla kweyi 18.

Igama \_\_\_\_\_

Tyikitya \_\_\_\_\_

Uhlobana njani Nomthathi nxaxheba:

Umhla \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix F: Teacher Consent Form

**Title of Study: Language use in South African rural classrooms**

*Name of researcher: Brian Ramadiro*

I have been informed about the nature of this study and willingly consent to taking part in it.

I understand that the content of classroom recordings and interviews will be kept confidential.

I understand that I may choose to withdraw my child from the study at any time.

I am over 18 years of age.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Isihloko Sophando: Ukusetyenziswa kwelwimi kumagumbi okufundela asemaphandleni eMzantsi Afrika**

*Igama lalowo oqhuba oluphando: Brian Ramadiro*

Ndazisiwe ngentlobo yoluphando kwaye ndizimisele ukunika imvume yokuthatha inxaxheba.

Ndiyaqonda ukuba ushicilelo lwengcombholo yamagumbi okufundela kwakunye nodliwano-dlebe kuzokugcinwa kuyimfihlo.

Ndiyaqonda ukuba ndingakwazi ukumrhexisa nanini na ndifuna umntana wam koluphando.

Ndineminyaka engetla kweyi 18.

Igama \_\_\_\_\_

Tyikitya \_\_\_\_\_

Umhla \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix G: Learner Consent Form

**Title of Study: Language use in South African rural classrooms**

*Name of researcher: Brian Ramadiro*

I have been informed about the nature of this study and willingly consent to taking part in it.

I understand that the content of classroom recordings and interviews will be kept confidential.

I understand that I may choose to withdraw from the study at any time.

I am between 13 and 16 years of age.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Isihloko Sophando: Ukusetyenziswa kwelwimi kumagumbi okufundela asemaphandleni eMzantsi Afrika**

*Igama lalowo oqhuba oluphando: Brian Ramadiro*

Ndazisiwe ngentlobo yoluphando kwaye ndizimisele ukunika imvume yokuthatha inxaxheba.

Ndiyaqonda ukuba ushicilelo lwengcombholo yamagumbi okufundela kwakunye nodliwano-dlebe kuzokugcinwa kuyimfihlo.

Ndiyaqonda ukuba ndingakhetha ukurhoxa koluphando nangaliphi na ixesha.

Ndiphakathi kweminyaka eyi-13 neyi 16 ubudala.

Igama \_\_\_\_\_

Tyikitya \_\_\_\_\_

Umhla \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix H: Ethics Clearance

**SSHP Ethics** <sshpeethics@bbk.ac.uk>

To

Penelope Gardner-Chloros Brian Ramadiro

CC

SSHP Ethics

08/30/13 at 6:09 PM

Date of submission: 18.7.13

Investigator: Brian Ramadiro

Reference n.: 2013-18

Title of Project: Code-switching (CS) in South African rural classrooms

Dear Brian

The School of Social Sciences History and Philosophy Ethics Committee has scrutinised this proposal and has given it ethical approval.

Please keep this message as official record of the approval for future reference. We will be happy to provide a formal letter of approval upon request.

Good luck with the research

Yours

Dan Alexander

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

Dan Alexander

Assistant School Manager, School of Social Sciences, History and Philosophy

Birkbeck, University of London

26 Russell Square

London WC1B 5DQ

020 7631 6735

[d.alexander@bbk.ac.uk](mailto:d.alexander@bbk.ac.uk)

## Appendix I: TCUs by Language by Teacher

Teacher	Lesson	Unit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
<b>Sindi</b>	English	N	350	232	3	145	47	15	0	0	38	830
		%	42	28	-	17	6	2	-	-	5	100
<b>Anele</b>	English	N	54	781	0	114	0	12	0	3	77	1041
		%	5	76	-	11	-	1	-	-	7	100
<b>Thami</b>	Social Science	N	58	114	1	149	-	1	-	-	4	327
		%	18	35	0	46	-	0	-	-	1	100
<b>Bamba</b>	Social Science	N	220	482	-	343	5	1	-	1	7	1059
		%	21	46	-	32	0	0	-	0	1	100
<b>Sindi</b>	Technology	N	572	147	-	98	-	9	-	-	37	863
		%	66	17	-	11	-	1	-	-	4	100
<b>Nande</b>	Technology	N	356	407	-	361	2	-	-	1	9	1138
		%	31	36	-	32	0	-	-	0	0	100

## Appendix J: Turns by Language by Teacher

Teacher	Lessons	Participant	Unit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
<b>Sindi</b>	English	Teacher	N	168	81	1	125	13	4	-	-	7	399
			%	42	20	0	31	3	1	-	-	2	100
<b>Anele</b>	English	Teacher	N	13	318	2	90	-	2	-	-	60	485
			%	3	66	0	19	-	0	-	-	12	100
<b>Thami</b>	Social Science	Teacher	N	19	37	0	59	-	-	-	-	2	117
			%	16	32	0	50	-	-	-	-	2	100
<b>Bamba</b>	Social Science	Teacher	N	72	113	-	223	-	-	-	1	-	409
			%	18	28	-	55	-	-	-	-	-	100
<b>Sindi</b>	Tech	Teacher	N	168	-	40	64	-	1	1	1	2	277
			%	61	-	15	23	-	-	-	-	1	100
<b>Nande</b>	Tech	Teacher	N	38	67	1	182	5	-	-	1	1	295
			%	13	23	-	62	2	-	-	-	-	100

## Appendix K: Sequence by Language by Teacher

Teacher	Lessons		1	2	3	4	5	Total
<b>Sindi</b>	English	Count	64	18	32	11	30	141
		%	41%	12%	21%	7%	19%	100%
<b>Anele</b>	English	Count	241	9	9	41	51	351
		%	69%	2%	2%	12%	15%	100%
<b>Thami</b>	Social Science	Count	104	6	10	12	19	151
		%	69%	4%	7%	8%	13%	100%
<b>Bamba</b>	Social Science	Count	102	16	19	8	16	161
		%	63%	10%	12%	5%	10%	100%
<b>Sindi</b>	Technology	Count	47	9	8	3	39	106
		%	44%	8%	8%	3%	37%	100%
<b>Nande</b>	Technology	Count	74	4	28	7	2	115
		%	64%	3%	24%	6%	2%	100%