



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

- This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.
- A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.
- This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.
- The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.
- When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

**When Language Policy and Pedagogy Conflict: Pupils' and Educators'
'Practiced Language Policies' in an English-Medium Kindergarten
Classroom in Greece**

Ifigenia Papageorgiou

Ph.D. in Linguistics

The University of Edinburgh

2011

Signed declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis has been composed by me and that the work is my own. This work has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

Signed

Ifigenia Papageorgiou
12 December 2011

Abstract

An international school (BES) in Greece, overwhelmingly attended by Greek origin children, has adopted, as its language policy, English as the ‘official’ medium of interaction, including in the Reception classroom, the target of this research. That is, through its language policy, the school aims to promote the learning and use of English throughout school. At the same time, the school has adopted ‘free interaction’ in designated play areas as its pedagogical approach. The aim of this approach is to promote learners’ autonomy and, in the particular case, it could be interpreted as including the possibility of using Greek. Thus, a conflicting situation has developed: how to reconcile the school’s English monolingual language policy and the pedagogical approach in the play areas? Reception educators are expected to police the use of English in the kids’ play areas without however undermining children’s autonomy and/or disrupting their ‘free interaction’.

The feelings and views expressed by educators show that they are seriously concerned about how this conflicting situation can be approached. The aim of this thesis is to respond to this issue of concern by providing a detailed description of how the school’s conflicting policies are actually lived in the educators’ and pupils’ language choice practices in the play areas of their classroom. By adopting the Applied Conversation Analytic perspective of “description-informed action” (Richards 2005), a perspective whereby practitioners are made aware of their own practices and are left to “make (their own) decisions regarding the continuation or modification” of their own policies and practices (Heap, 1990: 47), the aim is to raise BES stakeholders’ awareness about the possible advantages, possibilities and limitations of their policies and practices in Reception, and thus pave the way to more informed language policy making and practice in the school.

The data consists of audio-recorded naturally occurring child-child and child-adult interactions in the school’s play areas. The analytic framework draws on Spolsky (2004), for whom “the real language policy of a community” resides in its language practices (hence the notion of ‘*practiced language policy*’), and on conversation analytic methodologies applied to language choice (Auer 1984, Gafaranga 2000, 2001, 2005, 2007a, 2009).

The key finding is that, adult school members and children respond to the school’s conflicting policy demands in different ways, i.e. by orienting to different ‘practiced language policies’. On the one hand, as the adults’ ‘medium request’ (Gafaranga 2010) practices in the kids’ play areas demonstrate, from the adult perspective, at all times, participants need to attend to a language preference that is ‘*institutionally-assigned*’, i.e. adults orient to a ‘*practiced language policy*’ that is in line with the “declared” (Shohamy 2006) English monolingual language policy of the school. This shows that they have responded to the school’s conflicting policy demands by prioritising the school’s language policy (use of English) at the expense of the pedagogical approach (learners’ autonomy). On the other hand, children approach the conflicting situation differently. Children seem to have developed an alternative ‘*practiced language policy*’ according to which language choice during peer group interaction is not organised around the school’s “declared” (ibid) language policy but around their interlocutor’s “linguistic identity” (Gafaranga 2001). This alternative language policy allows the kids to attend to the pedagogical approach (learner autonomy and free interaction). 97.905 words including references

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my first supervisor, Dr Joseph Gafaranga, for his advice, very strong support and continuous encouragement throughout this study. I would also like to thank my second supervisors, Professor Miriam Meyerhoff, for her academic advice and invaluable help with various difficulties I faced during my postgraduate studies, and Dr Lauren Hall Lew, for her helpful comments on earlier drafts of this thesis. Many thanks also go to members of the Language in Context Research Group in the Department of Linguistics and English Language of the University of Edinburgh, and especially to my office mates and colleagues Rowan Mackay, Angela Gayton, Agata Dalezynska and Lauren Stewart. A very special word of thanks goes to the administrators and the teachers at the school (BES) in Athens where I conducted my fieldwork and collection of data. I am indebted to all of the primary school teachers and administrators for their invaluable insights into the school and its policies. In addition, special thanks go to BES's preschoolers who are the main actors in this study and have taught me so many things about their own policies and language choice norms and the bilingual organization of their own classroom reality.

I am also grateful to all those who have directly or indirectly contributed to this thesis: Hugh Trappes-Lomax at the University of Edinburgh, Erik Schleeff at the University of Manchester, Alexandra Georgakopoulou and Vally Lytra at Kings' College London, Jo Angouri at the University of the West of England (Bristol), and Bessie Dendrinou at the University of Athens. I am indebted to all of them for their invaluable help at the initial stages of my PhD studies.

I would also like to thank all of my Edinburgh friends and particularly Panos Angelikopoulos, Jesus Martinez Garcia, Spiros Adams-Florou, Loukia KapetanVasiliou, Elma Charalampidou, Andrea Ross, Panos Terzis and Marina Iliopoulou for making my life in Edinburgh happier. Special thanks go to Kaiti Logotheti-Anderson, Kevin Anderson and Robin Barber for being my rainbow all these years and sharing with me all the good and bad moments. I am particularly

indebted to Robin Barber for his generous offer to stay in his flat during the final stages of the writing up of this thesis.

Further, my heartfelt thanks to Christos Koutsarnakis for his incredible patience, very strong support and continuous encouragement throughout my PhD studies. His unfailing love gave me the strength to continue and achieve my dreams and goals.

Last but not least, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my family for their love, support, patience and financial assistance throughout my studies: my mother Christina-Melpomeni Papageorgiou, my brother Odysseas Papageorgiou and my grandmother Marika Kanelli who is no longer in life. I am profoundly indebted to all of them.

To my mother Meni for her
unconditional love and to Christos for
being a constant source of inspiration
and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	4
TABLE OF CONTENTS	7

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Motivation for the Thesis and Aims of the Research.....	12
1.1 The Applied Conversation Analytic Perspective of ‘Description-Informed Action’.....	13
1.2 Basic Concepts and Issues.....	16
1.2.1 Interaction in the Play Areas as Informal Classroom Talk.....	17
1.2.2 Language Policies in Practices: The Notion of ‘Practiced Language Policy’.....	18
1.2.3 The Conversation Analytic Approach to Language Choice and ‘Practiced Language Policy’.....	20
1.2.4 Previous Work on Children’s Language Play and Language Learning.....	21
1.2.4.1 Language Play Defined.....	21
1.2.4.2 Language Play and Language Learning.....	23
1.2.4.3 Children’s Language Play and Second Language Learning.....	25
1.2.5 Summary.....	29
1.3 Focusing on BES’s RK Reception Classroom.....	31
1.4 Organization of the Thesis.....	32

CHAPTER 2: SOCIOLINGUISTIC CONTEXT

2.0 Introduction.....	34
2.1 International Schools around the World.....	35
2.1.1 The emergence of International schools around the World.....	35
2.1.2 Towards a Definition of International Schools.....	37
2.1.3 Educational Policies in International Schools: Choosing a Curriculum.....	43

2.1.4 Language in Education Policies in International Schools.....	47
2.1.4.1 ‘Medium of Instruction Policies’	47
2.1.4.2 Language Support Policies.....	49
2.1.5 Summary.....	51
2.2 BES: an International School in Greece.....	51
2.2.1 Educational Policy at BES: Curriculum and Pedagogical Approach Followed.....	53
2.2.2 Language-in-Education Policy at BES: Medium of Instruction and Language Support Policies.....	55
2.3 Reception at BES.....	57
2.3.1 The Profile of Reception Children and Educators.....	57
2.3.2 Educational Policy at BES’ Reception: The Foundation Stage Curriculum and Its Play-Based Approach to Learning.....	58
2.3.3 Language Policy at BES’ Reception: Promoting the Use of English at School.....	64
2.3.4 The RK Classroom.....	65
2.3.4.1 The RK Classroom Participants.....	65
2.3.4.2 A day at BES’s RK Classroom.....	67
2.4 From the Conflictual Situation Observed to the Research Questions Explored in This Study.....	68
2.5 Conclusion.....	70

CHAPTER 3: LANGUAGE POLICY: CONCEPT AND APPROACHES

3.0 Introduction.....	72
3.1 A Lack of Interest in Language Practices.....	73
3.1.1 The Traditional Approach to LP and LEP Research.....	73
3.1.2 The Critical Approach to LP and LEP Research.....	77
3.2 Language Practice versus Language Policy	83
3.2.1 The Anthropological and Sociological Approach to LP.....	83
3.2.2 The Interdisciplinary Approach to LP.....	87

3.3 Language Practice as Language Policy.....	92
3.4 Conclusion.....	94

CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH METHODS

4.0 Introduction.....	96
4.1 Background of the Research and Issues of Access.....	96
4.2 Nature of Data	101
4.3 Data Collection Methodology	102
4.3.1 Policy and Curriculum Documents.....	102
4.3.2 Observing RK Participants’ Interactions in the CPAs.....	102
4.3.3 Audio-Recordings	105
4.3.4 Semi-Structured Interviews.....	107
4.4 On Transcribing and Translating the Data.....	108
4.5 Ethical Considerations: Getting Informed Consent and Ensuring Anonymity...109	
4.6 Data Analysis.....	110
4.6.1 The Conversation Analytic Approach to Language Choice.....	113
4.6.2 Conversation Analysis, Bilingual Classroom Talk and Child-Child Bilingual Interaction.....	123
4.6.3 The Membership Categorization Analysis Approach to Language Choice.....	126
4.6.4 Membership Categorization Analysis, Bilingual Classroom Talk and Child-Child Bilingual Interaction	130
4.7 Conclusion.....	132

CHAPTER 5: NORMATIVE AND REPAIRABLE LANGUAGE CHOICE ACTS IN THE CPAs AS EVIDENCE OF THE THREE DIFFERENT MEDIA AVAILABLE IN RECEPTION

5.0 Introduction.....	134
5.1 On the Organization of Repair in Interaction.....	135
5.2 Greek Monolingual Medium Talk.....	138

5.3 English Monolingual Medium Talk.....	146
5.4 Bilingual Medium Talk.....	151
5.5 Conclusion.....	158

CHAPTER 6: FUNCTIONAL DEVIANCE AS FURTHER EVIDENCE OF THE GREEK MONOLINGUAL MEDIUM

6.0 Introduction.....	160
6.1 From the Notion of Hearer and Speaker to that of ‘Participation Framework’ and ‘Production Format’	161
6.2 Goffman’s Notion of Footing in the Study of Bilingual Conversation.....	163
6.3 Changing ‘Participation Frameworks’ in and through Language Choice.....	164
6.4 Changing ‘Production Formats’ in and through Language choice.....	173
6.5 Conclusion.....	188

CHAPTER 7: ‘MEDIUM REQUESTS’ AS FURTHER EVIDENCE OF THE ENGLISH MONOLINGUAL MEDIUM

7.0 Introduction.....	191
7.1 From Language Negotiation Sequences to Medium Requests.....	192
7.1.1 The Interactional Activity of ‘Medium Request’	192
7.1.2 Request Strategy Types and their Level of (In)directness.....	194
7.2 The Educators’ Strategies of Requesting the Use of English in the CPAs.....	196
7.2.1 ‘Formulating the Medium’: the Educators’ Direct Medium Request Strategy	197
7.2.2 The Educators’ Indirect Medium Request Strategies.....	204
7.2.3 On the Repair of Medium Request Strategies.....	213
7.3 The Kids’ Reactions to Educators’ Medium Requests.....	221
7.3.1 ‘Compliance’ with the Educators’ Medium Requests.....	221
7.3.2 Ritualistic ‘English please’	226
7.3.3 Interruption of Ongoing Activity.....	228
7.3.4 Ignoring the Educators’ Medium Requests.....	231
7.4 Conclusion.....	233

CHAPTER 8: DISCUSSION: KIDS' AND ADULTS' 'PRACTICED LANGUAGE POLICIES' IN RECEPTION

8.0 Introduction.....	238
8.1 Attending to the ' <i>Competence-Related Language Preference</i> ' of the Co-Participants.....	239
8.2 Attending to an ' <i>Institutionally-Assigned Language Preference</i> '	241
8.3 Attending to Conflicting Norms.....	246
8.4 Conclusion.....	248

CHAPTER 9: REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH AND ITS CONTRIBUTIONS

9.0 Introduction.....	251
9.1 Summary of Research Findings.....	251
9.2 Research Contributions.....	259
9.3 Directions for Further Work.....	263

REFERENCES	264
-------------------------	-----

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Interviews at BES.....	281
Appendix 2: Transcription Conventions.....	286
Appendix 3: Letters and Consent Forms Given to Members of Staff and Parents...289	
Appendix 4: Transcripts of Classroom Play Interaction.....	297
Appendix 5: The RK Participants' Linguistic Background.....	309

List of Tables

Table 1: The RK Preschoolers' Linguistic Background.....	66
--	----

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.0 Motivation for the Thesis and Aims of the Research

An International School in Greece (BES¹) that is overwhelmingly attended by Greek background children has adopted an English monolingual policy, including in Reception, aimed at promoting the use of English throughout school. At the same time, the school has adopted a child-centred, play-based approach to learning aimed at promoting children's autonomy and 'free interaction' in designated play areas referred to as 'Continuous Provision Areas'. That is, the aim of this pedagogical approach (followed in the school's Reception) is to promote learner's independence and, in this particular case, it could be interpreted as including the possibility of using Greek. As a result of these policies, a conflicting situation has emerged in the school's Reception. On the one hand, English needs to be promoted throughout school. On the other hand, free play/interaction could be conducted in Greek. That is, the conflict observed plays itself out at the level of language choice while Reception educators are faced with the conflicting demand of policing the use of English in the kids' play areas without however undermining children's autonomy and/or disrupting their 'free interaction'.

The feelings and views expressed by Reception educators at BES show that they are seriously concerned about how this conflicting situation can be approached. The aim of this thesis is to contribute to this issue of concern and have a local impact on the policies and practices followed in the school by providing a detailed description of how the school's conflicting policy demands are actually lived in the educators' and childrens' actual language choice practices in the play areas of their classroom. More specifically, the aim of this thesis is to contribute to this issue of concern from the applied Conversation Analytic perspective of "description-informed action" (Richards 2005). It is to a discussion of this 'perspective' that I am turning to in the next section

¹ For anonymity purposes the school in question will be referred to here as BES.

1.1 The Applied Conversation Analytic Perspective of 'Description-Informed Action'

There has recently been a trend of Conversation Analytic (CA) studies conducted with an applied aim in mind. More specifically, CA studies in various institutional settings (e.g. studies of second language acquisition in the classroom (Seedhouse 2004), on TV and radio news interviews (Clayman and Heritage 2002), on forms of counselling and interactions in medical settings (Heritage and Maynard 2006)) have been conducted with the aim of revealing “aspects of ‘professional practice’ which seem to have implications for practice and for training” (Drew 2005: xv). However, as Richards notes the possibility of using CA tools for the purposes of ““applied” research of various kinds” (Heritage 1999: 73) raises the issue of how far ‘applied CA’ research can go with regard to ‘application’, i.e. with regard to “training and development interventions”, so that this kind of research is consistent with the nature of CA² (Richards 2005: 2). With the purposes of developing a perspective that would be consistent with CA principles, Richards describes three different models. Firstly, he talks about the “Theory-Practice” model. Under this model, ‘applied research’ is seen as being subordinate to ‘pure research’ (ibid). It is precisely for that reason that Richards criticizes this first model. As he puts it, the problem with this model is that it implicitly promotes a hierarchical relationship between ‘applied’ and ‘pure’ research with applied research being seen as inferior to pure research (Richards 2005: 3). However “such a distinction has no validity in CA” (Schegloff et al 2002: 4) and indeed if a distinction is to be drawn between applied and pure CA research it needs to be drawn on the basis of whether the research is relevant or not “to training or professional development” (Richards 2005: 3). The second model discussed by Richards is the “Discovery-Prescription” model (ibid). According to this model, the researcher is expected based on his findings on certain aspects of social or professional behaviour to prescribe or proscribe “certain courses of action” (Richards 2005: 3-4). This second model is primarily criticized because of its “underlying assumption that it is possible to specify exactly what actors should do in particular circumstances” (Richards 2005: 4), i.e. because of its underlying assumption that it is

² Some key CA principles are discussed in Chapter 4, section 4.6.2. For more detailed introductions to CA see also Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998, Liddicoat 2007, Psathas 1995.

possible to come up with “simple recipes or rules of thumb” (ten Have 1999: 199). As Richards argues, such a model creates the impression that the “application of CA findings is essentially unproblematic” (Richards 2005: 5). Finally, the third model discussed is that of “Description-Informed action” (ibid). The advantage of this model is that it does not imply any distinction between pure and applied research and in this way it does not exclude the possibility that both types of research “might generate insights with the potential to transform practice” (ibid). As Richards points out this is in line with CA’s methodological orientation. Further this model’s emphasis on “informed practice” is important in two ways (ibid). Firstly, it allows CA to have “an enabling rather than enacting role in professional development” (ibid). Rather than prescribing action,

“by thinking in terms of raising awareness, directing attention, developing sensitivity, challenging assumptions, etc, CA can contribute to informed professional action, helping professionals to deepen their understanding and develop new competencies” (Richards 2005:6).

Secondly, the focus on informed professional practice allows an additional possibility; namely the possibility for CA to provide not only descriptions of professional practice but also of “processes of training and development that might be associated with these” (ibid).

Various studies conducted in institutional settings have adopted the applied CA perspective of “description-informed action” (Richards 2005) as it is described above and have used CA tools with the aim of raising awareness and challenging assumptions that are commonly held by professionals in these settings. For example, Gardner draws on CA tools to describe and compare how a parent and a speech therapist interact with a child suffering from a speech disorder (Gardner 2005). Gardner points out the differences in the turn types that emerge in parent-child and therapist-child talk. By providing a detailed description of interaction in these two different types of contexts (parent-child and therapist-child talk), Gardner highlights underlying assumptions and establishes a basis “for helping the lay therapist develop awareness and skills that will improve the quality of therapeutic engagement with the

child and so extend the latter's exposure to remedial intervention" (Richard 2005: 8). Patricia Cahill in her (2010) study draws on CA to examine child (patient) participation in paediatric encounters taking place among a health care worker, the child and her/his adult carer. In and through the detailed description of how child 'involvement' is accomplished in paediatric consultations, Cahill aims her findings to "be directly applicable to clinicians who may wish to examine their own behaviour in consultations, with a view to introducing factors that might be relevant to their interaction in paediatric consultations" (Cahill 2010: 130). In educational settings, researchers have used CA tools to provide detailed descriptions of 'what actually happens' (Seedhouse 2005) in the classroom and thus contribute to more informed teaching practices. For example Markee draws on CA to describe 'what actually happens' in one instance of "small group work" during which learners of English as a Second Language engage in off-task talk (Markee 2005: 212). By providing a detailed description of how learners accomplish off-task talk, Markee provides examples of how his findings could inform future teacher practices, i.e. he suggests that "an obvious lesson to be drawn from these off-task data is that teachers who use small group work should have reserve tasks up their sleeve in order to keep those students who finish earlier than others gainfully employed with on-task work" (Markee 2005: 212). At the same time, Markee highlights the value of CA for classroom and educational research (ibid). As he puts it "the use of CA ... techniques is a resource that can help language teaching professionals understand what happens in their classes, how it happens and why" (Markee 2005: 212). In other words, Markee stresses here CA's potential to inform teacher's future practices and to contribute to professional development. Similarly, in their recently published book entitled "Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy", Wong and Zhang Waring (2010) demonstrate how CA can enhance "teachers' pedagogical knowledge" and contribute to the transformation of instructional policies and interactional practices in the language classroom.

For the purposes of this thesis, the CA perspective of "description-informed action" (Richards 2005) as described above and as it has been employed in other classroom-oriented research (Markee 2005) is adopted. More specifically, by adopting this perspective and providing a detailed description of how the conflicting

situation that has emerged as a result of the school's policies is actually lived in the everyday language choice practices followed by participants attending one of the school's Reception classrooms, my aim is not to prescribe specific courses of action when it comes to the school's policies and practices. Instead, my aim is through the detailed description of 'what actually happens' (Seedhouse 2005) as a result of the school's policies to raise BES's administrators' and educators' awareness about the implications of their policies and practices and leave them to "make (their *own*) decisions regarding the continuation or modification" of those policies and practices (Heap, 1990: 47).

1.2 Basic Concepts and Issues

As already mentioned, this study involves an examination of how the conflicting situation that has emerged as a result of BES's policies (i.e. as a result of its English monolingual policy (aimed at promoting the use of English throughout school) and of its pedagogical approach to learning (aimed at promoting free interaction and learner autonomy)) is actually lived in the language choice practices followed by Reception participants in the play areas of the RK classroom. In other words, my study involves an exploration of how BES's conflicting policy demands are lived in the language choice practices followed by Reception classroom participants during both child-child interaction and child-adult interaction in the play areas. To address this issue, a specific conceptualization of: a) interaction in the play areas; b) 'language policy', c) bilingualism and language choice is needed. In the three following sections (1.2.1-1.2.3), I briefly touch on how each of these issues is approached in this study. Moreover, since on certain occasions during child-child interaction in the play areas, children are seen to engage in several linguistic practices that could be characterised as 'language play' (Cook 1997, 2000), I also discuss below (section 1.2.4) previous work on children's 'language play' that I will be drawing on in my analysis of Reception children's practices in the play areas.

1.2.1 Interaction in the Play Areas as Informal Classroom Talk

Since my study at BES's Reception involves an exploration of Reception participants' language choice conduct during play area interaction taking place both among children and between children and adults, the issue of how to approach play area talk, a type of talk that falls outside the traditional IRF structure of classroom talk, is raised. Various interaction-oriented studies have dealt with different types of talk that takes place outside the IRF structure, i.e. small-group booktalk exchanges (Eriksson 2002), children's peer group discussions taking place around a specific topic (Melander and Sahlström 2009), task-oriented peer group talk taking place among pupils (Cromdal 2003, 2005) and preschoolers' 'free play' activities (Bjök-Willén and Cromdal 2009), as being instances of informal classroom talk. Further, some of these studies have specifically focused on the bilingual organization of informal classroom talk (Cromdal 2003, 2005, Bjök-Willén and Cromdal 2009). This work is particularly interesting for the purposes of my study of language choice during play area talk at BES's Reception since it deals with informal classroom talk that takes place in two or more languages. More specifically, Cromdal (2005) describes how 4th grade pupils who attend an English medium school in Sweden use their two co-available languages (English and Swedish) in and during their collaborative work that involves producing a written report on the computer of their classroom. That is, he shows how pupils systematically use English to produce the text and Swedish for any other interactional purposes. Similarly, in another study, Cromdal (2003) describes how a group of Turkish-Danish 8th grade pupils have locally constructed a bilingual order that informs the project they are mutually engaged in, i.e. the project of producing an illustrated cartoon strip. In this case as well, one of the two available languages (Danish) is used exclusively to narrate the storyline of the cartoon and Turkish for all other functions. Finally, Bjök-Willén and Cromdal (2009) demonstrate how bilingual preschoolers in two different educational settings (i.e. in a Swedish and Australian setting) have organized the 'free play' activities they engage in bilingually (see also Chapter 4 for a more detailed discussion of these studies).

In sum, there is research conducted in classroom settings that deals with interaction that goes beyond the traditional teacher fronted classroom interaction and the IRF structure, i.e. there is research that focuses on (monolingual or bilingual) informal classroom talk that takes place either between pupils and teachers (Eriksson 2002) or among children (Björk-Willén and Cromdal 2009, Cromdal 2003, 2005, Melander and Sahlström 2009). Taking into consideration this previous research (that has treated teacher-pupil and pupil-pupil interaction outside the IRF structure as being an instance of informal classroom talk), I have evaluated each individual instance of play area talk that is included in this dissertation. Since the results of this evaluation have shown that play area talk in the cases examined here is closer to the type of talk that has been characterized as ‘informal classroom talk’ (ibid), in my work as well, child-child and child-adult interaction are taken to be instances of informal classroom talk, or to use Björk-Willén and Cromdal’s terms, they are taken to be instances of “less formalized classroom exchange(s)” (Björk-Willén and Cromdal 2009: 1494).

1.2.2 Language Policies as Practices: The Notion of ‘Practiced Language Policy’

As I have already pointed out, participants’ language choice practices are examined with a view to see how the conflicting situation that has emerged as a result of BES’s policies is actually lived in and during language choice conduct in the play areas. The examination of how specific language policies and language-in-education policies in particular translate into actual language choice practices in the classroom has been at the centre of language-in-education policy (LEP) research for years (see for example Lin 1996, Martin 2005, Skilton-Sylvester 2003). As I have noted elsewhere (Papageorgiou 2009a, 2009b), the major thrust of language-in-education policy implementation studies have examined actual language practices (followed in various educational settings around the world) against the backdrop of macro-(national) language-in-education policies. Namely, actual practices have been examined vis-à-

vis macro-state language-in-education policies in an attempt to get insights into the conflicts and tensions faced by classroom participants in language policy implementation. Thus, language practices observed in a given classroom setting have been interpreted with reference to given macro-policies. Consequently, language practices were seen as being something distinct from language policy while language policy making has been conceptualized as something that occurs only at the macro level. In another strand of research however, an alternative conceptualization of language policy and of the relationship between language policy and practice has been introduced. More specifically, in his (2004) language policy model, Spolsky has introduced an expanded view of language policy according to which 'language practices', "what people actually do", constitutes one component of language policy (Spolsky 2004: 14 and 39). Namely, Spolsky argued that there are also language policies in practices. As he has put it, language practices "constitute a policy to the extent that they are regular and predictable" (Spolsky 2007: 3). Further, he argued that in order to reveal a community's "real language policy", one needs to look not in documents but in "what people actually do" (Spolsky 2004: 14), i.e. one needs to observe their practices. That is to say, the real language policy of a community resides in its practices, hence the notion of "*practiced language policy*" (Papageorgiou 2009a, 2009b, Bonacina 2010). By following Spolsky's (2004) conceptualization of language policy, in this thesis, the language choice practices followed by RK classroom participants are examined with a view that these practices may constitute language policy in their own right. Namely, this thesis addresses the following 'so what' question: so what if Reception members' language choice practices are policies in their own right? Indeed my main claim is that Reception children's and adults' language choice practices are not random but informed by two different 'practiced language policies' that children and adults have developed and follow as a response to the conflicting demands imposed on them by the school's policies.

1.2.3 The Conversation Analytic Approach to Language Choice and ‘Practiced Language Policy’

As it has already been pointed out (Papageorgiou 2009b, Bonacina 2010), although Spolsky argued that language choice practices are interesting and important, he did not specify what methodological framework can be used in order to reveal ‘*practiced language policies*’. In other words, there is no specification in his language policy model of what methodological approach one can adopt in order to identify the ‘*practiced language policy*’ followed by a given community of speakers. This methodological problem can be addressed if one views ‘*practiced language policies*’ as interactional norms³ and adopts the ‘Conversation Analytic approach to Language Choice⁴’ to identify these norms (Papageorgiou 2009b, Bonacina 2010). In other words, this issue can be addressed by adopting a Conversation Analytic approach to ‘practiced language policies’ (ibid). Such an approach has been recently used by Bonacina (2010) in her investigation of the ‘practiced language policy’ of a Reception class for newly arrived immigrant children in France. In this thesis, I will follow this lead in my investigation of ‘practiced language policies’ at BES’s Reception classroom.

Apart from CA though, for the purposes of analyzing child-child talk in the CPAs, I will also be drawing on interactional sociolinguistics and more specifically on Goffman’s notion of footing (1981). Footing has been defined as the “alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance” (Goffman 1981: 25). Drawing on previous work that has brought together CA and interactional sociolinguistics (see for example Lytra 2003, Cromdal 2000), ‘footing’ will not be treated here as an analytically static feature but as something accomplished in and through the participants’ own work during interaction. Further, to analyse the various linguistic

³ The notion of ‘norm’ is used here in the Ethnomethodological sense. Namely, norms are those ‘schemes’ of interpretation (Garfinkel 1967) that participants use to interpret each other’s acts in interaction. For a more detailed discussion see Chapter 4.

⁴ And more specifically the overall order conversation analytic approach to language choice (Gafaranga 2000, 2001, 2007a, 2007b, 2009)

practices that Reception kids engage during their interaction in the CPAs, I will also be drawing on previous work on children's language play and language learning (Cook 1997, 2000, Bongartz and Schneider 2003, Aronsson and Cekaite 2005, Broner and Tarone 2001). It is to a discussion of this work that I am turning to in the next section.

1.2.4 Previous Work on Children's Language Play and Language Learning

Although playing with language is a common practice among children that are in the process of acquiring a second language, there is a dearth of research when it comes to children's language play and the impact it may have on second language learning. Exception to this dearth of research constitute a few studies (Peck 1980, Bongartz and Schneider 2003, Aronsson and Cekaite 2005, Broner and Tarone 2001) that have focused on the language play practices that second language learners engage in and on the way these practices may enhance the second language acquisition process. Since in my data there are instances where Reception kids are observed to engage in linguistic play, I briefly review here this previous research on language play and second language learning that I will be drawing on in my own analysis of the language play practices that Reception kids engage during their interaction in the CPAs.

1.2.4.1 Language Play Defined

Two different definitions of 'language play' have been offered and taken up in studies of children's language play. Considering 'language play' to be something that is primarily connected to "enjoyment and relaxation" (Cook 1997: 227), Cook has initially defined language play as play that has to do with two different aspects of the language system, i.e. play that concerns either the formal or the semantic level of

language (Cook 1997: 228). Play at the formal level involves playing with “sounds (or with letter shapes, though this is less common) to create patterns of rhyme, rhythm, assonance, consonance, alliteration, etc. and play with grammatical structures to create parallelisms and patterns” (ibid). Play at the semantic level involves playing with “units of meaning, combining them in ways which create worlds which do not exist: fictions” (ibid). Later on, in his (2000) seminal work on language play, Cook respecified the defining features of language play and apart from play at the formal and semantic level of language, he talked about playing with pragmatics. More specifically, he provided examples of the defining features of language play at each of the following three levels:

- a) linguistic form : patterning of forms, emphasis on exact wording, repetition;
- b) semantics: indeterminate meaning, vital or important subject-matter, reference to an alternative reality, inversion of language/reality relation;
- c) pragmatics: focus upon performance, use in congregation and/or intimate interaction, creation of solidarity and/or antagonism and competition, no direct usefulness, preservation or inversion of the social order, enjoyment and/or value (Cook 2000: 123).

It is important to point out here that according to Cook (1997), the primary function of language play is ludic, i.e. to have fun. On the other hand, drawing on Vygotsky (1978) and his approach to play, Lantolf (1997) has taken the primary function of children’s language play to be “exercise, or the rehearsal of target forms” (Broner and Tarone 2000: 366). Taking language play to be a serious exercise of forms that have not yet been mastered by learners, Lantolf sees language play as involving the following practices: “talking out loud to yourself (in Spanish), repeating phrases to yourself silently, making up sentences or words (in Spanish), imitating to yourself sounds (in Spanish)” (Lantolf 1997: 11). It is clear then that Cook’s and Lantolf’s conceptualisations of ‘language play’ are conflicting. Since for the purposes of analysing and accounting for the linguistic practices in which Reception kids regularly engage during their interaction in the CPAs, Cook’s definition is more relevant, it is Cook’s definition of language play that will be adopted in this study.

Accordingly, I review below studies of language play that have embraced Cook's definition of language play and have focused on the language play practices of second language learners and on the impact that these practices may have on second language acquisition. However, since most of these studies have been inspired by Cook's (2000) and Tarone's (2000) theoretical work on language play and language learning, I will first discuss the work of these scholars.

1.2.4.2 Language Play and Language Learning

By taking a critical stance towards the orthodoxies of contemporary language teaching and learning models, language play scholars such as Cook (2000) and Tarone (2000) have argued for the need to incorporate language play within models of language teaching and learning.

Cook (1997, 2000) for example has criticised some of the basic tenets of communicative language teaching (CLT) and suggested that the incorporation of "a play element in language learning" (Cook 2000: 150) is very important. More specifically, Cook criticised the CLT's assumption that only the focus on meaning is authentic and natural and that actual "language use and communication do not focus upon linguistic form" (Cook 2000: 189-190). It is precisely because of this assumption that form-focused activities including opportunities for language play are seen as having no place in the second language classroom (ibid). However, as Cook has claimed, indeed a good deal of form-focused language use including language play is also natural and authentic and the incorporation of language play to language teaching and learning is essential since "knowing a language, and being able to function in communities which use that language, entails being able to understand and produce play with it, making this ability a necessary part of advanced proficiency" (Cook 2000: 150).

Tarone (2000) has also talked about the importance of language play in the process of learning a second language. Drawing on Larsen-Freeman's (1997)

conceptualisation of language as a dynamic, complex non-linear system and Bakhtin's (1981) model of language which is characterised by a tension between centripetal (normalizing) forces and centrifugal forces of individual creativity, Tarone has proposed to view language play as "a manifestation of individual creativity and a part of the essential unpredictability of language use by individuals" (Tarone 2000: 35). She argues that although language is not necessary for second language acquisition (since even children who do not engage in it are successful second language learners) (Tarone 2000: 50), language play can be seen to contribute to second language acquisition in four ways. Firstly, since instances of language play are affectively charged, they make the forms being played with more memorable (Tarone 2000: 45). Secondly, the positive affect that is connected with language play might lower affective barriers and help learners cope with the anxiety inherent in the process of learning a second language which is according to Krashen (1981) an inhibiting factor in second language acquisition (Tarone 2000: 45). Thirdly, semantic language play and the creation of imaginative worlds accomplished through this kind of play may foster the acquisition of multiple second language registers (Tarone 2000: 46). Finally, the most important function that language play plays in the acquisition of a second language is that of destabilizing the learners' interlanguage system and thus pave the way to its development (Tarone 2000: 47-48). As Tarone explains, learners play with linguistic forms because they have noticed these forms. This noticing however does not necessarily involve only noticing and playing with correct L2 forms (Tarone 2000: 49). Language learners play with both correct and incorrect L2 forms and often engage in the creative production of multiple variations of L2 forms, introducing in this way more variability in their interlanguage system. If (following Larsen-Freeman (1997)) the interlanguage system is seen as "a complex system in which forces of creativity are essential" for its development, then language play with second language forms can be seen as very important for second language learning, since such play provides the creative force that is necessary for the development of L2 learners' interlanguage system.

Because of their suggestion that second language learning also takes place in and through language play, Cook's (1997; 2000) and Tarone's (2000) theoretical work has been referred to as the "ludic model(s) of language learning" (Broner and

Tarone 2001: 170; Cekaite and Aronsson 2005: 183). Further, their work has been taken up by a few researchers who engaged in an empirical investigation of children's language play and the contribution it may make to second language learning. It is to a review of these studies that I am turning to in the next section.

1.2.4.3 Children's Language Play and Second Language Learning

One of the earliest studies on children's language play and the impact it may have on second language acquisition is that conducted by Peck (1980). The aim of Peck's research was twofold: a) to describe instances of language play occurring during the interaction of a child who was in the process of acquiring English as a second language with a child who is a native speaker of English and b) to examine the influence that language play may have on the child's acquisition of a second language. For this purpose, he audio-recorded the children's naturally occurring playground interactions and identified play language sequences based on three criteria: a) the participants' nonliteral orientation (i.e. the participants' own playful attitude towards talk at hand) b) their intrinsic motivation (i.e. their engagement in language play just for the purposes of having fun) and c) "the rule-bound quality of the language" (i.e. children's attention to linguistic and social rules) (Peck 1980: 155-159). Children's nonliteral orientation manifested in the high pitch they adopted and their lack of concern for meaning was attested in two occasions in Peck's data. In these occasions, children engaged in repeating phrases by adopting higher and higher pitch each time. The positive feelings in those two instances evident in the children's laughter create an affectively charged and non-threatening atmosphere that may enhance according to Peck second language acquisition. Further, when it comes to intrinsic motivation, Peck identified two instances whereby children engaged in either cooperative or competitive sound play. In the first example that Peck provides, children engaged in cooperative sound play and compared the pronunciation of the word 'darn' with the name of one of their classmates (called Dong). In the second example discussed by Peck, children engaged in competitive sound play and

compared the word 'piece' with that of 'pizza'. According to Peck, instances of language play like these provide opportunities for practice while at the same time they promote phonological awareness. Finally, with regard to children's attention to linguistic and social rules, Peck provides several examples whereby children produced phonological, syntactic and lexical modifications of their co-participant's previous utterances inviting in this way relevant contributions from their interlocutors. Peck concludes that "it is impossible to prove that children "learn" through language play, but the practice opportunities and the children's intense feelings in language play may contribute to the acquisition of a second language" (Peck 1980: 163). Clearly, children's repetitions and modifications of each other's sounds and syntactic patterns provide them with phonological and syntactic practice (ibid). Further, as other language play researchers as well have argued (see for example Tarone 2000; Broner and Tarone 2001) children play with certain aspects of the language system because they have noticed these L2 forms. Since as Peck above argues through language play an affectively charged atmosphere is created, the L2 forms being played with get noticed and become more memorable.

Another language play study conducted this time in a classroom setting is the study carried out by Broner and Tarone (2001) in a fifth-grade Spanish immersion classroom in the United States. The researchers audio-recorded and analysed the on-task and off-task naturally occurring interactions of three children over a five-month period. Informed by Lantolf's (1997) and Cook's (2000) definitions of language play, they used five criteria (i.e. presence/absence of laughter, shifts in voice quality and pitch versus shifts in loudness/whispering, use of language forms that are well-known versus forms that are new; presence/absence of a fictional world of reference, and presence/ absence of an audience other than the self) in order to categorise the language play episodes present in their data into the two following types: a) language play as rehearsal and b) language play as fun (Broner and Tarone 2001: 367). With regard to examples of language play as fun, they discuss cases whereby children engaged in phonological, morphological and semantic play to create nonsense words and imaginary worlds of fiction (Broner and Tarone 2001: 370-372). Particularly when it came to the creation of imaginary situations, the kids were also shown to engage in practices of mixing the L2 and L1 (Broner and Tarone 2001: 369). Further,

the researchers present examples of language play that could be interpreted as being both fun and rehearsal (Broner and Tarone 2001: 372). Finally, drawing on Tarone's (2000) and Cook's (2000) theoretical work on language play, the researchers conclude that the 'language play for fun' practices observed in their data may enhance acquisition of the second language in three ways: a) by being "affectively charged", language play makes aspects of L2 discourse being played with "more noticeable and thus more memorable" (Broner and Tarone 2001: 375); b) the creation of fictional worlds in and through the use of L2 may assist learners in the acquisition of "more than one register of the L2" (ibid); c) the deviation from established L1 and L2 language norms in and through the construction of creative forms may lead to the destabilization of the interlanguage system and thus pave the way to its development (ibid).

Bongartz and Schneider (2003) have also examined the importance of language play in the acquisition of a second language. By conducting a year-long ethnographic study of two American boys who had recently arrived in Germany, they observed and audio-recorded the boy's naturally occurring interactions in a variety of different social contexts. With regard to the analysis of the data, each researcher focused on a different aspect of the boys' process of acquiring German. By using a cognitive-linguistic framework, Bongartz focused on the kids' grammatical development, while by using an interactionist framework, Schneider (who was also the mother of the two boys) focused on the kids' social and interactional behaviour (Bongartz and Schneider 2003: 13-14). During the preliminary analysis of the data, Schneider found out that the majority of the kids' social interactions included language play and went on to categorize these language play sequences according to the type of language play involved in each of them (Bongartz and Schneider 2003: 17-18). Overall they identified four types of language play present in their data: a) sound play that entailed "paralinguistic verbalizations, such as laughter, exaggerated intonations, and motor sounds" (Bongartz and Schneider 2003: 18); b) word play characterised by repetitions and the creation of invented words and rhymes and c) narratives that were usually co-operatively constructed and included some form of role play and d) insults and "tough guy talk" characterised by "negative, demeaning, or otherwise offensive language uttered at someone's expense" (Bongartz and

Schneider 2003: 21). Sound play allowed the children to keep their interactions going on whenever they lacked vocabulary items in German and to create nonsense words in German just for the “pure enjoyment of it” (Bongartz and Schneider 2003: 19). In and through word play, by mixing English and German morphemes to create non-existent words that suited their interactional purposes (for example they invented the word ‘*supergefrischene* (superefreshing)), their awareness of how German morphology works was raised (Bongartz and Schneider 2003: 20). Narratives and more specifically the stories that children co-constructed during role play helped the non-German speaking children build stronger ties with their German speaking peers while at the same time they allowed non-German speaking children to adopt leading roles in their role play activities with their German speaking peers (Bongartz and Schneider 2003: 21). Finally, insults and tough guy talk promoted solidarity between the non-German and German speaking children. For example, by making derogatory comments about Barbie, one of the younger children managed to enter his older peers’ conversation. The researchers conclude that although there is no evidence of a direct causal relationship between language play and second language learning, the learner-initiated focus on form that occurs during language play and the opportunities language play offers for practice of these forms may indirectly lead to second language acquisition (Bongartz and Schneider 2003: 21).

Another empirical study of children’s spontaneous language play and the contribution it may have on second language acquisition is the study conducted by Cekaite and Aronsson (2005) in the immersion classroom for refugee and immigrant children in a Swedish school. The researchers video-recorded the on-task and off-task interactions of children aged 7 to 10 years who were beginning learners of Swedish and had recently arrived in Sweden from various part of the world (Iraq, Lebanon, Thailand, Turkey) (Cekaite and Aronsson 2005: 173). In order to identify language play sequences in the children’s joking events, the researchers adopted an emic perspective and accordingly coded a piece of talk as an instance of language play based on the children’s own orientation to it as funny, i.e. based on the children’s own laughing reactions. Three types of language play were present in the data: a) mislabelling which involved phonological and morphological play; b) subversion that entailed semantic language play and c) rudimentary puns that

involved semantic-syntactic language play. In their mislabelling, children violated phonological and morphological rules and these violations very often resulted in “collaborative sequences of other-repair” (Cekaite and Aronsson 2005: 179). For example, when one of the children produces an intentional mislabelling during a Memory game, his mislabelling is corrected by one of his co-participants (*ibid*). The researchers argue that in this way “mislabelling can be seen to trigger a peer-run ‘language lesson’” while at the same time it promotes metalinguistic awareness by drawing attention to acceptable forms (*ibid*). In and through semantic play, children attempted to subvert gender hierarchies (for example by intentionally referring to one of the female participants’ as ‘du pojke’ (you boy)). Similarly to phonological and morphological play, this kind of semantic play led to both “real repairs and joking repairs” (Cekaite and Aronsson 2005: 182) and to “informal language lessons” (Cekaite and Aronsson 2005: 183). Finally, the children were shown to create puns by exploiting semantic and syntactic ambiguity and by playing with homophones and homonyms. These instances offered opportunities for the “exploration of the relation between language meaning and form” (Cekaite and Aronsson 2005: 187). Cekaite and Aronsson conclude that the types of language play present in their data can be seen as promoting second language acquisition by: a) drawing learners’ attention to form; b) creating “possibilities for language practice”; c) offering opportunities for peer run “informal ‘language lessons’” and repair work which may generate opportunities for what Swain (2000) has termed “pushed output” (Cekaite and Aronsson 2005: 188). Swain’s notion of “pushed output” refers to idea of the learner himself being pushed towards the delivery of a message that is not only conveyed, but that is conveyed precisely, coherently and thereby appropriately (Swain 1985: 248-249). In and through this ‘pushing’ that occurred in and through the language play present in their data, the researchers further argue that the children displayed their L2 skills and competence as well as their “concern for L2 form and accuracy” (Cekaite and Aronsson 2005: 188).

In sum, the results of previous research on children’s language play indicate that language play in L2 may provide notice on form opportunities, lead on to “peer run language lessons” (Broner and Tarone 2001), and enhance the acquisition of L2

registers while at the same time playing with language is a marker of children's proficiency and of their growing "multicompetence" (Cook 1992).

1.2.5 Summary

To summarise, for the purposes of this thesis, taking into consideration previous research on various types of informal classroom talk, I have evaluated each individual instance of naturally occurring play area talk (included in this dissertation) and decided to treat both child-child and child-adult interaction in the play areas of the Reception classroom as an instance of informal classroom talk. Moreover, inspired by Spolsky's (2004) alternative language policy framework a view of language policy as something that resides and can be revealed in people's actual language practices (hence the notion of 'practiced language policy') is adopted. Further, with the aim of identifying any 'practiced language policies' (interactional norms) that may underly the language choice behaviour of BES's Reception classroom participants in and during their play area interaction, the study draws on the Conversation Analytic approach to language choice (Auer 1984, Gafaranga 2000, 2001, 2005, 2007a, 2007b, 2009). Previous research has shown that such a CA approach can be helpful towards discovering policies, namely 'practiced language policies', in actual practices (Bonacina 2010). Finally, for the purposes of analysing language choice and interactional behaviour in the CPAs, the study brings together CA and interactional sociolinguistics⁵ (and more specifically Goffman's work (1981) on 'footing') while at the same time it draws on previous work on children's language play (Bongartz and Schneider 2003, Aronsson and Cekaite 2005, Broner and Tarone 2001). It needs to be stressed though that with the focus of the thesis being on language choice during interaction in the CPAs (see chapter 2), the language play aspect is taken into consideration here but it is not explored in any depth in this thesis; it is only briefly discussed where relevant.

⁵ Previous studies on child-child talk in bilingual settings have successfully combined those two approaches (Lytra 2003, Cromdal 2000).

1.3 Focusing on BES' RK Reception Classroom

While during my preliminary fieldwork at BES I conducted observations in all three classrooms at BES' Reception, I decided to focus on one particular classroom (referred to here as the RK classroom) since the majority of children (22 out of 25 pupils) in this particular classroom were of Greek linguistic background. This homogeneity in the RK population resulted in a bilingual classroom environment in the sense that children shared the same mother tongue and had access to two different languages, i.e. English and Greek, and they could in theory at least draw on those two co-available languages during their interaction in the play areas. Thus, the conflict observed at BES's Reception (English-only versus free interaction could be conducted in the children's own language(s)) was more salient in this particular classroom; hence, my decision to base my exploration of how the school's conflicting demands are lived during interaction in the play areas in the RK classroom.

With the aim of exploring how the conflicting situation observed at BES's Reception is actually lived during interaction in the play areas of the RK classroom, I address three research questions in this study: a) How do RK Reception children respond to the conflicting situation imposed on them by the school's language policy and its pedagogical approach?; b) How do RK school personnel respond to children's actions resulting from the conflicting situation observed in Reception? and c) How do children themselves react to educators' own actions? Drawing on CA to explore the language choice practices and practiced language policies followed at BES's RK classroom, I demonstrate that RK children and adults have responded to the conflicting demands imposed on them by the school's policies in different ways; i.e. by developing and following two different 'practiced language policies'. That is, I show that adults have responded to the conflicting demands by attending to a 'practiced language policy' that is in line with the "declared" (Shohamy 2006) language policy of the school, i.e. they have prioritised English at the expense of learner autonomy. On the other hand, as I demonstrate, children have developed and follow an alternative 'practiced language policy' that does not depend on the

school's language policy but on their interlocutor's 'competence-related language preference'. In turn, this policy allows children to attend to the pedagogical approach (learner autonomy and free interaction).

1.4 Organization of the Thesis

Having talked about the main aim of this thesis and having briefly described the main perspective adopted and the frameworks I will be drawing on to address this aim, I now proceed with an overview of the organisation of the thesis.

Chapter 2 provides a detailed description of the context of the study. Since the preschool classroom under investigation is part of an International School in Greece (BES), I first talk about international schools around the world and about the educational and language policies followed in these schools and then move on to the target international school in Athens and offer an account of the distinct features of the school and of its language and educational policy. Next, I focus on the specific (Reception) preschool classroom I studied; I provide a detailed description of the organization of educational practice at BES's Reception, and then move on to issues and concerns that emerge from this setting. On the basis of these issues, I then formulate the research questions explored in this study.

Chapter 3 offers a review of the language policy literature and describes the major language policy (LP) and language-in-education policy (LEP) approaches that have emerged throughout the history of the LP and LEP field. In tracing the development of different LP approaches, the chapter presents the different foci and the different conceptualisations of the relationship between language policy and practice that have been offered within each approach while it introduces the major conceptual framework that will be adopted in this study to address the issues under investigation.

Chapter 4 presents the types of data used in this study and the data collection methodology that has been followed in order to collect each of these types of data. It also provides a detailed account of the methodological framework (the Conversation Analytic approach and the Membership Categorisation Analysis approach to language choice) adopted in order to analyse these data and thus address the issues investigated in this thesis.

Chapter 5 investigates how children respond to the conflicting situation imposed on them by their school's policies, i.e. it examines how BES's conflicting policy demands are lived in Reception childrens' actual language choice practices during their peer interaction. More specifically, drawing on Gafaranga's notion of "medium" (Gafaranga 2000b; 2007a) and by examining how kids orient to each other's language choice acts in and during their interaction in the CPAs, the chapter shows that there are three different media available in the Reception play areas, i.e. participants may adopt a Greek monolingual, an English monolingual or a bilingual medium.

Chapter 6 goes on with the investigation of 'what actually happens' in terms of language choice during child-child interaction in the play areas by focusing on cases where the kids use English and orient to each other's use of English as an instance of functional deviance. Drawing on Goffman's notion of "footing" (Goffman 1981), the chapter shows how children systematically use and orient to the use of English as accomplishing a shift in 'footing', i.e. as serving a particular interactional purpose. This use of English and the kids' systematic orientation to it as being functionally motivated provides further evidence for the kids' orientation to a Greek monolingual medium during peer group interaction in the CPAs.

Chapter 7 shifts the focus onto how adult school members respond to children's actions that have resulted from the conflicting situation observed in Reception. The

chapter examines a specific interactional practice which, following Gafaranga (2010) is referred to as “medium request” and whereby adult participants intervene in the play areas and request children to medium-switch from Greek and use English. As I argue, these medium request practices provide further evidence for the Reception participants’ attendance to an English monolingual medium in the Reception CPAs. Further, in this chapter, I examine the various ways in which children react to adult school members’ actions in the play areas and show how the imposition of English attempted by Reception adults is oriented to by children as a disruption.

Chapter 8 discusses the research results of the previous chapters (chapters 5-7) in view of the interactional norms that underlie the participants various ‘medium-related’ practices. Drawing on the MCA approach to language choice (Gafaranga 2001, 2005) and Auer’s (1998) notion of language preference, I argue that the various language choice practices that Reception participants were shown to engage in the previous Chapters (Chapters 5-7) are not random but organized around two different interactional norms. Further, insofar as (I demonstrate that) child-child interaction is approached from two different perspectives, i.e. insofar as kids’ and adults’ language choice acts are informed by two different ‘schemes of interpretation’ (Garfinkel 1967), I speak of two different ‘practiced language policies’ being followed in the target Reception classroom. That is, the adults’ policy of attending at all times to a language preference that is ‘institutionally-assigned’ and the kids’ own policy that consists of attending to a language preference that is ‘competence-related’.

Chapter 9 reviews the key findings of the thesis, identifies its contributions and suggests directions for future work.

Chapter Two: Sociolinguistic Context

2.0 Introduction

In this chapter, I provide a detailed description of the preschool setting that constitutes the context of my study. Since my research focuses on a preschool classroom (referred to here as the RK Reception Classroom) that is part of an international school, I first talk about international schools around the world (sections 2.1.1-2.1.2) and about the educational and language policies followed in these schools (sections 2.1.3-2.1.4). In the following section (2.2), I proceed with an account of the specific International school setting in Greece (referred to here as BES) with the purpose of: a) foregrounding distinct features of the school and b) presenting its language and educational policy (sections 2.2.1-2.2.2). In the next section (2.3), I talk about BES's Reception and the profile of its participants (2.3.1). Further, I present the specific language and educational programme developed by BES in order to cater for the needs of its preschoolers (2.3.2-2.3.3). Next, I proceed with the RK Reception classroom (2.3.4), provide a description of the linguistic and cultural identity of its participants (2.3.4.1) and demonstrate what a typical day in this classroom is like (2.3.4.2). Finally, I look at issues and concerns that emerge from BES's preschool setting and that will constitute the focus of my research (section 2.4).

2.1 International Schools around the World

2.1.1 The emergence of International schools around the World

The first decades of the 20th Century and mainly the period after the Second World War have been characterised by the emergence of a mobile working force consisting of professionals that took up posts in prestigious international organisations or

companies outside their home countries and who had to be on the move for most part of their careers. It was mainly in order to cater for the educational needs of the children of these professionals that the first International Schools were founded. Students attending these schools have been characterised as “Third Culture Kids” (Useem 1976) or as “global nomads” (McCaig 1992) who follow their parents’ careers around the world and who are “neither a product of the culture of the country in which they are studying nor of the country of their legal nationality, because for most of their lives they have lived in a variety of alien settings” (European Council of International Schools, 1993: xiii). As Hayden and Thompson note, the first international schools were created on “a relatively ad hoc basis” (Hayden and Thompson 1995a: 332) in order to respond to the immediate educational needs of these multicultural and multilingual student populations that were characterised by constant movement. Similarly, Belle-Isle has argued that the original mission of international schools “was to respond to the need of a growing number of mobile students for a pedagogical programme and diploma which would enable them to continue their studies in schools in other parts of the world or be easily re-integrated into their own national systems on returning home” (Belle-Isle 1986: 27) One such school, which claims to be the first International School, was established in Geneva in 1924 (Hill 2002: 21).

Nowadays, the network of international schools has expanded to such an extent that, according to the International School Consultancy (ISC) (in co-operation with the Council of International Schools), there are 4104 international schools in 186 countries (ISC in Gallagher 2008: 29). Further, although, as already mentioned, the first international schools were founded with the purpose of educating the children of mobile families, i.e. the children of expatriate parents, nowadays the student populations of most international schools also include: a) host country national students whose parents may see their kids’ attendance of an International School “as an investment for the future⁶” and b) “repatriated host country nationals who, having been educated for a period outside their own national education system,

⁶ Quite possibly because of the English medium offered (see Murphy 2003 but also section 2.1.4 below).

find an international school in their home country more appropriate than attempting to fit back into the national system” (Hayden 2006: 39-40).

Educational professionals and administrators working for international schools also constitute a mobile body⁷ and have early enough expressed their need to come together in order to share concerns, experience and expertise. As a result, professional organisations such as the European Council of International Schools (ECIS), the Council of International Schools (CIS) and the International Schools Association (ISA) were founded. These professional organisations provide accreditation, advice on curriculum development and teacher training but above all they make all the professionals in international schools feel they are part of a community which has to deal with the same challenges i.e. those involved in educating a multicultural and multilingual student body.

2.1.2 Towards a Definition of ‘International Schools’

The 1964 edition of the world Year Book of Education proposes the existence of a new concept, ‘international schools’, founded with the specific purpose of furthering international education (Jonietz and Harris 1991:x). This can be seen as the first attempt to define what an ‘international school’ is. However, since then, many other researchers (Leach (1969), Terwilliger (1972), Pönisch (1987) and Matthews (1989)) working within the field of international education have attempted to define which of the schools that include or do not include the term ‘international’ in their title can actually be considered to be ‘international’.

Leach (1969) has identified four different types of ‘international schools’ and has therefore suggested that the term ‘international’ may be applied to refer to any of the following categories of schools:

- a) Schools “serving or being composed of students from several nationalities” (Leach 1969: 7). However, as he himself notes, this is a rather confusing

⁷ For detailed discussion of this see Hayden (2006), Chapters 6 and 7.

definition if one takes into account that “practically every school in such a cosmopolitan centre as London and New York includes a number of nationalities in its student body” (ibid)

- b) ‘Overseas schools’ whose purpose is to serve the educational needs of an expatriate community. This category would include schools such as the British International, the French International and any other schools “devoted to preparing their students for rapid integration into the life of the nation of origin at whatever point their clientele goes home” (Leach 1969: 9).
- c) Schools “founded by joint action of two or more governments or national groupings” such as the binational schools of Latin America and the John F. Kennedy School in Berlin (ibid).
- d) Schools that “belong to the International Schools Association (ISA), or could do so” (Leach 1969: 10). In this case as well, as Leach himself notices the boundaries of the category in question are blurred since ISA would at that time “accept for membership schools moving toward its criteria but not clearly already there” (ibid).

In a similar vein, by taking into consideration what Fox (1985) has called ‘realistic’ and ‘idealistic’ features, Sanderson (1981) conceptualised international schools as being any of the following seven types:

- a) Schools that have “consistently tried to develop and practice a distinctive form of international education” and have therefore adopted the International Baccalaureate (IB) programme⁸ (examples of such schools are the United Nations International School in New York, the International School of London and the International School of Vienna);
- b) Schools that do not offer the IB but which “claim to be international because their students come from many countries”;
- c) Schools founded to serve expatriate communities (i.e. overseas schools) and that follow educational programmes that are firmly rooted in the educational

⁸ For a more detailed discussion of the IB programme see section 2.1.3 below.

system of a specific country, although their students may come from many different countries;

- d) Schools founded to serve expatriate communities that may be influenced in their programmes by a particular national tradition but may have also tried to espouse a more international perspective just by “adopting the IB”;
- e) Regional or bi-national schools that aim to cater for the needs of children whose parents work for European Community Institutions;
- f) Schools based on two different educational traditions (although their student populations may include children of more than two nationalities);
- g) “Internationally-minded schools which have traditionally welcomed foreign pupils and attempted to create an international dimension within the school” (Sanderson 1981)

Building on and including in her own classification the types of international schools identified by Leach (1969) and Sanderson (1981), Pönisch (1987) talked about 11 types of international schools that further include:

- Schools that are IB oriented at different degrees;
- Schools that serve “a voluntary mobile body” (Pönisch 1987).

However, these categorisations of international schools and the attempt to define them by identifying different types of schools has been seriously questioned by other scholars working within the field of international education. As Hayden and Thompson claim “in a diverse and constantly changing context, the number and nature of categories into which international schools can be subdivided is to some extent arbitrary, with categories less likely to be discrete groupings than broad areas which may often overlap” (Hayden and Thompson 1995a: 335). Others like Belle-Isle (1986) have argued that certain types of schools included in the classifications of international schools offered by Leach (1969), Sanderson (1981) and Pönisch (1987) should not actually be considered as being international. As Belle-Isle puts it

“those schools (are not) international which, despite their names and overseas locations, have remained closely related to their national systems through their curricula and programmes. A school cannot claim the status of an international institution of learning simply because seventy or eighty per cent of its clientele represent a variety of nationalities, races and cultures while the curriculum and the programme meet the needs of the remaining twenty or thirty per cent” (Belle-Isle 1986: 28).

Thus, Belle-Isle implies that a stricter definition of ‘international schools’ is needed. On the other hand, other scholars like Gellar (1993) have embraced a much more liberal definition. She has argued that an international school is any school that works towards “building multicultural understanding” (Gellar 1993: 6) i.e. that works towards an understanding “that cooperation, not competition, is the only viable way to solve the major problems facing the planet, all of which transcend ethnic and political borders” (ibid). In this respect, any school can be international (ibid).

In his own attempt to clarify the concept of ‘international schools’, instead of providing another list of different types of ‘international’ schools, Terwilliger (1972) has identified four requisites that any school that would like to be called ‘international’ needs to have. These are:

- a) “The enrolment of a significant number of students who are not citizens of the country in which the school is located”;
- b) A board of directors consisting of “foreigners and nationals in roughly the same proportions as the student body being served”;
- c) Members of teaching staff that have themselves “experienced a period of cultural adaptation”;
- d) A curriculum that is “a distillation of the best content and the most effective instructional practices of each of the national systems” represented in the student body so that it allows students to move easily to other international schools or to return to their own national schools in their home country in case their parents decide to return there (Terwilliger 1972: 360-361).

Although Terwilliger refrained from providing another classification of international schools, his attempt to provide a list of the defining characteristics of these schools has also been criticised. Matthews argued that any attempt to draw generalisations about international schools is “likely to produce little that is worthwhile, given the variety of the institutions which describe themselves by that umbrella ‘term’” (Matthews 1989:12). Instead of talking about the defining features of international schools, by focusing on the ethos and the educational philosophy of international schools, Matthews proposed a distinction between two different types of schools, namely: a) “ideology-driven schools” whose purpose is to “further international understanding and cooperation” and b) “market-driven schools” founded with the purpose of serving the needs of certain expatriate communities (ibid). Similarly, Haywood (2002) talked about two types of international schools, namely those with a “pragmatic rationale that view the community they serve as the defining factor” and those with “a visionary ideal of offering students an experience that will help to promote a world view based on cross-cultural understanding” (Haywood 2002: 171). What is problematic though with such dichotomies is that they promote thinking in binary terms so that they miss the fact that certain schools “which are market driven may ...also be underpinned by a sound ideological philosophy” (Hayden and Thompson 1995a: 337; see also Hayden 2006: 16-17). An example of such a school is, as Hayden and Thompson note, the International School of Geneva which was founded, on the one hand, in order to cater for the needs of a multinational student body whose families were based in Geneva and on the other, in order to help children “appreciate their own diversity so they can...create a better world” (International School of Geneva 1994 cited in Hayden and Thompson 1995a: 337). Therefore, as Hayden suggests, it would be more productive to think of international school types in terms of a continuum “with the ideological at one end and the market-driven at the other” (Hayden 2006: 17).

Finally, in considering the ideological dimension of international schools and the nature of the educational experience they may offer, Gellar suggested that international schools may be defined in terms not of the curriculum they follow but in terms of “what takes place in the minds of children of other cultures and backgrounds” (Gellar 1993: 6). She conceptualised international schools as those

educational institutions where children are “experiencing togetherness with different and unique individuals; not just toleration, but the enjoyment of differences; differences of colour, dress, belief, perspective” (ibid). Further, she concluded that international schools are those that contribute to the “building of bridges, not walls” (ibid).

With Gellar’s definition we have therefore moved towards a definition of international schools that is based on what is referred to in the international education literature as ‘international-mindedness’⁹ (see Hill 2000; 2002; Skelton 2002: 40; Ellis 2006), “worldmindedness” (Sampson and Smith 1957) or “international attitude” (Hayden and Thompson 1995b). Gellar seems to suggest that what matters is not so much the formal characteristics of a school but the type of educational experience offered and whether this contributes or not to the formation of an ‘international attitude’.

Research¹⁰ conducted at the University of Bath (Center for the Study of Education in an International Context) has shown that both pupils and educators believe that the development of an ‘international attitude’ and of international understanding in relation to other people’s cultural and language identity has more to do with the informal dimensions of schooling, the actual interactions that take place among pupils, teachers and parents in a particular school setting, rather than with the formal aspects of schooling, i.e. the Curriculum adopted (Hayden and Thompson 1995a; 1995b; Hayden and Wong 1997). As the University of Bath’s researchers suggest, educational experiences that promote an international attitude can be offered both by schools that call themselves ‘international’ as well as by national schools, while the title ‘international’ in a school’s name does not necessarily mean that the

⁹ Hill (2002) talks about ‘international-mindedness’ and how the concept came into being through a Conference of Internationally-minded Schools (CIS) organised in 1951 with the support of UNESCO. The purpose of this Conference, that later on led to the formation of the International School Association (ISA), was to bring together schools that aim at ‘international mindedness i.e. that “consciously aim at furthering world peace and international understanding through education” (Conference of Principals of International Schools and Schools Specifically Interested in Developing International Understanding (1951) cited in Hill 2002: 22). Further, Skelton argues that the concept of ‘international-mindedness’ is akin to the UNESCO declaration of 1996 that “identifies issues such as a sense of universal values, valuing freedom, intercultural understanding, non-violent conflict resolution and so on” (Skelton 2002: 40).

¹⁰ This type of research has been based on data collected through questionnaires and interviews with pupils and educators.

school offers international education, i.e. that it offers educational experiences and types of interactions that will help the pupils develop an ‘international attitude’ (ibid).

Being informed by the findings of this research, and in order to make it clear that international schools, just like national schools, should not be confused with international programmes and national programmes respectively, Hill (2006a) talked about four combinations of schools/programmes:

- a) national school abroad and national programme of home country;
- b) national school in home country and international programme;
- c) international school and international programme;
- d) international school and national programme of one or more countries (and perhaps the host country) (Hill 2006a).

In summary, it is apparent that the issue of what types of educational institutions can be referred to as ‘international schools’ has been at the centre of theoretical discussions and research with several international education researchers proposing different defining criteria. Since the school I have been working with calls itself ‘international’ based on the diversity of its student population (as will see in section 2.2 below), in this thesis, the term ‘international school’ (and any reference to BES as an international school) will be taken to be synonymous with a school that is attended by students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

2.1.3 Educational Policies in International Schools: Choosing a Curriculum

The section above has highlighted the difficulties in defining ‘international schools’ from outside as it were. In this section, I move on to a description of what goes on inside those schools, i.e. I talk about the organisation of educational practice in these

schools. More specifically in this section, I first discuss Curriculum choices (educational policy) available in the international school context and then (in section 2.1.4) move on to the issue of language policy which as I show below is indissolubly linked with educational policy decisions.

In designing and reaching decisions about the Curriculum and the educational policy to be followed, most International schools have to deal with the competing tensions involved in educating students of diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds and in fulfilling the requirements and expectations of their accreditation agencies. These tensions have to do with respecting, on the one hand, the linguistic and cultural capital of students and promoting on the other the learning of the language of the curriculum that is usually a second/foreign language for most of the students. However, as Cummins (2007) notes, compared to state schools, international schools have more freedom when it comes to decisions that concern their profile and their educational philosophy. As he puts it “most International schools have considerable autonomy and are not tied to hierarchical chains of command to the same extent as public (i.e. state) schools in particular jurisdictions. Thus, the potential for imaginative instructional innovation in International schools is immense” (Cummins 2007: ix). In practice, this means that although national schools in most cases simply implement Curricula and Language policies that have already been decided by a given government, in the case of international schools, schools themselves develop the educational and language policy to be followed.

With regard to developing and/or choosing the Curriculum to be adopted, as Hayden (2006) notes this may turn out to be a complicated matter. Following Lawton’s definition of ‘curriculum’ as ‘a selection of the culture of a society’ (Lawton 1989), Hayden argues that the issue of which curriculum to follow in an international school context is very complex as it leads to the following questions: “From which society’s culture(s) is an international school to select? What sort of society or culture is the school aiming to promote?” (Hayden 2006: 131). According to Thompson (2001), international schools around the world have responded to the dilemmas involved in devising curricula in four different ways. These are:

a) Exportation: the marketing abroad of existing national curricula and examinations with little or no effort to adjust the curriculum to the educational context in which it is applied. In practice this means that “the value system is unapologetically that of the national country from which it is exported” (Thompson 2001: 278-279). As Thompson notes, in this case, the Curriculum can be seen as ‘international’ only in the sense that “it is used in a geographically dispersed market” (Thompson 2001: 279). There are many examples of curricula mainly from Germany, France, the UK and the US that have been exported for the purposes of educating pupils in international schools around the world (Hayden 2006: 133).

b) Adaptation: existing national curricula being adapted in order to respond to the needs of a given educational context. In this case, although the local contextual features are taken into consideration in the process of adaptation, the ‘inherent value system’ is not likely to go through any changes resulting in this way, as Thompson puts it, in an “unwitting process of educational imperialism” (Thompson 2001: 279). Examples of national curricula that have been adapted for the purposes of educating pupils attending an international school include the International General Certificate of Secondary Education (IGCSE) (it involved the adaptation of the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) followed in the UK) (Thompson 2001:279), the French Baccalaureate Option Internationale and the Advanced Placement (AP) International Diploma (it involved the adaptation of the AP programme followed in the USA) (Hayden 2006: 133-134).

c) Integration: ‘best practices’ from a range of ‘successful’ curricula are brought together to form a curriculum that may be operated across a number of systems or countries. This very often involves dealing with “quite different, and often inconsistent, values or ideological positions” inherent in each of the ‘successful’ curricula that are brought together (Thompson 2001: 279). The most famous example under this category is one of the most widely implemented Curricula in international schools around the world i.e. the International Baccalaureate (IB) Diploma Programme¹¹. As Thompson notes the IB programme in

¹¹ As Hill (2002) notes the IB Diploma programme was developed for the following ideological, utilitarian and pedagogical reasons:

its earlier days¹² (its formulation started in 1958) involved some form of integration since experts from many different countries were asked to provide examples of ‘good practice’ from their own national systems (ibid). These examples then constituted the basis of the IB Diploma Programme (ibid) which is now offered in both national and international schools in three different languages (English, French and Spanish) “in which all materials are produced and all assessment examinations may be undertaken” (Hayden 2006: 135).

d) Creation: in this case a programme is developed ‘from first principles’ (Thompson 2001: 280). As Hayden (2006) notes most of the programmes followed in international schools would come under this category (Hayden 2006: 135). However, as she argues “no programme can ever be considered to have been created entirely *de novo*”, since people involved in its development will inevitably be influenced by other systems and will be drawing on their own previous educational experiences (Hayden 2006: 135, emphasis in the original). Examples of curricula under this category include the IB Middle Years Programme¹³ (IBMYP) and the IB Primary Years Programme¹⁴ (IBPYP) (Thompson 2001: 280).

Apart from choosing a curriculum, another important decision concerns the pedagogical approach to teaching and learning to be followed. According to Gallagher (2008), like in any other school, in international schools as well, there are three options available. Schools may follow :a) Traditional Pedagogy, i.e. “a form of banking or empty vessel education” or elsewhere referred to as “the transmission model of education”; b) Progressive Pedagogy, i.e. a child-centred approach in which educational practice is permeated by the belief that “education is not simply a matter of receiving information but rather a means of intelligent inquiry and thought” and c)

-
- a) to promote international understanding, prepare students for world citizenship and promote peace
 - b) to provide a diploma that would allow students to enter universities in different parts of the world
 - c) “to promote critical thinking skills via a balanced programme in the humanities, the experimental sciences and experiential learning” (Hill 2002: 20).

¹² For a detailed discussion of the development of the IB Diploma Programme see Peterson (2003) and Hill (2002; 2006b).

¹³ This was initially developed by the International Schools Association (ISA) and was then taken over by the International Baccalaureate Organisation in 1992 (Elwood 1999: 35).

¹⁴ This was initially created by the International Schools Curriculum Project (ISCP) with the International Baccalaureate Organisation taking over the programme in 1997 (Hayden 2006: 135).

Transformative Pedagogy which uses “Critical Inquiry to enable students to analyse and understand the social realities of their own lives and of their communities” (Gallagher 2008: 13-14).

As the next section shows, educational policy issues, and particularly the issue of which process (exportation, adaptation, integration or creation) and as a result of it which Curriculum will be followed in a particular international school are indissolubly linked with language-in-education policy issues. These issues and the way international schools have dealt with them are examined in the next section.

2.1.4 Language-in-Education Policies in International Schools

Apart from choosing a curriculum, international schools are also faced with important language-in-education policy decisions. As we will see in this section, these decisions are centred around two major issues: a) what medium/media of instruction will be adopted and b) what language support if any will be provided to students whose mother tongue is different from the language adopted as the medium of instruction (see also Murphy 2003). Each of these issues and the way international schools have dealt with them is discussed in the two following sections (i.e. in 2.1.4.1 and 2.1.4.2 respectively).

2.1.4.1 ‘Medium of Instruction Policies’

Based on the ‘medium of instruction policy’ adopted one can talk about three different types of international schools: a) English monolingual international schools; b) non-English monolingual international schools and c) bilingual international schools. Each of these types of schools is described in turn below.

The majority of International schools around the world fall within the first type of school since they offer English-medium education, i.e. the majority of schools are '*English monolingual international schools*' that cater for the needs of both native and non-native speakers of English. More specifically, the International School Consultancy (ISC) (in co-operation with the Council of International Schools) talks about the existence of 4104 international schools in 186 countries with 3548 of them being English-medium schools (ISC in Gallagher 2008: 29). To give just two examples of this first type of school, the International School of London and the Vienna International School have adopted English as the sole medium of instruction.

If parental expectations (at least as these have been portrayed in research) are taken into consideration the fact that most international schools have opted for an English-medium programme is not surprising. Research conducted in a variety of international school settings around the world (e.g. Deveney's (2000) research in an English-medium international school in Thailand, Gould's (1999) research in a British-type international school in Saudi Arabia, MacKenzie et al (2001) and (2003) studies in international schools in Switzerland and Wijewardene's (1999) study of ten international schools in Sri Lanka) clearly shows that learning English in an English-medium educational context constitutes for the parents the most important reason for sending their children to international schools. As Murphy puts it, the non-English speaking child

“has been enrolled in the (international) school to learn English, or to have what the parents perceive to be a superior, western-style education, or both. Furthermore, the parents hope to achieve some measure of continuity in the child's schooling abroad by enrolling the child in an international school in each location. They also hope that such an education will equip their child with some knowledge of how the world works, so that a measure of success may be ensured in the future. All the child has to do is learn English” (Murphy 2003: 26).

Apart from those monolingual international schools that have adopted English as the sole medium of instruction, it is not a rare phenomenon for international schools to opt for an exported educational program of a non-English speaking country (for example from Germany, France, Holland etc.) and accordingly

offer education in the language in which this programme is normally delivered in the country of origin (i.e. offer German, French, or Dutch-medium education). In most cases, these types of schools, i.e. *non-English monolingual interactional schools*, cater for the needs of expatriate communities and their aim is to assist the re-entry of their pupils into the national (German, French, Dutch) educational system of their home countries. However, nationals of the host country who may wish their children to be educated according to the educational system of a different country and/ or to become fluent in a second language may also send their children in these schools. Examples of international schools of this type are the German School of Shanghai that offers German-medium education, the Lycée Français Charles de Gaulle in London that offers French-medium education and the Hollandse School in Singapore that provides Dutch-medium education. In these institutions, although English and a variety of different languages may be taught as subjects, instruction takes place only in one language.

Finally, there are those international schools, referred to above as '*bilingual international schools*', that offer a bilingual education programme and accordingly use two languages as the media of instruction (with English being one of them and usually the child's mother tongue being the second language). A case in point is the John F. Kennedy School in Berlin. The school offers a bilingual programme with instruction being conducted in German and English (Carder 2007a: 17). Another example is the International School of Geneva that offers an English-French bilingual programme. Finally, another example is that of the Atlanta International School that has developed its own bilingual English-French programme (Horsley 2003).

2.1.4.2 'Language Support' Policies

A further language-in-education policy issue primarily faced by those schools that follow a monolingual 'medium of instruction policy' (school type (a) and (b) in 2.1.4.1) for the purposes of educating students who are non-native speakers of the

language that has been adopted as the medium of instruction is what kind of language support if any will the school offer:

- a) for learning the medium of instruction;
- b) to support the kids' own mother tongue.

Since the majority of monolingual international schools are English monolingual schools (see section 2.1.4.1 above) with regard to (a) the issue in question is in reality that of ESL support¹⁵. As Carder has noted, English monolingual medium schools' ESL support policies vary with some schools offering some form of ESL support and other schools offering no support (Carder 2007a: 4). In this second case, as he notes, "children are simply left to sink or swim" (ibid). An example of an English monolingual international school that offers a strong ESL support for those students who are non-native speakers of English is the International School of Vienna (Carder 2007a). Similarly, the International School of London offers an ESL programme for those pupils that have no knowledge of the English language (Williams 2003).

With regard to the issue of mother tongue support, international schools that aim, as Carder notes, in developing children's additive bilingualism rather subtractive bilingualism¹⁶ (Carder 2007a) have designed some kind of provision for the learning of children's own language(s). For example, the International School of Vienna (although an English monolingual school) offers a strong mother tongue programme which is "largely an after-school program taught by private tutors, involving25 languages" (Carder 2007b: 381). Another example is the International School of London that "value(s) highly the learning of mother-tongue languages" and therefore offers the learning of around twenty different languages as part of the mainstream curriculum (International School of London 2011). It needs to be pointed though that the children's mother tongue is taught in those cases as a

¹⁵ As Hayden (2006) notes, in the international education literature, the term 'ESL' has been replaced by the term 'EAL' i.e. English as an Additional Language, to describe the situation of many children attending international schools that "speak more than one language in addition to English" (Hayden 2006: 61).

¹⁶ 'Additive' bilingual programmes are those that aim at preserving the students' mother tongue and at the same time 'adding' on to it, a second language, while 'subtractive' programmes are those which aim at replacing kids' mother tongue with a second language (Lambert 1980).

subject. Sadly though, many other international schools offer no support for the children's mother tongue considering it a responsibility of the parents (Carder 2007b: 4).

2.1.5 Summary

In summary, international schools are educational institutions that in most cases cater for the needs of students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. These students have found themselves enrolled in these schools because their parents see an English medium education (as we have seen most of the international schools are English-medium schools) as an investment for the future (Murphy 2003) and/or because their parents are professionals who have to be constantly on the move throughout their careers and would therefore like to ensure some continuity in their children's education. Further, as we have seen, parental expectations about learning English, the issue of enhancing student mobility and the issue of managing the linguistic and cultural diversity of the student population constitute important concerns that have to be dealt with one way or another in the educational and language policies developed and followed in these schools.

2.2 BES: an International School in Greece

BES is a prestigious international school which was founded in the 50s.¹⁷ The Governing Body of the school comprises twelve members. It is the Governing Body that "decides on policy and oversees the general functioning and development of the

¹⁷ Information on the school comes from two different sources, namely interviews with BES's educators and administrators (for a discussion of interview data collection methodology see Chapter 4, Section 4.3) and other documents, such as:

- a) The School's Annual Review (BES 2007);
- b) The School's Official Website (BES 2008a; BES 2008b);
- c) The School's Information Booklet for parents whose kids are in Reception (BES 2008c). For methods of getting access to these documents see Chapter 4, section 4.3.1.

school” but also the Headmaster has a say in “his capacity as Headmaster and Chief Executive Officer” (BES 2008a).

The school is located in one of the Athenian suburbs. It has to be noted though that the fact that the school is located in a specific suburb does not necessarily mean that the pupils attending BES also reside in this suburb. Most children attending BES commute every day to the school from various locations within Athens.

All classrooms at BES are well equipped and the school is very proud about its use of the latest educational technology. Each classroom has an interactive whiteboard and each member of staff is given his/her own laptop. Other on-site educational facilities include two libraries, scientific laboratories, specialised music and drama rooms, an art suite and an Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) suite. The schools’ sport facilities include an outdoor swimming pool, football pitches, tennis courts, basketball and volleyball courts as well as a general sports hall that also works as an expandable stage for annual plays and performances (BES 2008a).

Overall there are 800 students attending BES (BES 2008a). The school’s student population includes both Greek national and international students coming from 52 different countries (ibid). In fact BES’s student population has significantly changed over the years. Although the school was initially intended for “British and Commonwealth children temporarily resident in Greece” (ibid) now it is open to Greek-speaking, English-speaking and international students.

BES prides itself on its international identity. As the Headmaster puts it “We are justifiably proud of our school’s internationalism and see it as an essential element of our overt and hidden curriculum. It is the very essence of our ethos” (BES 2008b). It needs to be stressed here that the school’s self-definition as an international school primarily derives from the international nature (what the Headmaster calls above ‘the school’s internationalism’) of its student body, i.e. its self-definition as an ‘international school’ is based on the linguistic and cultural diversity of its student population.

With regard to personnel, more than 100 teachers and associated personnel work for BES. All staff are “experienced educators in the field of British and international education” (BES 2008a) while the majority of them come from various English speaking countries such as the UK, Canada and the US.

2.2.1 Educational Policy at BES: Curriculum and Pedagogical Approach Followed

As we have seen in section 2.1.3 above, a major educational policy issue in international schools is the choice of the curriculum. More specifically, as already mentioned, due to the observed linguistic and cultural diversity of the student population in international schools, there are inherent tensions in the process of choosing a curriculum. These tensions are centred around the issue of whose ‘society or culture’ to promote (Hayden 2006: 131). Further, as shown (in 2.1.3 above), according to Thompson, this dilemma is responded to by international schools by exporting, adapting, or integrating an already existing curriculum or by creating from scratch a new curriculum (Thompson 2001: 279-180)

For the specific case of BES, that as demonstrated in the previous section (2.2 above) is an international school that is also characterized by diversity in its student population, the dilemma of whose ‘society or culture’ to promote has been addressed by following a combined solution. That is, by following a combination of “adapted” and “integrated” Curricula (Thompson 2001). More specifically, BES has chosen to follow an adapted version of the National Curriculum for England and Wales and the IGCSE¹⁸ and the IB Diploma Programme which constitutes according to Thompson a case of an “integrated” Curriculum. As we have seen in section 2.1.3 above, the process of curriculum adaptation involves taking into consideration local contextual features (Thompson 2001: 279). In BES’s adaptation of the National Curriculum as well, the local context of Greece and more specifically the cultural heritage of

¹⁸ As already mentioned the International General Certificate of Secondary Education is an example of a Curriculum that according to Thompson (2001) has been ‘adapted’ from the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) followed in the UK.

Greece has been taken into consideration. Given the fact that many pupils attending BES are of a Greek cultural background, this adaptation of the curriculum followed means that the kids' own cultural identity is being valued and respected. However, it needs to be pointed out that as Thompson has noted, in adapted curricula "the inherent value system" of the curriculum is not likely to go through any changes and it largely remains rooted in the country of origin, which is England in BES's case. Finally, with regard to the last two years of schooling, BES pupils can choose from courses that lead either to the International General Certificate of Secondary Education (IGCSE) or to the IB Diploma. The choice of these two Curricula for the last years of schooling clearly serves the aim of enhancing the mobility of students for the purposes of Higher Education since both the IGCSE and the IB Diploma permit the entrance of graduate students to universities all around Europe and the US. It has to be noted though that Greek Higher Institutions do not constitute an option since none of those two Certificates/Diplomas meet the entrance criteria set by Greek Universities.

With regard to the pedagogical approach followed, in Gallagher's terms (see section 2.1.3 above), the approach to teaching and learning adopted at BES can be characterised as a 'Progressive Pedagogical' (Gallagher 2008: 14) approach that promotes children's independence and autonomy in learning (BES 2008a). Children of all ages (i.e. children aged from 3 to 18 years) are encouraged to work in small groups independently of the teacher and in various areas of the Curriculum. As the school itself describes the learning experience offered, "smaller working groups of pupils within classes (are) immersed in active learning activities, whether they relate to art, science, reading skills or ICT" (BES 2008a). Wondering around the school "one can see ...attentive teaching staff encouraging very young children to think about nature through play, dedicated teachers coaching to play musical instruments or swimming skills, and individual and groups of friends absorbed in computer or drama projects" (ibid).

2.2.2 Language-In-Education Policy at BES: 'Medium of Instruction' and 'Language Support' Policies

As I have already pointed out curriculum choices in international schools are indissolubly linked to language-in-education policy decisions. As it becomes evident in this section, the same goes for BES. Namely, it seems that the school's decision to follow the National Curriculum for England and Wales has also informed its decision to use English as the medium of instruction. More specifically, as we have seen in 2.1.4.1 above, based on their medium of instruction policies, international schools fall within three different categories. Clearly, since English has been adopted as the sole medium of instruction at all levels and grades at BES, BES falls within the first category of schools, i.e. it is an '*English monolingual international school*'.

Apart from this monolingual medium of instruction policy, the school has also adopted a monolingual medium of interaction policy that aims at promoting the use of English throughout school (BES 2008b; Interview with the Head of Reception, 12/11/2008). As the Head of Reception puts it "ideally we would like them (pupils) to *use English all the time*" (Interview with the Head of Reception). BES's adoption of an English monolingual language policy seems to be linked to the school's aim of "develop(ing) a fluency in English language" (Interview with the Headmaster). As the Headmaster explains one of the major aims of the school is not simply to help children acquire competency and a certificate in English (something that would be acquired simply by teaching English as a subject), but to help kids become fluent speakers of English; hence the adoption of an English monolingual policy that promotes the use of English not only during instruction but throughout school. In turn, since English is viewed at BES as an international, a "world language in actual fact" (ibid) the acquisition of a fluency in English is seen as interconnected to the central mission of the school, which is to "develop a pupil's potential as a responsible global citizen fully prepared with the skills, knowledge, attitudes and values enabling him or her to participate naturally and with confidence in the international arena" (BES 2008b; Interview with the Headmaster). In that respect, the school's English monolingual language policy has a double significance. It serves both the school's

aim of developing a fluency in English and the school's mission of creating global citizens. Finally, the school's English monolingual language policy has to some extent influenced the school's policy when it comes to the admission of new pupils to the school. As the Headmaster puts it, for the admission of pupils who are non-native speakers of English and who constitute according to the Headmaster of the school 80% of the student population (Interview with Headmaster, 03/11/2008), a working knowledge of English is required (but see also section 2.3 below).

As already mentioned in section (2.1.4.2), another significant language-in-education policy issue in international schools is that of whether and how the school will provide ESL support to those children who are non-native speakers of English and whether and how the school will support the learning of the children's own mother tongue. With regard to the issue of ESL/EAL support, BES follows a strong EAL programme that gives the opportunity to children, who have been categorised as 'EAL', to attend EAL courses run by specialised EAL/ESL teachers. More specifically, in Reception that constitutes the target of this research, children categorised as 'EAL' are withdrawn four times per week in a separate classroom for the purposes of their EAL classes that are taught by Ms Halls, a specialised EAL/ESL teacher and a native speaker of English. With regard to providing support for the learning of children's own mother tongue, since the majority of the non-native speakers of English at BES are of a Greek linguistic background, the school has organised and offers Modern Greek classes from year 1, i.e. Key Stage 1 (BES 2008a). More specifically, the school offers two different types of Modern Greek courses while only one of them constitutes in reality a mother tongue support program. Namely, it offers one programme for native speakers of Greek (i.e. Greek as a mother tongue support program) and one programme for non-native speakers of Greek (i.e. Greek as a second language program). Further, apart from the EAL and the mother tongue support program, from Year 2 onwards, students have the option of learning three different languages: Spanish, German and French (BES 2008a). It has to be noted however that Greek and any of the three foreign languages mentioned above are only taught as a subject with English being the sole medium of instruction.

2.3 Reception at BES

2.3.1 The Profile of Reception Children and Educators

As mentioned before, the student population at BES consists of Greek national and international students. This is also the case in the Reception class. Reception pupils, aged 4 to 5 years, comprise those who have previously attended BES's Nursery and those who have just arrived in Greece and at BES. More specifically, with regard to their linguistic background, Reception class pupils divide into three groups:

- a) Greek-background children;
- b) English-background children (mainly from the UK and the US);
- c) Non-Greek non-English background children (from Italy, Spain, Poland etc).

In granting a place to pupils who would like to join either BES's Nursery or Reception, the school takes into consideration the children's English language skills and has a preference for children who possess a working knowledge of English (BES 2008a). In fact, all potential pupils take a test of English. The English language test for newcomers has the form of an interview that takes place between potential pupils and the Head of Reception (Interview with the Head of Reception, 12/11/2008). However, very often the school allows pupils with minimal or no prior exposure to English to join BES's Reception (ibid). For those pupils, as already mentioned in 2.2.2 there are English as an Additional Language classes. In short, pupils come into Reception with many different mother tongues, varying levels of proficiency in English and varying degrees of familiarity with each other and with the school.

There are three Reception classes at BES. Each of them is staffed by a teacher and an Early Years classroom assistant (BES 2008a). All Reception teachers are qualified educators who hold degrees in Early Years Education. The Early Years classroom assistants have some pedagogical training (i.e. they have all attended the school's in-service training for classroom assistants) but not a full teacher training

(Interview with the Headmaster). Two out of the three Reception teachers are English native speakers (Mrs Barber and Mrs McIntyre¹⁹) with almost no competence in Greek or any other language. The third Reception teacher (Miss Karavanta²⁰) is bilingual in English and Greek. The same goes for the three Reception assistants (Miss Charalampidou, Miss Floros and Mrs Matzari); they are all bilingual in English and Greek.

2.3.2 Educational Policy at BES' Reception: The Foundation Stage Curriculum and its Play-Based Approach to Learning

In accordance with the rest of the school that follows the National Curriculum for England and Wales (see section 2.2 above), Reception at BES uses the Foundation Stage Curriculum²¹, i.e. that part of the British National Curriculum that has been designed to address the needs of very young pupils aged from 3 to 5 years. The Curriculum sets six areas of learning “covering children’s physical, intellectual, emotional and social development” (QCA 2003: 1). These areas of learning are:

- “Personal, social and emotional development;
- Communication, language and literacy;
- Mathematical development;
- Knowledge and understanding of the world;
- Physical development;
- Creative development” (QCA 2000: 26).

¹⁹ For anonymity purposes, none of the names used in this dissertation constitute the participants’ real names (More on this in Chapter 4, section 4.5).

²⁰ This is also a fake name.

²¹ This Curriculum later on (September 2008) led to and formed the basis of what is now known as the ‘Early Years Foundation Stage Curriculum’.

Within each area of learning, there are various steps corresponding to the goals that children need to reach by the end of the Foundation Stage. Further, the Foundation Stage Curriculum promotes a child-centered pedagogical approach that is based on a number of principles that practitioners need to take into consideration when working with children in any of the areas of learning referred to above. These principles are:

- Providing learning opportunities that reflect the development of young children;
- Providing learning opportunities that build on what children already know and can do;
- Ensuring that all children feel included, secure and valued;
- Removing barriers, so that children with English as an additional language or special educational needs are able to learn. “No child should be excluded or disadvantaged because of ethnicity, religion, language, family background, special need, gender or ability”;
- Developing strong partnerships between parents and the early years setting;
- Supporting children's learning through planned play (QCA 2000: 11-12).

This last point about learning through play reflects the whole educational philosophy that underpins the Foundation Stage Curriculum that is considered to be synonymous with a play-based approach to learning (Adams et al 2004; McGillivray 2007). As McGillivray (2007) notes, the Foundation Stage Curriculum has been developed in order to address the lack of a play-based approach to Early Years education (McGillivray 2007: 35) that characterised the Desirable Outcomes²² (SCAA 1996). In addressing this gap in Early Years education, the Foundation Stage Curriculum places emphasis on both ‘structured’ play, i.e. play that has an end product and is planned, initiated, guided and controlled by adults (Bruce 1991; Tamburrini 1982), and ‘free’ play, i.e. play that is without an end product, and although adults may indirectly get involved in structuring and extending it, children voluntarily participate in it and can wallow in their own ideas and experiences, feelings and relationships (Bruce 1991:42; Tamburrini 1982). In the Foundation Stage Curriculum both forms of play are seen as a central part of Early Years education with children’s ‘playtime’

²² That is the previous British National policy for Early Years Education.

constituting an integral part of ‘worktime’. In other words, both ‘structured’ and ‘free’ play are seen as serious business, not contrasted but relevant to the educational purpose of the preschool. With regard to structured play, as it is explicitly stated in the Curriculum, “well planned play is a key way in which children learn with enjoyment and challenge during the foundation stage” (QCA 2000:7). With regard to free play, it is pointed out that, “what appears to be random play can often be linked to the development of concepts such as position, connection or order” (QCA 2000: 21). Further, the Curriculum suggests that young pupils’ learning experience should be “a rewarding and enjoyable experience in which they explore, investigate, discover, create, practise, rehearse, repeat, revise and consolidate their developing knowledge, skills, understanding and attitudes” (QCA 2000:20). Playing and talking are seen as the most effective means through which these different aspects of learning can be brought together (ibid).

At BES’s Reception, the Foundation Stage Curriculum as described above, constitutes the basis of the school’s educational policy when it comes to young learners but, as the school states, there are certain adaptations and additions to it that take account of the school’s unique circumstances (BES 2008c:5). As already mentioned in sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 additions and adaptations at that preschool stage include: a) offering English as an Additional Language classes to all pupils that the school thinks could benefit from ESL/EAL support and b) incorporating aspects of the Greek culture in the teaching and learning that takes place in Reception. As the school puts it, BES’s Reception “takes every opportunity to benefit from the rich heritage of Greece and every class looks at a different aspect of Greek history or culture, usually supported by educational visits” (ibid). It has to be pointed out though that the Greek language is not taught as a subject at this stage.

Further, apart from the Foundation Stage Curriculum and the adaptations described above, educational practice at BES’s Reception is informed by 12 additional principles that the school views as “basic to good Early Years practice” (BES 2008c:6). All of the principles are in line with the philosophy of the Foundation Stage Curriculum since they favour a child-centred and play-based

approach to learning that aims at learner independence and autonomy. These principles are:

- “Early childhood is the foundation on which children build the rest of their lives; it is not just a preparation for the next stage-it is vitally important in itself.
- Children develop emotionally, intellectually, morally, physically, spiritually and socially, at different rates. All aspects of development are equally important and are interwoven.
- Young children learn from everything that happens to them and do not separate their learning into subjects.
- Children learn most effectively by doing rather than by being told.
- Children learn most effectively when they are involved and interested.
- Children need time and space to produce work of quality and depth.
- What children can do rather than what children cannot do are the starting points in their learning.
- Children who feel confident in themselves and their own ability have a head-start to learning.
- Children who are encouraged to think for themselves are more likely to act independently.
- All children have abilities which should be identified and promoted.
- The relationships which children establish with adults and other children are of central importance in their development.
- Playing and talking are the main ways through which young children learn about themselves and the world around them” (BES 2008c:6).

Finally, in line with the play-based approach to learning of the Foundation Stage Curriculum and in accordance with the aforementioned principles of good practice that characterise BES’s educational philosophy in Reception, in September 2007, the school introduced in Reception the so-called ‘Early Excellence model’ of learning (BES 2007: 20). This model’s primary aim is to promote independent learning through resources that “make little learning areas (called Continuous Provision Areas) where the children can access activities and materials to support their learning in all areas of the curriculum” (ibid). The Continuous Provision Areas (CPAs) are in reality play areas that are used by Reception educators as a teaching tool to enhance the kids’ learning. Children are invited to play with resources and materials that are relevant in most cases to the Reception teacher’s planning focus. For example, if the planning focus of the week in mathematics is shapes, then polydron (shapes) will be provided in one of the areas (typically in the Construction area), or if the Chinese culture has been the focus of the week, one of the play areas (i.e. the Theme based

area) turns into a Chinese restaurant and so on. In other areas though, for example in the drawing area or in the water play or sand play area, and depending on the occasion, a range of materials and resources are provided that are not necessarily directly related to the teacher's weekly teaching plan but may be indirectly related to the overall educational purpose of the preschool. It needs to be stressed though that no matter whether they are directly or indirectly related to the teacher's plan, in all cases, materials and resources in the CPAs are organized and pre-selected by adult school members. In that respect, children's play in the areas is 'structured' by adults. However, insofar as in all cases children's play in the areas does not need to have an end product and it is kids themselves that decide: a) in which area they prefer to play on a given day and b) what they would like to do with the resources provided, children's play in the CPAs can be characterized as 'free play'. Also it is important to highlight the fact that, in and through these 'free play' opportunities in the CPAs, the school aims to "build learner autonomy", "encourage free interaction" and, as already mentioned, further develop the kids' skills in all areas of the curriculum (BES 2007; field-notes 21/01/2008).

Playing and talking with peers in the play areas constitutes an integral part of the kids' everyday educational experience at BES's Reception since Reception pupils spend approximately 90 minutes per day in the CPAs. In the immediate outside environment of each of the Reception classroom at BES and inside each of these classrooms, can be found the following outdoor and indoor Continuous Provision Areas.

Outdoor play areas include:

- a) A '*Water Play Area*' that provides opportunities for playing with containers and tubes of various shapes and sizes, sea animals and boats;
- b) A '*Sand Play Area*' that provides opportunities for playing with farm animals, zoo animals, dinosaurs and different sand tools;
- c) A '*Theme Based Area*' that offers opportunities for making connections with cultural aspects of the curriculum i.e. opportunities for playing with different types of food or dresses from various countries;

- d) A '*Small World Area*' that provides opportunities for imaginative play with 'small-world' people, furniture, vehicles, animals, doll's houses, trees, walls, buildings and fences.

Indoor play areas include:

- a) A '*Computer Area*' that provides opportunities for various computer games;
- b) A '*Drawing Area*' that provides opportunities for drawing activities;
- c) A '*Construction Area*' that provides opportunities for playing with Lego, Dupilo etc.;
- d) A '*Role Play Area*' that provides opportunities for 'in-character' play;
- e) A '*Workshop Area*' that provides opportunities for playing with play dough and other cooking and baking tools.

Children have access to most of those areas during the CPAs period and as mentioned above they self-select where they would like to play. There is some restriction though when it comes to the outdoor play areas since access to them very much depends on the weather.

In summary, in and through the adoption of the Foundation Stage Curriculum and the Early Excellence model (EE 2008), BES's educational policy in Reception aims at a child-centred and play-based approach to learning that promotes learner autonomy and free play/interaction among preschoolers. As we have seen, this approach to early years teaching and learning entails providing opportunities to young learners to engage in 'free play' talk in the various CPAs of their classroom.

2.3.3 Language Policy at BES' Reception: Promoting the Use of English at School

As shown in the previous section, in Reception the school follows the Foundation Stage Curriculum, i.e. that part of the National Curriculum for England and Wales that has been designed for early years education. In fact, as the school puts it, the school's aim is to use the Foundation Stage Curriculum in the same way as Reception classes in the UK do (BES 2008a). This clearly has also consequences when it comes to the medium of instruction. That is, in line with the rest of the school, but also in accordance with the way the Foundation Stage Curriculum is implemented in the UK, at BES's Reception too, English is the medium of instruction.

Also, as already mentioned in section 2.2.2 above, the school has also adopted an English monolingual medium of interaction policy according to which pupils are required to "*use English all the time*" (Interview with the Head of Reception, 12/11/2008). The same goes for BES's Reception. The aim is to get pupils to use English all the time, i.e. to promote the use of English throughout school. More specifically, with regard to interaction in the school's play areas, Reception educators claim they were told by the school to deal with those cases where kids deviate from the use of English by intervening in the school's play areas and asking children to switch into English (Group Interview with Reception Educators, 03/11/2008). Further, according to Reception teachers, the promotion of the use of English at school (i.e. beyond the classroom) does not only have to do with school expectations but also with parental expectations. As Mrs McIntyre (one of the Reception teachers) argues, both foreign and Greek parents expect that BES is an English school and that accordingly their kids will be speaking English all the time (ibid). Further, parents are seriously concerned about how their kids are going to learn English if they play in Greek and if they spend time with children who are not speaking English all the time (ibid). It is clear then that both the school and parents expect Reception educators to promote the use of English-only throughout school.

Finally, with regard to the school's language support policy in Reception, as already mentioned (in 2.2.2), the school offers EAL courses for those children who are non-native speakers of English and have been categorized as EAL (for more details on these EAL courses see section 2.2.2 above). With regard to language support that concerns mother tongue teaching and learning, it needs to be stressed that the teaching and learning of languages other than English does not start before year 1 (for the teaching of Greek) and year 2 (for the teaching of French, Spanish and German). Namely, the kids do not receive at that stage any support for learning their own mother tongue.

2.3.4 The RK²³ Classroom

Having talked about BES's Reception and its educational and language policy, in this section, I move on to a description of one of the three Reception classrooms at BES that constitutes the focus of my research.

2.3.4.1 The RK Classroom Participants

The RK Reception classroom under study is linguistically and culturally mixed. It comprises of 2 kids of an English linguistic background, 1 child of an Italian linguistic background, 20 kids of a Greek linguistic background and 2 kids of a mixed, i.e. Greek/English background (see also table 2.1. below).

²³ Each Reception classroom at BES is named after the initial of the teacher's surname preceded by (R) that stands for Reception (e.g. if the surname of the teacher is Lampiri, the classroom is referred to as RL). Since the Reception teacher who participated in my study is for anonymity purposes referred to here as Miss Karavanta, the Reception Classroom under investigation will be referred to as the RK classroom.

Table 2.1 The RK preschoolers' linguistic background

RK Reception Classroom	2	2	1	20	25
Linguistic Background	Greek-English	English	Italian	Greek	Total

One of the English background kids (John) and the majority of the Greek background kids (Stella, Alexander, Steve, Roksani, Europi, Katerina, Anna, Mary, Marianthi, Odysseas, Stelios, Nantia, Elli, Kyriaki, Hrusa and Nikos²⁴), i.e. 17 out of 25 kids, have also attended BES's Nursery. The rest of the kids are recent arrivals (Kevin, Stephano, Sofoklis, Christos, Konstantinos, Yiannis, Dimitris, Rachel) who joined BES's Reception at different stages of the 2007-2008 academic year.

At the time of the recordings (February-April 2008), all of the RK pupils were able to communicate in English. However, 7 of them (Sofoklis, Christos, Stelios, Yiorgos, Elli, Stephano and Dimitris) had been categorized as being of a limited proficiency in English, i.e. as EAL, and were therefore withdrawn four times per week for their EAL classes with Ms Halls (see also 2.2.2 above).

Miss Karavanta, the RK teacher, is an English/Greek bilingual who was born and lived most of her life in Toronto, Canada. She holds a degree in Education from the University of Toronto. She has been working at BES's Reception for the last 4 years. The RK teaching assistant, Miss Charalampidou, is also an English/Greek bilingual who has lived in Greece and the US. She holds a Certificate in Early Years Education from one of the Private Colleges in Greece. She has been working for BES's Reception for the last 5 years. Before taking up the post of teaching assistant at BES, she worked as an assistant in another private English-medium nursery in

²⁴ For the purposes of anonymity, the kids' actual names have been replaced with 'fake' ones. For more on this see Chapter 4, section 4.5.

Athens. She is also the music teacher for all three Reception classes at BES. Other staff working for the RK Reception at BES include Miss Christopoulou and Miss Tsiamtsika (English/Greek bilinguals), two BES high school students that occasionally work as volunteer teaching assistants, Mrs Halls (English monolingual) who (as mentioned in section 2.2.2) is the EAL teacher and Miss Johns (English monolingual) who is the Physical Education teacher.

2.3.4.2 A day at BES's RK Classroom

The school day starts at 8.30 in the morning with the teacher taking the register. During the '*register routine*', the kids sit on the red carpet of their classroom with their legs crossed and talk only in response to the teacher's call of their name. The '*register routine*' is followed by curriculum activities (related to the six areas of learning of the National Curriculum) taking place in and through whole classroom instruction but also in and through tasks that give children the opportunity to work relatively autonomously at their tables. The first lesson is followed by a fruit break that takes place at 9.45. During the fruit break children spend approximately 15 minutes eating various fruits they have brought from home. The fruit brought from home is shared with all RK classroom participants. Girls bring enough fruit every Monday and boys do the same every Wednesday. For the period of time from 10.00 to 10.15, children get 15 minutes of play on the schoolyard. Following this, the class returns to its curriculum activities until the lunch break at 12:00. The lunch break takes place in the classroom and children consume food brought from home. After the lunch break, the '*Quite Time*' routine follows. During this routine, teacher and pupils relax with yoga exercises. More specifically, during this routine, all pupils have to sit on the red carpet of their classroom with their legs crossed and their eyes closed and follow the instructions given by the teacher. The '*Quiet Time*' Routine is followed by the afternoon '*Register Routine*' (same as in the morning). Then a 90 minute period of play in the indoor and outdoor CPAs of the classroom follows. The process of moving into the play areas involves: a) self-selecting in which of the

indoor or outdoor CPAs the kids would like to play; b) notifying the teacher about their choice(s) (*'Choosing a Play Area' Routine*); c) putting their 'name cards' in the name card holder of the area that they have just entered (*'Name Card' routine*). During actual playtime in the CPAs, there is a lot of movement from one area to another with the kids constantly forming new groups and coming up with new play activities in each of the areas. When the 90 minute CPAs period is over, i.e. at 14:45, the Reception teacher switches off the lights to introduce the *'Tidy up Time'* routine. Switching off the lights signals to the pupils that they have to 'freeze', i.e. to stop what they are doing, and start tidying up the CPA where they were playing. For those outdoor CPAs (sand play and water play area) that are just next to the windows of the classroom, the teacher's light signal is also visible to the kids playing there. For the rest of the outdoor CPAs though, it is usually a member of the classroom, adult or child, that notifies children that it is 'tidy up time'. Having tidied up the play areas, Reception participants return to their curricular activities (in most cases at this time of the day curricular activities involve reading a story) for the period from 14:45 till 15:05. At 15:15 the class breaks up and children are handed over to parents.

In sum, daily life in Reception is characterized by a constant movement between periods that include whole classroom instruction and independent child peer group work or play in the CPAs. This dissertation will only focus on that period of time (90 minute period) that is devoted to 'free play' in the CPAs.

2.4 From the Reception Educators' Concerns to the Research Questions Explored in This Study

As we have seen (section 2.3.3.1) the majority of the RK pupils (22 out of 25) are of a Greek linguistic background. Further, as shown above (section 2.3.1), BES's 'CPAs' pedagogical approach in Reception aims at promoting 'free play/interaction' and learner autonomy. In theory this means that, in those cases where children's self-selection practices lead to the formation of a Greek-only group in the play areas, kids

may adopt Greek as the medium of their 'free play' interaction. At the same time however, as I have already mentioned, the school has adopted an English monolingual policy, including for Reception, aimed at promoting the use of English at school. It is apparent then that as a result of the school's policies a conflictual situation has emerged. On the one hand, free play/interaction could be conducted in Greek (pedagogical approach to learning), while on the other hand, English should be promoted throughout the school. In other words, the conflict observed plays itself out at the level of language choice.

Reception educators report that they are seriously concerned with how this conflictual situation can be approached. They do understand that Reception children "need the language they need English" (Group Interview with Reception Educators, 03/11/2008) and that therefore the use of English needs to be promoted. At the same time though, they also think that apart from those cases where an English monolingual child is being excluded because of his co-players' use of Greek, imposing the use of English in the kids' play areas "is not correct" (ibid). A similar view is expressed by the Head of Reception who notes that, in those cases where the focus of the kids' play activity is not language related, the educators' linguistic interventions in the play areas could actually spoil the children's play (Interview with the Head of Reception). Further, Reception educators argue that although they have always acted as 'English norm enforcers' (since this is what was expected), they never felt comfortable with this role. As one of the Reception teachers puts it, "I always felt very uncomfortable I really felt gosh you know I don't want to sound like eh anti-Greek" (Group Interview with Reception Educators). Another Reception teacher claims that although she would always intervene in the areas and say "No Greek in the classroom thank you very much", she always felt very guilty (ibid). Overall, the educators' feeling about the situation in Reception is that they are caught in a bind (ibid). On the one hand, the school and its language policy as well as parents expect them to impose the use of English. On the other hand, the school's play-based approach to learning expects educators to promote and show respect for the kids' 'free interaction' in the CPAs.

The aim of this research is to contribute precisely to this issue of concern at BES's Reception. More specifically, by adopting the Applied CA perspective of "description-informed action" (Richards 2005), a perspective whereby practitioners are made aware of their actions and, in full knowledge, "make decisions regarding the continuation or modification" of their own policies and practices (Heap, 1990: 47), the purpose of my study is to provide a detailed description of how the conflictual situation observed at BES's Reception is actually lived in the participants' language choice acts. More specifically, by using the children's language choice acts as the starting point, the aim of the research is to explore the following issues:

- a) How do RK Reception children respond to the conflicting situation imposed on them by the school's language policy and its pedagogical approach?
- b) How do RK school personnel respond to children's actions resulting from the conflicting situation observed in Reception?
- c) How do children themselves react to educators' own actions?

By answering these questions, I hope to raise BES stakeholders' awareness about the possible advantages, possibilities and limitations of their policies and practices, and thus pave the way for more informed language policy making and practice at BES. In other words, I hope to have a local impact on the policies and practices followed in the school.

2.5 Conclusion

In summary, an International school in Greece (BES) that is overwhelmingly attended by Greek background children has adopted an English monolingual policy, including in Reception, aimed at promoting the use of English throughout school. At the same time though, the school has adopted a child-centred, play-based approach to learning aimed at promoting children's 'free play/interaction' in designated play areas. 'Free play/interaction' could include the possibility of using Greek at least in

those cases where the kids' self-selection practices have led to the emergence of a Greek only play group in the CPAs. It becomes apparent then that a conflictual situation has emerged in the school's Reception. On the one hand, free play/interaction in the CPAs could be conducted in Greek. On the other hand, English needs to be promoted throughout school. In other words, the conflict observed plays itself out at the level of language choice. The aim of this study is precisely that, i.e. to see how this conflictual situation (free/play interaction conducted in Greek versus English should be used all the time) is responded to by RK Reception participants in their language choice acts in the CPAs. To address this aim, and since the designated play areas are meant to offer opportunities for child-child interaction, it is children's language choice acts in these areas that will be used as the starting point of investigation.

Chapter 3: Language Policy: Concept and Approaches

3.0 Introduction

As already mentioned in Chapter 2, the focus of this study is on how the conflict brought about by the school's policies is actually lived in the RK Reception participants' language choice acts in the play areas of their classroom. To address this issue that lies at the interface between language policy and language practice a specific view of the relationship between language policy and language practice is needed. In this chapter, I review the language policy (LP) literature and describe the different approaches and models that emerged throughout the history of the LP and Language-in-Education Policy (LEP) field by focusing on: a) their research foci and on whether the examination of practices is seen as part of language policy research and b) how 'language policy' itself and the relationship between language policy and practice has been conceptualized in each case. More specifically, in tracing the development of different approaches in LP and LEP research, I show how the focus of LP research has expanded over the years to include language practices and how 'language policy' and the relationship between language policy and practice has been conceptualized and re-conceptualized in different ways. As it becomes clear in the discussion that follows, based on whether practice constituted part of their foci and based on the way the relationship between language policy and practice has been conceptualized, LP approaches and models fall into three different categories: a) approaches and models whereby there is no interest whatsoever in actual language practices and therefore there is no proposed conceptualization of the relationship between policy and practice (section 3.1); b) approaches and models whereby there is an interest in actual practices and whereby language policy is conceptualized as being something distinct from language practice (practice versus policy approaches) (section 3.2) and c) models (Spolsky 2004, 2008) in which there is an interest in actual practices and whereby language policy is no longer seen as distinct from practice but as something that resides in actual practices (practice as policy model) (section 3.3).

3.1 No Interest in Language Practices

In this section, I present two early approaches to LP and LEP, i.e. the so-called ‘traditional approach’ (Ricento 2006a: 12, Tollefson 2008:3) and the ‘critical approach to LPP’ (Tollefson 2002a, 2006). As we will see below, although those two approaches differ in terms of their foci and the way in which language policy research has been conceptualized, they can be seen as similar in the sense that they are both characterized by a lack of interest in actual language practices, i.e. in both of them language practices fall outside the scope of language policy research.

3.1.1 The Traditional Approach to LP and LEP Research

Early research in ‘language policy and planning’ (henceforth LPP) has been concerned with the rise of ‘new developing nations’ and the various linguistic problems these nations were faced with. Language planning was at that stage seen as the “organized pursuit of solutions to language problems, typically at the national level” (Fishman 1974: 79). It was perceived as a problem solving activity “characterized by the formulation and evaluation of alternatives for solving language problems” (Rubin and Jernudd 1971a: xvi). Although the term ‘Language policy’ was used interchangeably with that of language planning, and was therefore used to refer to the technocratic, language engineering exercise that policy practitioners engaged in, the term was also used to refer to the actual linguistic solution proposed by these practitioners. In any case, it is important to highlight the fact that LP scholars following this technical conceptualization of ‘language policy’ did not actually engage in conducting language policy research. They were mainly policy practitioners who were interested in working out the best solution to the language problem at hand, i.e they practiced language policy without actually conducting research on language policy. By adopting a cost-benefit approach and with a focus on the macro-process involved in the decision making that language planning involves, LP practitioners have in this early period concentrated on developing

language policy models and typologies that would facilitate planners in planning language in more effective ways (see Fishman (1968), Haugen (1966a, 1966b, 1983), Kloss (1966, 1968) and Ferguson (1968)).

A good example of the models developed at the time is Haugen's (1966a) model. According to this model, the language planning process was thought to consist of the following four activities: a) selection of a norm; b) codification of form; c) elaboration of function and d) acceptance by the community (Haugen 1966a: 18). In (1983), by taking into consideration Rubin's (1971) notion of 'evaluation' and Kloss's (1969) proposed distinction between two different types of language planning (see discussion below about Kloss's distinction between 'status' and 'corpus' planning), Haugen offered a revision of his previous model. With regard to the typologies developed at this early period of LPP research, a good example is Fishman's (1968) typology of nations. Fishman identified three types of nations, namely 'the new developing nations', 'the old developing nations' and 'intermediate types', talked about the different kind of language problems that each of these three types of nations faced and proposed specific language planning solutions for each of them.

Apart from models and typologies, LP scholars talked about three major language planning types, namely: a) 'corpus planning', b) 'status planning' (Kloss 1969: 81-83) and c) 'acquisition planning' (Cooper 1989) which is also known in the literature as 'language education policy' (Spolsky 2008). Corpus planning refers to the decision making process that focuses on "agreeing upon a model of good language" (Fishman 1979). It involves creating new forms, developing old ones and selecting from alternative forms the one that will serve as the standard (Cooper 1989: 31). It deals with changes at all levels of the language system. As Luke et al (1990) put it, corpus planning has to do with "the description and formalization of languages" (Luke et al 1990: 26). Status planning, on the other hand, refers to "the analysis and prescription of the sociocultural statuses and uses of languages" (ibid). It concerns the allocation of functions to certain languages and/or language varieties. For example, a major status planning issue in developing nations was selecting which language would serve and have the status of the national language. Finally,

acquisition planning refers to planning that is “directed towards language spread”, namely planning that is directed towards “increasing the number of users-speakers, writers, listeners or readers” of a language or language variety (Cooper 1989: 33). It is linked to decisions on which languages are going to be learnt /taught to which part of the population and how. As Cooper notes although ‘acquisition planning’ goes beyond decisions that concern the language of instruction, “the planning of language instruction accounts for the lion’s share of acquisition planning” (Cooper 1989: 160). It is important to note that although initially these three language planning types/activities were presented as distinct, it was very soon realized that all three language planning activities are interconnected. For example, if certain functions are allocated to specific linguistic varieties or languages that have never been used to serve those functions, then those varieties or languages may not be structurally prepared to serve those functions. As Fishman notices “status planning without concomitant corpus planning runs into a blind alley. Conversely, corpus planning without status planning is a linguistic game, a technical exercise without social consequence” (Fishman 1979: 12). Further, acquisition planning is also indissolubly linked with status and corpus planning in the sense that if a language is chosen as the official language of a nation-state (status planning), then in most cases it will also serve as the medium of instruction (acquisition planning), and in order to be able to serve as the medium of instruction, some technical terminology (ibid) will also be necessary (corpus planning).

In the LP literature, this first approach to LPP whereby language planning was primarily seen as a problem solving activity that takes place at the macro-national level is known as the “traditional approach” (hence the title of this section) (Ricento 2006a: 12, Tollefson 2008:3). Other scholars refer to it as the “neoclassical approach” (Tollefson 1991: 27) or as the “positivist approach” (Ricento and Hornberger 1996: 405). As mentioned above, this first approach coincides with the independence of former colonial countries and the emergence of new developing nations and it marks as Ricento notes, the “development of LPP as an identifiable field” (Ricento 2000: 197). It was then (i.e. during the 60s) that LPP started to be recognized as a field of inquiry and more specifically it was then that it came to be seen as a “branch of sociolinguistics” (Ricento 2006a: 12).

In this traditional approach to LPP, the one nation-one language ideology prevailed. According to this ideology, linguistic heterogeneity was seen as an obstacle to a nation's development, unification and modernization (Ricento 2000: 198). On the other hand, monolingualism and the adoption of a prestigious foreign language was considered to be the solution to most of the problems faced by developing new nations. Further, it was thought that technical experts (i.e. language planners) would be able through rational plans to assist newly emerging nation-states in the process of achieving unification, modernization, efficiency and democratization. These were precisely the perceived at the time goals of language policy and planning. All that the planners had to do in each case was to identify the problems faced by a given nation and then based on a rationally-driven decision making process (language planning) suggest specific solutions for these problems (language policy). It is worth noting that, within the traditional paradigm, language was viewed as a resource (like any other resources) and as such subject to planning (Jernudd and Das Gupta 1971: 211; Tollefson 1991: 36) while language planning was conceptualized as being like any other kind of planning (Rubin 1971), "as one more task in the development plans" of new nations (Rubin and Jernudd 1971a: xiv). Further, as Tollefson notices, development and modernization theory had greatly influenced this first approach to LPP (Tollefson 2008). As he puts it, the traditional approach to LPP shared with modernization theory the following three key assumptions: a) that LPP could be beneficial to ethnolinguistic minorities; b) that technical experts could assist in the formulation and implementation of "efficient, rational plans and policies" and c) that the nation-state should be the focus of research and practice (Tollefson 2008: 4). In short, language policy and planning was approached from a "top-down" (ibid), macro-level perspective while the bulk of LP work conducted within this tradition focused on providing detailed descriptions and accounts of the language planning processes followed in various newly independent states (see for example Rubin and Jernudd's (1971b) and Fishman, Ferguson and Das Gupta's (1968) collections of LP studies). Further, this early research is characterized by an interest primarily in status and corpus planning issues. However, as evidenced by Fishman's (1979) paper on bilingual education and language planning, an interest in 'language education policy' had also started to emerge. This emerging interest in

LEP is also evident in Spolsky's (1972) edition that brings together studies on the language education provisions that various countries have developed in their attempt to cope with the needs of minority children.

In brief, by viewing language policy as a technocratic, rational exercise that takes place at the macro level, there was within the traditional approach no interest whatsoever in actual language practices. That is, there was no interest at that stage of LP work in what actually happens at the micro-level of everyday interaction. The same lack of interest in practices characterizes the approach that developed immediately after the traditional approach, i.e. this lack of interest is also observed in the so-called 'critical approach' described in the section that follows.

3.1.2 The Critical Approach to LP and LEP Research

During the 1980s, there was a growing realization that despite the language planning efforts of experts, former colonial countries failed to achieve modernization and national development. In fact, in some cases, former colonial countries ended up being "more dependent on their former colonial masters than they had been during their colonial era" (Ricento 2000: 200). As Ricento notes in the face of this reality, LP scholars started formulating responses (Ricento 2000: 200). As part of these responses, extensive criticism started to emerge against the traditional approach to LPP (see for example Pennycook 1994; Ricento and Hornberger 1996; Tollefson 1991, 2008). The traditional approach was criticized mainly for its underlying assumption that language policy and planning is an apolitical and ideologically-neutral process (Tollefson 1991, 2008; Ricento and Hornberger 1996) that can enhance the social and economic mobility of ethnolinguistic minorities. As Tollefson noted, this "optimistic belief" in the value of LPP could no longer be maintained since research had provided them with evidence to the contrary (Tollefson 2008: 4), i.e. there was evidence that access to a dominant language does not necessarily go hand in hand in with political and economic power. Rather, as various LP scholars demonstrated, language policies are actually highly ideological and political and can be used to further power and economic inequality (Hornberger 2002; Tollefson 1991,

1995, Pennycook 1994, 2002). Moreover, the traditional approach has been criticized for its assumption that there is a straightforward relationship between language policies and outcomes (Tollefson 2008: 4). In this way, as Tollefson puts it, the traditional approach “ignore(s) the complexity of socio-political systems” and the wider socio-political, ideological and historical context in which language policies were created and implemented (ibid). Consequently, such an approach fails to explain why “some communities are willing to go to war over language issue, while others easily accept language loss” (Tollefson 1991: 29). Finally, the ‘one nation-one language’ ideological premise of the traditional approach to LPP was seriously challenged by the reality of several multilingual states (India, Pakistan, Nepal etc) (Hornberger 2006). For these multilingual states, the ‘one-language one-nation’ language planning solution of the traditional approach was no longer relevant or desirable. As this monolingual ideology started falling apart, so too the LP field started moving away from the traditional approach and its ‘ideologically-neutral’ LP models and typologies.

The growing awareness of the negative effects and limitations of the early traditional LPP models gave rise to an alternative LPP approach, i.e. to the so-called ‘critical approach to LPP’ (Tollefson 2002a, 2006). According to Tollefson, this alternative approach is referred to as ‘critical’ for three reasons. Firstly, because it is influenced by critical theory (primarily by the work of Bourdieu (1991) Foucault (1972) and Habermas (1979), (1985)). Secondly, because it aims at a ‘critical’ reading of language policies, i.e. its aim is to “understand the social and political implications of particular policies adopted in specific historical contexts” (Tollefson 2002a: 4). In this way, it is hoped that any inequalities created by specific policies will come to the fore (see below) and that critical language policy research will thus contribute to ‘social change’ (Tollefson 2006: 42). Finally, the approach is referred to as critical because it is ‘critical’ of traditional approaches to language policy (Tollefson 2002a: 4). Contrary to the assumption inherent in the traditional approach to LP that language is a resource like other resources and the belief that any language change brought about by language policy making is the result of a cost/benefit analysis of individuals, in the critical approach, language is taken to be “unlike most other resources” while language change is not seen as being necessarily the product

of a cost/benefit analysis (Tollefson 1991: 36). As Tollefson puts it “Unlike most other resources, all language change involves real people living in history and organized into groups according to symbols, roles, and ideologies that may not correspond to the economic logic of cost/benefit analysis” (ibid). Further, contrary to the neoclassical assumption that language policies and plans constitute a government’s well-intentioned and rationalistic response to practical concerns, in the critical approach, LP is seen as a central mechanism used by modern states to further and sustain unequal relations of power and unequal access to economic resources and political institutions (Tollefson 2002a: 7). In this light, the major goal of researchers working within this critical tradition (e.g. Tollefson 1991, 2002a; Pennycook 1989, 1994; Wiley et al 1996, Wiley 2002) is to “make explicit the mechanisms by which policy decisions serve or undermine particular political and economic interests” (Tollefson 1991: 32). In short, ‘critical’ researchers were no longer interested in developing LP models and typologies. Rather, with the ultimate aim being to unravel the ideologies and discourses inherent in specific language policies and language planning processes, their focus shifted to the interconnections between language policy and a) power, b) ideology and c) inequality. According to Tollefson, in critical policy research, power refers to discourse, state and ideological power (Tollefson 1995: 2). It refers to “the capacity to control resources, both tangible economic resources and intangible resources such as language and discourse” (ibid). A major concern for researchers within the critical tradition is to investigate how language policies reflect and perpetuate unequal relations of power (ibid). Ideology refers to “normally unconscious assumptions that come to be seen as common sense” (Tollefson 1991: 10). A major tenet in the critical approach is that ideology plays a critical role in the justification of unjust language policies and in sustaining inequality (ibid). In this light, the aim of critical LP research is to reveal the ideologies that gave shape to specific policies and to unravel the discursive process through which policies that are in favor of the interests of dominant groups have come to be seen as commonsensical (Tollefson 2002a: 6). Finally, with regard to the interest in inequality, a critical approach to LPP recognizes that policies create and perpetuate several forms of social inequality and that in most cases policy makers work to support the interests of dominant groups (Tollefson 2006: 42). The aim of

critical analysis of language policies is two-fold in that respect. Firstly, in and through critical analysis of language policies, the aim of research is to demonstrate how certain policies promote and sustain political, social and/or economic inequality. Secondly, having shown how “systems of inequality are created and sustained” (Tollefson 2006: 43), critical LP research aims at contributing to the development of language policies that will “reduce the various forms of inequality” (ibid). This concern within the critical approach with inequality gave rise to a concern about another interrelated issue, that of respecting and promoting ‘linguistic human rights’ (Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson 1994, Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas 1996, Skutnabb-Kangas 2008). Linguistic human rights refer to all those language rights that speakers of a dominant language enjoy (Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson 1994: 1). More specifically, they refer to the right that linguistic minorities have to learn their mother tongue (in and through formal education) and the right to use that mother tongue for official purposes (Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson 1994: 2). Further, ‘linguistic human rights’ refer to the linguistic minorities’ right to learn the official language of the country where they reside (ibid). Critical LP researchers like Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas have argued that the reluctance of governments to grant ‘linguistic human rights’ to ethnolinguistic minorities has to be examined “in the light of the political reality of unequal access to power” (Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson 1994: 3). They claim that in most cases language policies do not respect or promote the linguistic rights of minorities because dominant groups would like to see minorities being assimilated rather than gaining power and “reproducing themselves as minorities” (Skutnabb-Kangas 2008: 117). As Skutnabb-Kangas puts it, the linguistic human rights of minorities have in most cases not been respected because of the fear of dominant groups that by having their linguistic rights recognized and promoted, minorities will gain cultural, economic and political autonomy and power and will threaten in this way the linguistic homogeneity and power of the dominant group (ibid).

Researchers working within the critical LP paradigm have ‘critically’ analyzed both national policies about languages (see for example Tollefson (1986) for a critical analysis of language policy making in the Philippines and Tollefson (2002b) for a critical analysis of language policy making in Yugoslavia) and

language-in-education policy making processes (see for example Wiley and Lukes (1996), Wiley (2002) and McCarty (2004) for a critical analysis of LEP making in the US and Moore (1996) for an analysis of LEP in Australia). It has to be noted though that in analyzing language policies, critical researchers have taken two different directions that can be seen as constituting two distinct approaches offered within the critical LP paradigm. These approaches are referred to in the literature as the “historical-structural approach” and the “governmentality” approach (Tollefson 1991, 2006) with Tollefson and Pennycook being the major exponents of each of these approaches respectively.

In the ‘historical-structural’ approach the focus is on revealing the historical and structural forces that have influenced the formation of specific language policies and that constrain individual language choice (Tollefson 1991: 32-33). Further, this approach emphasizes the role of the state in creating and promoting unjust language policies that ensure that only certain (i.e. dominant) groups will have access to economic and political power. Consequently, researchers following this approach analyze discursive events that are tied to language policy making at the macro-level (at governmental-state level) (for examples of research conducted within this paradigm see McCarty (2004), Tollefson (2002b) and May (2006)).

Contrary to the ‘historical-structural’ approach, the ‘governmentality’ approach takes a more micro-level perspective by shifting the focus of attention away from the state. It focuses on ‘micro’ indirect acts that legitimize, promote or restrict certain languages. Drawing on postmodern theories and Foucault’s (1991) notion of ‘governmentality’²⁵, Pennycook suggested to examine language policy as “practices of governance” with the aim of revealing the various implicit ways through which governmental power may be realized (Pennycook 2002: 92). He proposed to look at “discourses, educational practices and language use” (ibid), i.e. to look at micro-level practices that influence linguistic behavior and act out programs of governance (for examples of research conducted within this paradigm see Pennycook (2002) and Moore (1996)).

²⁵ Following Foucault (1991), Pennycook uses the notion of governmentality to refer to the various ways in which “power operates at the micro-level of diverse practices” (Pennycook 2006: 64).

In summary, critical LP researchers have moved away from developing LP models and typologies in order to focus on the ideologies and discourses that are embedded in specific language policies. Further, this shift in foci had important implications about the way language policy research came to be understood. That is, as we have seen within the traditional approach, LP scholars engaged in LP work which in most cases was synonymous with language engineering. In that respect, we cannot speak of policy researchers as such but of policy practitioners who engaged in problem solving activities and language exercises. Within the critical paradigm however, by reflecting on the work of those practitioners and by looking at it from a ‘critical’ perspective, scholars have started conducting actual language policy research, i.e. they have engaged in a critical examination of language policies. That is they have engaged in a critical examination of policy texts and of the discourses that permeate these texts (see Ball (1993) for a discussion of how ‘language policy’ came to be conceptualized as text and discourse within the critical paradigm).

Despite these differences though in research foci and in the way language policy research came to be understood, what these early approaches have in common is that there was no interest at that stage of LPP work in actual language practices. Pennycook’s ‘critical’ LP work can be seen as an exception to this lack of interest in practices since as we have seen he proposed to include micro-level practices such as educational practice and everyday language use in language policy research. However, it needs to be pointed out that even Pennycook proposed to examine practices only with the purpose of revealing subjugation, i.e. only in order to reveal how power relationships at the macro-level are played out at the micro-level of everyday practices²⁶. Therefore, the only interest in practices observed in early LPP work was limited in character, while in the bulk of LPP work following the traditional or the critical paradigm, the investigation of actual practices was not seen as falling within the scope of policy research.

²⁶ As Johnson puts it, “Pennycook’s move to the micro-level does not insert agency into LPP processes as much as it positions discourse, and therefore discourses, as perpetuating their own subjugation by acting out larger power relationships over which they have no control” (Johnson 2009: 140).

3.2 Language Practice Versus Language Policy

I have so far talked about LPP approaches that are characterized by their lack of interest in practices and whereby precisely because language practices are not taken to be part of language policy research, there is no proposed conceptualization of the relationship between language policy and practice. In this section, I am moving on to LPP approaches that are characterized by their common interest and focus in language practices. As it becomes evident below, in these more recent approaches (i.e. in the so-called ‘anthropological’ and the ‘interdisciplinary’ approach), practices become part of language policy research and are examined vis-à-vis language policies (not in order to reveal subjugation as was the case in Pennycook’s work but) in order to reveal human agency.

In the discussion that follows, I first talk about the so-called ‘anthropological approach to LP’ where we begin to see aspects of practice being examined as part of LP research and then move on to the ‘interdisciplinary approach’ (and to examples of LP work following this paradigm) whereby the examination of actual language choice practices becomes an integral part of LP research. I conclude the section by highlighting the similarities between those two approaches particularly with respect to the way the relationship between language policy and practice has been conceptualized.

3.2.1 The Anthropological and Sociological Approach to LP and LEP

The value of the critical LPP approach and the significant role it has played in enriching “our conceptualization of language policy” (Johnson 2009: 155) on the one hand, and in illuminating the various ideologies that are embedded in language policy on the other has been recognized even by researchers working outside the critical paradigm (see for example Johnson 2010: 62). At the same time though, the critical approach has received extensive criticism (see for example Davis 1999,

Ricento and Hornberger 1996, Hornberger and Johnson 2007, Johnson 2009). It has primarily been criticized for two reasons. Firstly, Ricento, Hornberger and Johnson argued that by overemphasizing state power the critical approach tends to underestimate human agency (Ricento and Hornberger 1996, Hornberger and Johnson 2007). Namely, the critical approach has been criticized on the basis that by overemphasizing state control, it tends to underestimate the power of individuals to interpret, re-interpret, transform and resist certain language policies in varying and unique ways (Hornberger and Johnson 2007: 509). Secondly, another criticism directed towards the critical approach was that by obfuscating the agentic role of individual actors, the critical LP paradigm fails to account for language policy activity that may occur at various levels of LPP (Davis 1999, Ricento and Hornberger 1996).

As a way of responding to these limitations inherent in the critical LPP approach, various LP scholars and researchers (Canagarajah 2006; Ricento and Hornberger 1996; Hornberger and Johnson 2007, Johnson 2009, 2010, Ramanathan 2005) have introduced an alternative LPP approach that focuses on human agency. This approach is referred to in the literature as the “anthropological and sociological approach” to LPP (Johnson 2009: 142; Ricento 2006c: 131). By focusing on individuals’ agency, the aim of this approach is to reveal the various local ways in which language policies are interpreted, implemented and resisted by human agents in specific social contexts (Hornberger and Johnson 2007: 509, Ricento and Hornberger 1996: 516). A major tenet here is that LPP is “a multilayered construct, wherein LPP components-agents, levels and processes of LPP-permeate and interact with each other in multiple and complex ways as they enact various types, approaches and goals of LPP” (Ricento and Hornberger 1996: 419). To capture the idea that the LPP processes involve various agents and consist of various layers and levels, Ricento and Hornberger (1996) have introduced the metaphor of an onion. They argued that the various planning agents that are involved one way or another in LPP, the various levels (national, institutional and interpersonal) and processes are “layers that together compose the LPP whole (the “onion”) (Ricento and Hornberger 1996: 402). In order to understand then how language policy moves and develops across different layers and levels, it is necessary to examine human agency since it is

the individual actors (educators when it comes to LEP) that are taken to be at the centre of the LPP onion (Ricento and Hornberger 1996: 417). As proponents of this approach claim, although analyses of the actual language policy texts are important, “the texts are nothing without the human agents who act as interpretive conducts between the LP levels (or layers of the LPP onion)” (Hornberger and Johnson 2007: 528). Further, the anthropological approach is permeated by the belief that although certain ideologies may be embedded in specific policies, speakers are not just passive recipients or slaves of these ideologies. In implementing language policies, they can follow, challenge and/or resist certain policies and the ideologies that are embedded in them. The same goes for LEP. Although LEP has the power “to normalize particular ways of educating” (Johnson 2010: 75), as active agents, educators can play a crucial role in the interpretation and appropriation of language-in-education policies. In order to depict the agentive role of educators and their power to transform even restrictive policies for the benefit of their pupils, Hornberger has introduced the notion of “opening and filling up implementational and ideological spaces in language policy” (Hornberger 2002, 2005). This notion is used to refer to the interstices that often exist in macro-policy texts and discourses. More specifically, Hornberger suggested that even in the face of restrictive (monolingual) policies, there are often implementational spaces that educators can fill up by following multilingual practices and thus also open up the way for alternative ideological spaces (ibid). Further, she argued that, alternatively, educators can take advantage of ideological spaces of alternative discourses that are available in the school or community level and in this way carve out implementational spaces that allow multilingual practices which will in turn empower their pupils (ibid).

Hornberger’s notions and ideas about opening and filling up spaces but also the basic notions and ideas that permeate the anthropological LPP paradigm have primarily been implemented in LEP research (see Freeman 2004, Hornberger and Johnson 2007, Johnson 2010; Ramanathan 2005, Skilton –Sylvester 2003). The majority of LEP researchers working within the anthropological tradition have adopted ethnographic methods in order to examine the agentive role of educators in language policy making. A major finding of this LEP research is that teachers can use their pupils’ L1 as a resource in and during instruction although official policies

may militate against it. For example, based on a study of what actually happens during non-bilingual ESL instruction offered to Khmer pupils in Philadelphia, Skilton-Sylvester (2003) shows that ESL teachers can contest commonplace ideologies and policies and incorporate Khmer (the students' L1) language and culture as a resource into their classrooms. Based on this finding, she argues that there is not a deterministic connection between macro-level state language-in-education policies and actual practices in the classroom (Skilton-Sylvester 2003: 170). Further, Skilton-Sylvester argues that "the amount of support given to the language and culture of Cambodian bilingual students in Philadelphia has more to do with the policy of the teacher than state or federal law (Skilton-Sylvester 2003: 173). In this way, she highlights the importance of teacher practices and the role of the teacher as a policymaker. This idea that teachers are policymakers since as active agents they have the power to transform, contest or reproduce dominant macro-discourses and policies is also shared by other LEP researchers working within the anthropological LP paradigm. In that respect, another good example of research is Johnson's (2010) investigation of how the US 'No Child Left Behind' policy has been interpreted and implemented by educators working within the School District of Philadelphia. Johnson shows that as active agents, educators have interpreted, re-interpreted and appropriated the official policy in various ways. As he puts it, although official policies may set some limits with regard to what is possible in the classroom, "educators make choices, they are not helplessly caught in the ebb and flow of language policies, no matter how strong policy 'discourses' might be" (Johnson 2010: 76). Similarly, drawing on his study on English-and-vernacular-medium education in Gujarat, India, Ramanathan has provided evidence for the agentive power of educators by showing how teachers "harness their students' vernacular resources and literate practices" even within the context of restrictive policies (Ramanathan 2005: 99).

Finally, it needs to be stressed that although proponents of the anthropological approach to LPP have focused on human agency and have criticized the 'critical approach to LPP' for its overemphasis on state power, critical analyses of policy texts and of the discourses that permeate these texts have not been abandoned altogether within the anthropological paradigm. Rather, the proponents of

the anthropological paradigm have argued in favor of a balanced methodological approach that combines critical discourse analysis of macro-state policy texts and discourses with ethnographic data collection (hence the reference in the literature to an “ethnography of LP” (Johnson 2009: 142)) that has the potential to reveal how macro-policies are interpreted and implemented by agents in specific local contexts. As Johnson puts it, analysis needs to incorporate “both critical analyses of local, state, and national policy texts and discourses as well as (ethnographic) data collection on how such policy texts and discourses are interpreted and appropriated by agents in a local context” (Johnson 2009: 142). This is precisely where the interest and focus in practices comes in. However, it is important to highlight the fact that despite this emerging interest in practices, since these practices are always examined against the backdrop of the macro-policy texts that are being implemented by human agents in specific settings, the major language policy making is seen as taking place at the macro (national) level, i.e. to occur outside practice. Further, it needs to be pointed out that despite the emerging interest in practices, by following ethnographic methods, LPP research conducted within the anthropological paradigm was primarily based on interviews and observations. That is, the actual language practices followed by speakers in and during their everyday interaction were not documented in a detailed way. In a more recent approach however, i.e. in the so-called ‘interdisciplinary approach’, actual interactional practices followed by speakers become the focus and are systematically being investigated as part of LP research. It is to a description of this approach that I am turning to in the next section.

3.2.2 The Interdisciplinary Approach to LP and LEP

Although ‘agency’ and discourses about practices have gone on to constitute a major concern in LPP research, in a more recent approach, the scope of language policy research and analysis has been broadened to also include the *actual language practices* followed by speakers in their moment-to-moment interactions in a variety of social settings around the world. More specifically, a number of LP scholars (Ball

1990, 1993, Lin 1996, 2005, 2008) started conducting multi-foci LP research by focusing on: a) macro-level (state) policy texts; b) the discourses and ideologies surrounding these policy texts; c) the agency of the speakers who are involved in the implementation of these policies and d) the actual (micro-level) language practices that these speakers follow.

One of the major tenets of this multi-foci and multi-level approach is that in order to provide decent explanations or accounts in language policy research more than one theories are needed (Ball 1993: 15). As Ball puts it, “the complexity and scope of policy analysis-...-preclude the possibility of successful single theory explanations. What we need in policy analysis is a toolbox of diverse concepts and theories” (Ball 1993: 10). Similarly, Lin has proposed that LP researchers need to adopt the role of a ‘tweener’ (Luke 2002 cited in Lin 2005: 43) who is willing to travel between different disciplines and positions (Lin 2005: 43). She argues that only “by travelling between different disciplinary perspectives, we can develop interilluminating, transdisciplinary, critical theoretical and analytical lenses for researching language-in-education policies and practices” (Lin 2005: 51). Thus, researchers working within this paradigm have drawn on a variety of different epistemological and theoretical approaches (such as interactional sociolinguistics, ethnography of communication, critical discourse analysis) and have conducted both macro-level analyses of policy texts and micro-level analysis of everyday language practices. Further, as evidenced by Lin’s statement above but also by a series of publications (see for example Martin 2005, Lin and Martin 2005, Nunan 2003), LP scholars claimed to be conducting ‘language policy and practice’ rather than ‘language policy and planning’ research. Indeed most researchers that follow an interdisciplinary approach have conducted research at the interface between policy and practice and have engaged in investigating “the conflicts and tensions between language policy and bilingual codeswitching practices” (Wei and Martin 2009: 117). Further, the majority of researchers working within this tradition have primarily conducted research in educational settings. In other words, the interdisciplinary approach to ‘language policy and practice’ has primarily been adopted for the purposes of LEP research (see for example the collection of (2009) studies published in the *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*).

The major thrust of studies conducted within the interdisciplinary ‘language policy and language practice’ paradigm has examined actual language practices (followed in various educational settings around the world) against the backdrop of macro-(national) language-in-education policies. Namely, similarly to the anthropological approach, actual practices have also been examined here vis-à-vis macro-state language-in-education policies in an attempt to get insights into the conflicts and tensions faced by human agents in language policy implementation. Thus, in an attempt to reveal human agency and to show to what extent the practices observed in given settings are in line with a given macro (-national) language policy, practices have been interpreted with reference to given macro-policies. Consequently, similarly to the anthropological approach, in these studies as well, language practices were seen as something distinct from language policy, with language policy making taken to be something that occurs primarily at the macro-national level.

An example of study whereby actual language choice practices are examined against the backdrop of a macro (-national) policy is the “discourse analytic study” (Martin 2005: 93) conducted by Martin in two rural classrooms in Malaysia. In this study, Martin examines the classroom implementation of the Malaysian (2003) language-in-education policy according to which schools were expected to “switch the medium of instruction in mathematics and science from Malaysian to English” (Martin 2005: 75). By focusing on the actual language choice practices followed by participants in two different rural classrooms, his aim is to show “how the language practices in each of these classrooms articulate or disarticulate with the language policy” (ibid). He demonstrates how in one of the classrooms he investigated, teachers and pupils (as active agents) engaged in “safe” practices by allowing the use of English or Malay in the IRF response slot (Martin 2005: 80). He argues that the observed practice is a “safe” practice in the sense that it facilitates comprehension and allows the participants to go on with their lesson (ibid). In fact, as Martin notes, the whole lesson in this classroom is conducted in “a mixture of two languages”, i.e. participants use Malay (one of the school languages) to teach English (the other school language) (Martin 2005: 83). In the second target classroom, the teacher was observed to use both English and Kelabit during the lesson, but only in order to

“gloss words or statements that appear in the text” while the interactional architecture of this classroom positioned the learners into the role of a passive recipient who only provides minimal responses to the teacher’s requests (Martin 2005: 88). Martin characterizes the practices observed in this second target classroom as “safe” in the sense that they allow “classroom participants to be seen to accomplish lessons” (Martin 2005: 89). According to Martin, it is the tensions inherent in the Malaysian language-in-education policy that led to these bilingual ‘safe’ practices at the level of classroom interaction in both classrooms (Martin 2005: 94). Namely, Martin attributes the observed practices to human agency, i.e. he sees the observed bilingual ‘safe’ practices as the participants’ pragmatic response to the demands imposed on them by the Malaysian language-in-education policy.

Lin’s work (1996) can also be seen as representative of this strand of research whereby actual language practices are examined against the backdrop of a given macro (state) language-in-education policy. In her examination of the code-switching practices followed in an English-medium classroom in Hong Kong, Lin analyzed pupils’ and educators’ English-Chinese alternation practices with reference to the ‘English-only’ policy of the school (Lin 1996). She claims that the observed teachers’ language alternation practices across IRE exchanges, although facilitate in a way the teaching and learning process, ultimately reflect “the domination of English academic monolingualism” (Lin 1996: 71) that has been promoted by and is inherent in the Hong Kong’s government policy of streaming students into schools of “one clear medium”, i.e. into an English-only school in that case (Lin 1996: 52). As Lin puts it, the observed teachers’ language alternation practices (referred to as “Cantonese-annotated English academic monolingualism” (Lin 1996: 70)) reflect both the educators’ “resistance and compromise with the monolingual English objectives of the curriculum” (Lin 1996: 68). On the one hand, as active agents, in using Cantonese to annotate key English terms and thus facilitate comprehension, the teachers deviate from the English monolingual governmental policy. On the other hand, by using Cantonese only for annotation purposes rather in order to promote bilingual knowledge, the teachers seem to have accepted that “the official goal of the curriculum is to establish English academic knowledge” (Lin 1996: 71-72). It becomes apparent then that the educators’ language choice practices are examined

here vis-à-vis the macro state and school policy and they are therefore seen as either a direct application or as an instance of deviance from this macro policy.

Further representative examples of studies where practices are examined against the backdrop of policies can be found in the (2009) issue of the *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* edited by Li Wei and Peter Martin. As the editors put it, the main aim of their issue is to bring together studies that “focus on the conflicts and tensions between language policy and bilingual codeswitching practices” (Wei and Martin 2009: 117). To put it differently, the aim of these studies is to reveal any clashes between actual practices followed in specific educational settings and macro-policies imposed by governments and their institutions. Ultimately what comes to the fore through these studies is the agency of participants who are involved in language policy implementation. For example, in their study of actual practices followed in complementary schools in Britain, Wei and Wu (2009) focus on the tensions between “school ideologies and policies and the actual practices” followed by participants in these settings (Wei and Wu 2009: 193). The researchers show that, as active agents, Chinese pupils code switched from Chinese (the official medium of instruction and classroom interaction) to English in order to challenge the authority of their teachers as well as the monolingual policies followed in their schools (Wei and Wu 2009: 196 and 208). Another major finding of this study is that Chinese pupils were creatively drawing on their language skills and linguistic resources in order to “simultaneously follow and flout the rules and norms of behavior in the school” (Wei and Wu 2009: 208). It becomes evident then that in this case as well, researchers have examined participants’ actual language choice practices against the norms of linguistic behavior imposed on them by the school, i.e. against the school’s monolingual policy. Further, other studies published within the same volume (see for example Tien 2009, Raschka et al 2009) focus on how actual language choice practices articulate or disarticulate with specific monolingual policies and the discourses embedded in them.

In summary, both in the anthropological and in the interdisciplinary approach, the investigation of the language practices followed by human agents in specific sites (where macro (national or institutional) language policies are being

implemented) came to be seen as part of language policy research. This is precisely what distinguishes these more recent LP approaches from the earlier approaches discussed in section 3.2 above. Further, as already mentioned in studies following any of those two approaches, practices have been examined against the backdrop of macro (national or institutional) language policies. That is, practice has been conceptualized as distinct from policy and therefore, despite the emerging interest in language practices observed in policy research conducted within the anthropological and the interdisciplinary paradigm one cannot yet speak of language practice itself as policy. However, in another strand of LP research, the distinction between language practice and language policy has been dropped and an expanded view of language policy as something that also includes language practices has been introduced. It is to this strand of research that I am turning to in the next section.

3.3 Practice as Policy

In recent developments in language policy theory (Baldauf 2006; Spolsky 2004) and particularly in the language policy framework proposed by Spolsky (2004), an alternative view of ‘language policy’ and of the relationship between language policy and practice has emerged. More specifically, Spolsky’s view is that language policy can be looked at three levels: a) language management; b) language beliefs and ideology and c) language practices (2004: 39). Language management refers to explicit policies and plans, “what someone else wants (people) ... to do” (Spolsky 2004: 39 and 218). Language beliefs and ideology refer to “what people (themselves) think should be done” while language practices refer to “what people (themselves) actually do” (Spolsky 2004: 14). According to Spolsky, a specific language policy may be revealed in and through the investigation of each of these three components (management, beliefs, and practices). As he puts it

“it (language policy) may be discovered in the linguistic behavior (language practices) of the individual or group. It may also be discovered in the ideology or beliefs about language of the individual or group.

Finally, it may be made explicit in the formal language management or planning decisions of an authorized body” (Spolsky 2004: 217).

Also very importantly, Spolsky claims that each of these components may reveal a different language policy (ibid). Further, it needs to be pointed out that out of these three components, Spolsky prioritizes and places special emphasis on the investigation of actual language practices. As he puts it, “the real language policy of a community is more likely to be found in its practices than its management” (Spolsky 2004: 222). Therefore in order to reveal a community’s “real language policy”, one needs to look not in documents but in “what people actually do” (Spolsky 2004: 14), i.e. to observe their practices. That is to say, the real language policy of a community resides in its practices, hence the notion of “*practiced language policy*” (Papageorgiou 2009a, 2009b, Bonacina 2010).

Further, Spolsky specifies that practices constitute a policy insofar as they are “regular and predictable” (Spolsky 2007:3). Similarly, in an earlier publication, Spolsky and Shohamy argue that insofar as the speakers’ language practices are governed by specific rules, one can talk about a policy (Spolsky and Shohamy 2000:2). In fact, discovering the ‘practiced language policy’ followed by speakers involves identifying the “deducible, implicit rules” that underlie language use (ibid). More specifically, it involves identifying the “set of descriptive and explanatory rules that would somehow capture the idea that members of the community have of appropriate behavior” (Spolsky and Shohamy 2000: 29).

Spolsky’s suggestion that language policy also resides in actual practices constitutes an important contribution to the field of language policy. As we have so far seen, in previous LP research, ‘language policy’ has been conceptualized as something that resides *outside* practice, as something that primarily occurs at the macro (national or institutional) level. Without abandoning this ‘traditional’ conceptualization of language policy (Spolsky himself talks about language management and language beliefs), Spolsky has introduced a third alternative conceptualization of language policy as something that resides *inside* actual practices. In that respect, and contrary to previous approaches that have also focused on actual practices (see 3.2 above), actual practices are taken here to be interesting

and important not because they reveal agency or how certain macro language policies are being challenged or not challenged by speakers, but because they may constitute language policy making in their own right.

In addition, another fundamental element in Spolsky's LP model is that "language policy operates within a speech community of whatever size" (Spolsky 2004: 40). As Spolsky claims, any defined or definable social group or community, "ranging from a family through a sports team or neighbourhood or village or workplace or organization", may have its own language policy and therefore the domain of language policy need not necessarily be the nation state but any of these groups (ibid). In the case of the RK Reception classroom at BES that constitutes the target of my investigation, this means that the members of the RK classroom as a social group may have developed and follow their own language policy.

In short, the major difference between previous LP research (see section 3.2 above) and Spolsky's language policy framework is that while the former views language policies and practices as separate entities and accordingly proposes an examination of language practices vis-à-vis macro language policies, the latter proposes to view language policy as something that also resides in actual practices and accordingly suggests that language practices need to be examined with a view that these may constitute language policy making in their own right.

3.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have reviewed the LP literature and described the major LP and LEP approaches that have emerged throughout the history of the LP and LEP field. In tracing the development of different LP approaches, I have provided a description of their different foci and of their different conceptualizations of the relationship between language policy and practice. With regard to the different foci, we have seen how the LP field has moved from a focus on developing LP models and typologies (traditional approach), to a focus on ideologies and discourses of power and

inequality (critical approach) and then to a focus on agency and actual language practices (anthropological and interdisciplinary approach). Further, we have seen how these shifts in foci have been accompanied by shifts in how the relationship between language policy and practice has been conceptualized. As shown, early approaches (i.e. the traditional and the critical approach) were characterised by their lack of interest in practices. As a result of this lack of interest in practices, no specific conceptualization of the relationship between policy and practice has been adopted in LP work following these paradigms. In more recent approaches however (i.e. in the anthropological and the interdisciplinary approach), language practices came to be seen as part of language policy research while in the major thrust of studies following these more recent paradigms everyday language practices have been examined against the backdrop of macro (national or institutional) language policies. Consequently, language practice and language policy have been conceptualized as distinct entities. In another strand of research though, i.e. in Spolsky's work (2004, 2008), the distinction between language practice and language policy has been dropped and language practices came to be seen not only as part of language policy research but also as constituting language policy making in their own right.

My own investigation of how the conflicting policy demands at BES are actually lived in and during the Reception participants' language choice practices will be informed by Spolsky's LP model and his alternative conceptualization of the relationship between language policy and practice. Namely, drawing on Spolsky's (2004) LP model and his alternative conceptualization of language practice as policy, in this thesis, the language choice practices followed by RK classroom participants will be examined with a view that these practices may constitute language policy making in their own right, i.e. with a view that these practices may constitute the RK community's 'practiced language policy'.

Chapter Four: Research Methods

4.0 Introduction

As shown in Chapter 2, the issues addressed in this study are the following:

- a) How do RK Reception children respond to the conflicting situation imposed on them by the school's language policy and its pedagogical approach?
- b) How do RK school personnel respond to children's actions resulting from the conflicting situation observed in Reception?
- c) How do children themselves react to educators' own actions?

In this Chapter, I move on to the research methods I followed in order to address the issues above. More specifically, I first provide a description of how I got access to the school (BES) (4.1). Next, I proceed with an account of the different types of data I used for the purposes of my research (4.2) and then move on to the exact methods I adopted in order to collect each of these different types of data (4.3). In the following sections, I discuss issues involved in transcribing and translating the data (4.4) as well as ethical issues such as gaining informed consent and ensuring confidentiality and anonymity for the participants (4.5). Finally, I talk about the methodological framework that will inform my analysis (4.6).

4.1 Background of the Research and Issues of Access

In January 2007, I started a PhD research degree at the University of Edinburgh (Linguistics and English Language Department) with a general interest in bilingual classroom interaction. This interest led me to conduct preliminary observations in different bi-(multi)lingual educational contexts in Athens, Greece. More specifically, I have initially sought (February 2007) and gained consent (March 2007) by the

Greek Ministry of Education to conduct preliminary fieldwork (based only on classroom observations) in five different Cross-Cultural schools in Athens. These are schools whose ‘specific purpose is to ensure equality of educational opportunities by offering linguistic and other support to bilingual (immigrant and repatriated) children in the context of mainstream education’ (Papageorgiou 2008). When I first visited these schools, I explained to all educators that I am interested in observing naturally occurring talk in the classroom and invited them to self-select whether they would like me to observe their classes or not. Although many educators in the Cross Cultural schools I visited invited me to observe their classes, in most cases they interpreted my role as that of the evaluator who is hired by the Ministry and therefore engaged in practices that seemed completely unnatural. For example, some educators deviated from the lesson that they had planned and engaged in practices of presenting their students, their linguistic and cultural profile and the difficulties they have in learning Modern Greek. In other cases, no bilingual practices were observed. However, towards the end of my two-month (April-May 2007) preliminary fieldwork in Cross-Cultural state schools, I met a teacher who felt very confident with her teaching practices, i.e. she was happy to include in her lesson languages other than Greek although Greek is the official medium of instruction. It was thanks to the very interesting bilingual practices that I observed in her classroom that I decided that it would be worthwhile conducting my PhD research in this particular classroom. After gaining the informal consent of the teacher of this classroom and that of the Headmaster of this particular school, I applied to the Greek Ministry of Education (May 2007) in order to gain official consent to conduct research (based on audio-recordings and observations) in this specific Cross Cultural state school. At this point, it is important to point out that in order to conduct any kind of research, including applied linguistic or sociolinguistic research in Greek state schools, researchers have to apply to the Greek Ministry of Education which then forwards all the relevant documents to the Greek Institute of Pedagogy, i.e. the body which is responsible for granting permission to researchers to conduct various types of research in Greek state schools. As required by the Ministry, my application was accompanied by: a) a detailed research design explaining the methods of collecting data and the methods of ensuring confidentiality and anonymity for the participants;

b) a brief CV; c) proof of student identity and d) a letter from my supervisory team explaining the motivation for the study. After a few months (November 2007), a member of the evaluation board of the Greek Institute of Pedagogy wrote to me in order to explain the reasons she has been unable to grant me permission to conduct the research proposed. As the member of the Institute of Pedagogy explained, although she thought the proposed research was very interesting and the suggested methods of collecting data were in line with the purposes of the research, permission could not be granted since the Ministry had adopted a ‘blanket ‘no’ policy’ when it comes to audio or video recordings in Greek state schools. Despite my best efforts to explain both to administrators at the Greek Ministry of Education and to inspectors at the Institute of Pedagogy that the audio-recorded data would be used only for the purposes of research and that anonymity for the school and the participants would be ensured, both the Greek Ministry of Education and the Institute of Pedagogy insisted on their ‘no-recordings’ policy. As a result of this denial by the Ministry to grant me permission to conduct research at the specific Cross Cultural school and being aware at that stage of the Ministry’s ‘no-recordings policy’, I started exploring opportunities of conducting research in private (international) schools where access and permission to conduct research could be negotiated locally.

To avoid the access problems I faced in the case of Greek state schools and being aware of the gatekeeping problems and trustworthiness issues that other researchers have faced in educational contexts (for example see Bonacina 2010), in order to gain access to private educational institutions in Greece, I adopted a “bottom-up approach to access” (Silverman 2000) and more specifically I followed Milroy’s (1987) ‘friend of a friend’ access strategy. This strategy, that has also been adopted by Lytra (2003) in her sociolinguistic research in a Greek school setting, allowed me to develop a relationship of “good faith” (Milroy 1987:54) with the people whose behavior I wanted to observe (see below). It needs to be pointed out though that this “bottom-up approach to access” (Silverman 2000) was possible because, contrary to Greek state schools, international schools are independent in ownership and management (and therefore are not under the control of the Ministry) but also because I had contacts working for such private institutions in Athens.

More specifically, since my interest was still in bilingual classroom interaction and in order to get access to private educational institutions where such interaction could potentially take place I drew on the network of friends and acquaintances I had developed throughout my childhood and adolescence. Having attended as a learner of English several ESL programmes in Athens throughout my childhood and adolescence, I had developed strong interpersonal ties with many English-background teachers that work for various private International Schools in Greece. This provided me with a network of friends and acquaintances that I was able to call upon when permission to conduct research in state cross-cultural schools was denied by the Greek Ministry of Education. Drawing on this network of International School educators, I got access and conducted preliminary observations in two different international schools in Athens, Greece. To get access to the first school, (referred to here as ELS for anonymity purposes), I contacted Ms Meimerakis²⁷ that was a former English language tutor of mine and had been working for ELS, a multicultural English medium school, for more than 15 years. In negotiating access to the school and in order to conduct preliminary fieldwork, I introduced myself to school members as a friend of Ms Meimerakis, who is also a language teacher and a researcher. In gaining however access to the various classrooms at ELS and observing their various classes, it turned out that although at ELS, the majority of the participants had access to at least two different languages, in the various classes I observed, only one language was used during classroom interaction. Since ELS turned out to be a monolingual educational context, I decided to turn to another international school (referred to here as BES for anonymity purposes).

In fact it was Ms Meimarakis (my contact at ELS) that suggested conducting preliminary fieldwork at BES since this is another multicultural school that is famous for the quality of English-medium education it offers to non-English background bilingual children²⁸. Also Ms Meimarakis suggested that I could make reference to our relationship in negotiating access to this school since she knew personally many

²⁷ All the names that appear on this thesis constitute fake names.

²⁸ As already mentioned in Chapter 2 (section 2.2), BES's student population includes both Greek national and international students coming from 52 different countries.

BES members of staff and administrators. After this suggestion, I contacted (in December 2007) the Head of Lower School at BES. In that first contact with the Head, I explained that I am friend of Ms Meimarakis and a teacher of English who is currently doing a Research Degree at the University of Edinburgh. Further, we made arrangements to meet so that we can talk in person about my research interests and explore whether they would be happy as a school to co-operate with me for the purposes of my research degree. When we actually met, I provided her with official documents from the University of Edinburgh (Postgraduate Office) confirming my identity as a PhD student. Then she showed me around the Lower School and its various facilities. After this tour, we had a short meeting, during which I talked about my interest in bilingual classroom interaction and asked for the school's consent to conduct preliminary classroom observations at their various grades and classrooms. Shortly after this meeting, the Head notified me that they would be happy as a school to let me observe their classes. Hence, I started my preliminary fieldwork in the school (January 2008). To BES member of staff, I introduced myself as a 'friend of a fellow international school teacher' and further explained that I am also a 'teacher' and a 'post-graduate research student' at Edinburgh University. In turn, BES members of staff introduced me to their pupils as a 'teacher' and 'post-graduate research student' ("Miss Ifigenia is a teacher and researcher and she will be observing our class for the purposes of her research project").

During this preliminary fieldwork, I conducted observation in all grades and classes and in all lessons taught across the Curriculum at BES's Lower School and had extensive informal discussions with BES member of staff about the pedagogy, curriculum and language programme followed in the school. It was however the observations that I conducted at BES's Reception and more specifically the observations conducted at BES's RK classroom, which is a classroom that as shown in Chapter 2 is heavily populated by Greek-background children, that sparked my interest in a research topic that was slightly different from my initial broad interest in bilingual classroom interaction. More specifically, during the first week of my fieldwork, through the observations at BES's Reception and the informal discussions I had with Reception school members my interest shifted from bilingual classroom interaction to the specific problems encountered by educators in this setting. That is,

I became interested in how the conflicting demands brought about by the school's English monolingual policy and its CPAs approach to learning are actually lived during the participants' language choice practices in the play areas (already discussed in section 2.4, Chapter 2). Since for ethical reasons video recording was not feasible, I decided to base my research on audio-recordings (see 4.2 below) and sought BES's consent (see 4.5 below) to conduct such recordings in this particular classroom.

4.2 Nature of Data

For the purposes of my study at BES's Reception, I have adopted a Conversation Analytic approach. A basic requirement of Conversation Analysis is the collection of naturally occurring interactional data. Accordingly, in order to address the research questions explored in this study (see section 4.1 above but also section 2.4 in Chapter 2), only one specific type of data was deemed necessary, i.e. audio-recordings of naturally occurring interactions collected from the RK classroom's CPAs. In order though to be able to contextualize the audio-recorded data and thus facilitate transcription and analysis of the data, fieldnotes taken during observation of classroom participants' interaction in the CPAs were also deemed essential.

In addition, in order to get a more in-depth understanding of the school's language policy and of its pedagogical approach to learning and thus to be able to provide a detailed description of the context of my study (see Chapter 2), the following types of data were also collected, namely:

- a) Policy and Curriculum documents;
- b) Interview data obtained from semi-structured interviews with BES's administrators and Reception educators.

It needs to be stressed though that for the purposes of this thesis, *only the audio-recordings of naturally occurring interactions in the CPAs* will be analysed in the coming chapters (chapters 5-8). Policy and curriculum documents as well as

interview data will only be used for the purposes of describing the context of the study.

4.3 Data Collection Methodology

4.3.1 Policy and Curriculum Documents

Upon arrival at the school, the Headmaster at BES provided me with documents related to the school's policy, i.e. BES's annual review and Reception Booklet. In order to get further information on the school's educational and language policy (National Curriculum for England and Wales, BES mission statement), I conducted on-line and bibliographic research.

4.3.2 Observing and Documenting RK Participants' Interactions in the CPAs

My observations at BES can be divided into two different periods. During the first period, (as already mentioned in 4.1) I conducted observation in all grades and classes at BES. The main objective of these preliminary observations was to familiarize myself with pupils and educators at BES's various classes, develop interpersonal relations and explore possibilities for conducting research in the school. Further, when I decided that the RK classroom would be the target of my research during this preliminary fieldwork stage I started exploring what would be the most appropriate method for collecting data in this classroom. It needs to be stressed though that during this four-week preliminary observations period (January 2008) no recordings were conducted. During the second period (February –April 2008),

observation focused only on RK participants whose conversations I had decided to audio-record. Observations in this second stage were “closely connected to the recording process” in order to “contextualise the recorded data” (Lytra 2003:59) as much as possible. Namely, during these observations, I systematically kept a record (field-notes) of non-verbal aspects of interaction, the movement of pupils from one area to another (composition of the kids’ play groups), and the type of play activities children were involved. I then included these field-notes in the transcripts when I deemed them to be relevant for the interpretation and analysis of Reception participants’ interactions in the CPAs.

One of the most important issues for researchers conducting observation is how to deal with the so-called “observer’s paradox” (Labov 1972, Milroy, Li and Moffat 1991). The observer’s paradox has been defined as the effect that the observer (researcher) may have on the data being collected. Milroy, Li and Moffat maintain that it is better to account for the “observer effect systematically” by addressing the issue straight from the beginning in the fieldwork design rather than assuming that the role of the observer is insignificant (Milroy, Li and Moffat 1991: 293). According to Milroy et al (1991) one way of accounting for the role of the observer and the effect he/she may have on the data is to develop culturally recognizable roles for the fieldworker. Following Milroy, Li and Moffat (1991), throughout my fieldwork at BES I assumed the following socially recognisable roles: a) that of a ‘friend of a friend’, b) that of a ‘teacher’ and c) that of a ‘researcher’.

As already mentioned (in 4.1 above), with BES’s member of staff, I negotiated access to the school and their classroom by introducing myself as ‘a friend of a friend’, ‘fellow teacher’ and ‘post graduate student’. Thus throughout the fieldwork I had an in-between status, i.e. I was both an insider (Greek-background adult that has also lived abroad and is also a teacher) and an outsider (researcher). With regard to the researcher’s outsider status, as Lytra (2003) has put it, it may actually turn out to be valuable since as an outsider the researcher is more sensitive to norms and behaviours that members of a particular classroom culture may consider ‘obvious’ and in this way the researcher’s status as an outsider may sharpen his/her analysis and interpretation of the data (Lytra 2003: 76). Further, as Milroy

(1987) has argued this in-between status of the researcher gives him/her access to a range of different speech styles (Milroy 1987: 62).

With regard to my role as a ‘friend of a friend’ in the field, once I became acquainted with Reception teachers and teaching assistants I was flooded with personal questions (about my age, marital status and background) that I answered in a relaxed and friendly manner. Further, I regularly had lunch with Reception teachers and other BES member of staff. These lunch breaks provided opportunities for informal discussions about personal issues and current affairs. With regard to my role as a teacher, I participated in classroom routines (such as the ‘quiet time’ and ‘register’ routine), helped classroom participants during the ‘tidy up’ routine in the play areas or during lunch time, got involved in discussions about educational issues with teachers and assistants during breaks, attended staff meetings and the school’s performances, and supervised children in the outside CPAs when asked by Miss Karavanta (the RK Reception teacher). With regard to my role as a researcher, from the beginning of my fieldwork in the school, I answered all questions concerning my research and my research degree at the University of Edinburgh. Further, the identity of the researcher was lived in the field in and through practices such as keeping extensive fieldnotes during observations, setting up and keeping an eye on the recording equipment used, and by asking school members clarification questions about routines and practices in Reception.

With pupils, (as already mentioned in 4.1) my roles were that of ‘teacher’ and ‘researcher’ and, as the data show, pupils very often oriented to these teacher-ascribed roles. Namely, they referred to me as ‘Miss Ifigenia’ and used English in order to ask me to provide help with their work or whenever they wanted me to intervene in order to resolve a conflict that had arisen in the peer group (see for example Chapter 6, extract 23 and Appendix 4, extract 17). At other times though, kids challenged my adult roles by using Greek³⁰ or by referring to me simply by using my first name (i.e. as ‘Ifigenia’) (see Appendix 4, extracts 23-25), i.e. by engaging in practices that deviated from those that kids typically followed with their educators. With regard to my role as a researcher, as already mentioned, this was

³⁰ This was mainly done to assess my proficiency in Modern Greek, see Appendix 4, extract 25.

lived in the field by keeping notes and setting up and checking the recording equipment. In connection with my identity as a researcher, children only oriented to it in the initial stages of data collection when they asked questions about the recording equipment (see for example extract 1 below) and the purpose of my presence in the school. After the first week of recordings however, the kids did not reveal any orientation to my identity as a researcher. On my part though, this identity was lived by acting as a semi-participant observer (Martin et al 2003: 5) of children's play interaction in the CPAs. That is, as a researcher who is conducting semi-participant observation, I observed and kept notes of the kids' behaviour and only partially participated in their play activities, i.e. I participated in their play activities only whenever I was invited to do so.

In sum, by following Milroy, Li and Moffat (1991), I have tried to make the observation procedures more accountable and replicable by assuming through my fieldwork at BES's RK classroom, the following socially recognisable roles: a) that of a 'friend of a friend', b) that of a 'teacher' and c) that of a 'researcher'.

4.3.3 Audio-Recordings

As mentioned before, in order to address the main research aim of my thesis, samples of naturally occurring interaction in the CPAs were necessary. Such samples would involve both child-child talk as well as talk between adults and children. Between February 2008 and April 2008, I recorded RK classroom conversations within the usual school's timetable, at the rate of three recording sessions per week. Each recording session lasted for approximately 75 minutes and overall 23 such sessions were conducted.

For each recording session, I used two digital voice-recorders, thus recording conversations in indoor and outdoor RK CPAs simultaneously. Recording interactions both in the indoor CPAs (where the Reception teacher was present, overheard the kids' play interactions and engaged from time to time in conversations with them) and the outdoor CPAs (where apart from the researcher no other adult-

BES member of staff was present) was deemed necessary in order to be able to collect samples of both child-child talk and adult-children's talk.

In each case I tried to record the kids 'CPAs-wise'. That is to say, during the CPA period in Reception, I would place one of the recorders in one of the indoor CPAs and the other in one of the outdoor CPAs and leave the recorders there for as long as there were kids that were playing. Since Reception kids usually moved from one area to another (see section 2.3.3.1, Chapter 2), within one recording session it was possible to record different groups of children in each of the target CPAs. Hence I managed to get at least a minimal amount of recording of all RK children. In those cases though where a play group completely abandoned the CPA that was being recorded with no other pupils moving in, I followed this last play group in the new CPA of their choice.

With regard to the effect that the recording equipment may have on the data collected, Duranti has argued that "with the exception of obvious camera behaviours (e.g. certain kinds of camera-recognitions or salutations like staring into the camera and smiling), people do not invent social behaviour, language included out of the blue" (Duranti 1997: 118). Further, based on her research experience in a bilingual classroom setting in Greece, Lytra notes that people are too "involved in their own lives to make significant alternations just for the sake of the tape-recorder" (Lytra 2003: 71). As my own data shows (see extract 1 below), although there were occasions (only during the first two recording sessions) that children noticed the recording equipment and departed from their own play activities to ask questions about it, this departure was only temporary with the kids returning to their own play interaction after a few turns. Therefore, there is no indication in my data that the use of an audio-recorder resulted in any unnatural behaviour, including at the level of language choice.

Extract 1

Drawing Area: Steve, Anna, Europi, Nikos, Ifigenia

1. Anna : **why you put it here?**
 2. Ifigenia: **it is about my project**
 3. Anna: **you have two**
 4. Steve: **why?**
 5. Ifigenia: **please will you make sure nobody touches it? eh? is it ok?**
 6. Steve: **(I will touch it)**
 7. (.)
 8. Ifigenia: **It will stop If you press a key it will stop recording**
 9. Steve: **my dad has one but it is eh grey**
 10. Ifigenia: **ah all right**
 11. (0.3)
 12. Europi: to pira
 13. Nikos: to pira haha pios theli na kano ena mikro kastraki?
 14. Anna and Europi: ego
 15. (...)
-
12. Europi: I took it
 13. Nikos: haha I took it who would like me to make a castle?
 14. Anna and Europi: me
 15. (...)

4.3.4 Semi-Structured Interviews

Throughout my fieldwork in the school, I regularly engaged in informal discussions with BES's educators and made sure I asked clarification questions. In this way it was possible to cross-check my emerging understanding and interpretation of different aspects of the educational environment at BES's Reception. However, in order to get a more 'formalized' understanding of the school's language policy and of its pedagogical approach to learning, I conducted interviews with BES administrators and Reception educators. Additionally, the interviews were an opportunity for me to ask clarification questions on issues that emerged during the collection of conversational data. Thus, having completed my four-month fieldwork (January-April 2008) in the school, and after having spent a few months (April-September 2008) liaising with my supervisors and the Edinburgh University academic community, I returned to the school in November 2008 to interview BES's member of staff. By that time and because my fieldwork in the school preceded the interviews, I had already established strong interpersonal ties with Reception educators. The interviews took a semi-structured format. Also, I conducted both

individual and group interviews for the latter are widely recognized to lead to exchanges between interviewees (Rampton 1992; 1995), and, therefore to better insights into the issues³¹ at hand.

4.4 On Transcribing and Translating the Data

Bloom suggests that in order to avoid being overwhelmed by details, transcribers need to see themselves as interpreters of the event, rather than providers of description (Bloom 1993: 153). Further, as Danby and Baker note, “what is transcribed and what is left out by the transcribers means that the transcription process and outcomes are not neutral but reflect the transcribers’ theoretical interests” (Danby and Baker 1998: 161). Similarly, Ochs speaks of “transcription as theory” and argues that “transcription is a selective process reflecting theoretical goals and definitions” (Ochs 1979: 44).

Drawing on this conceptualisation of transcription as “theory” (ibid) and with an interest in RK participants’ language choice practices, audio-recorded conversational data were transcribed only taking into account details deemed relevant for the purposes of the study. The transcription system employed draws mainly on Gail Jefferson’s system as described in Atkinson and Heritage (2006) with some additional conventions used to indicate language contrast³² (see Appendix 2 for transcription conventions).

As I have already indicated, the data used in this thesis were only audio-recorded. As a result, non-verbal features of talk were not captured on the tape. However, as I observed most of the interactions as they unfolded, I have been able to note some of the significant non-verbal features and, in the transcripts, I have indicated them when I deemed them to be significant for the interpretation and analysis of the data (see also 4.3.2 above).

³¹ For a list of topics covered during these interviews see Appendix 1.

³² Contrary to conversation data, interview data were transcribed by using standard orthography since these data have only been used for the purposes of providing a detailed description of the context (Chapter 2).

Transcribing Greek conversations is a concern for many Greek sociolinguists as the Greek alphabet is not as easily accessible as the Latin alphabet. Thus, some Greek sociolinguists transcribe their data phonetically (using the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), e.g. Georgakopoulou 1997; Makri-Tsilipakou 1994; Pavlidou 1991), while others have argued against this practice. For example, according to Lytra (2003) “phonetic details with respect to the rules of Greek pronunciation and the particulars of the Greek articulatory context does not enhance the readers’ understanding of the original text” (Lytra 2003: 77-78). On the other hand, among researchers of bilingual conversation it is common practice to transliterate their data by using the Roman alphabet (e.g. Johnson 1985, Wei 1994, 2002). In line with this practice, I have opted for the use of Latin characters to facilitate the reading of the Greek original text³³.

With respect to the English translation of Greek excerpts, a free translation rather than a word for word translation is provided. Concerning transcription conventions, due to differences in word order rules between the two languages intra-turn pauses and overlaps are not marked in the English translation.

4.5 Ethical Considerations: Getting Informed Consent and Ensuring Anonymity

As I pointed out, for the purposes of my preliminary fieldwork in the school I initially gained BES’s consent only for conducting observations (see 4.1 above). Since during these preliminary observations I developed an interest in the language choice practices of a particular classroom at BES and since for ethical reasons video recording in the target classroom was not feasible, I later on (end of January 2008) sought BES’s consent for audio recordings and classroom observations. More specifically, I explained the process I would follow in order to collect data and reassured all participants that recordings and all other types of data would be used only for the purposes of research. I also emphasised the fact that any teacher’s or

³³ For the Romanization Conventions I followed see Appendix 2.

pupil's decision not to participate would be respected as well as their right to withdraw from the study at any time. BES administrators and members of staff were then asked to complete and sign consent forms (see Appendix 3). Once members of staff agreed to participate, both me and the Head of Lower School sent out letters to RK pupils' parents (see Appendix 3) informing them about my study and asking them to give their consent in order for their children to participate. I also had a session with RK pupils during which I presented my recording equipment to them, talked about my project, and asked for their oral consent. Once permission from all the parties had been gained, I proceeded to the collection of data.

Following BAAL's 'Recommendations on Good Practice' (BAAL 1994:9), confidentiality and anonymity has been respected and ensured by concealing identities of all classroom participants. This has been accomplished by replacing in all transcripts their real names with invented ones. It needs to be stressed that none of the names that appear in this thesis are real names.

4.6 Data Analysis

As I have already pointed out (section 4.2), in order to address the research questions explored in this study, I used transcripts of audio-recorded naturally occurring interaction in the RK CPAs. To analyze these conversational data, two frameworks will be brought to interact, namely: a) Spolsky's (2004) LP framework and b) a broad Conversation Analytic approach that includes both sequential and categorization analysis (Auer 1984, Gafaranga 2000, 2001, 2005, 2007a; 2009). At some point (Chapter 7) though, for the purposes of analyzing the phenomenon of medium requests (Gafaranga 2011) observed in my data, I will be moving beyond the scope of CA and will also be drawing on Discourse Analysis and more specifically I will be drawing on Blum-Kulka's (1987, 1989) discourse analytic work on different request types. Although CA and Discourse Analysis different in terms of their foci and methods, the incorporation of Discourse Analysis in the study at hand

was deemed necessary in order to provide a detailed description of the various request strategies that educators in Reception employ and their level of directness.

With regard to the adoption of Spolsky's framework (already discussed in Chapter 3, section 3.4), by following Spolsky's alternative conceptualization of 'language policy' and of the relationship between language policy and practice (see section 3.4, Chapter 3), in this dissertation, the language choice practices followed by the members of the RK Reception classroom at BES will be examined with a view that these may constitute language policy making in their own right, i.e. with a view that these practices may be part of the 'practiced language policy' followed at RK's Reception classroom. However, as it has already been pointed out elsewhere (Papageorgiou 2009b, Bonacina 2010), although Spolsky argued that language choice practices are interesting and important, he did not further specify what methodological framework can be used in order to reveal '*practiced language policies*'. In other words, there is no specification in his language policy model of what methodological approach one can adopt in order to identify the '*practiced language policy*' followed by a given community of speakers (ibid). There are though some hints in his work that a CA approach could be used to reveal practiced language policies.

More specifically, there are statements in his work that seem to echo some basic tenets that underlie CA³⁴. Firstly, Spolsky argues that for the purposes of discovering the language policy of a community one needs to "look at what people do and not at what they think should be done or what someone else wants them to do" (Spolsky 2004: 218). Spolsky's focus here on actual interaction echoes the CA insistence on studying 'naturally occurring conversations' (Heap 1990, Goodwin and Heritage 1990, Liddicoat 2007). Further, Spolsky claims that the language choices made by members are "governed by conventional rules" (Spolsky 2004: 9), i.e. that members' choices are not random. This claim echoes the Conversation Analytic assumption that "talk is an orderly activity" (Gafaranga 2009: 101) and that consequently the task of the analyst is to describe that order (Psathas 1995:2, see also

³⁴ For a brief discussion of the basic tenets of CA see discussion below. For more detailed discussion of CA, see Goodwin and Heritage 1990, Liddicoat 2007 and Psathas 1995.

discussion below). Moreover, Spolsky defines 'practices' as those "deducible, implicit rules that seem to underlie the language use of a defined community" and that capture "the idea that members of the community have of appropriate behaviour" (Spolsky and Shohamy 2000: 2 and 29). This statement by Spolsky echoes the CA and Ethnomethodological notion of norm. In Ethnomethodological and CA terms, a norm is that "scheme" of interpretation (Garfinkel 1967) that participants use to interpret each other acts. It is "a point of reference or action template for interpretation" (Seedhouse 2004: 10). In addition, Spolsky notes that in investigating the language policy of a specific community of speakers one needs to take into account that "several parties in the community may each have their own conflicting policy...For this reason, it makes sense to look generally at the policy revealed in the language practices of the society"(Spolsky 2004: 222). This suggestion by Spolsky, namely that language policy may be revealed in the language practices of members of a community hints to the possibility of adopting an 'emic' perspective for the investigation of 'practiced language policy', i.e. points to the possibility of revealing the language policy of a community as this is manifested in members' own behaviour. This 'emic' perspective constitutes another central tenet of the Conversation Analytic approach (see discussion below). Finally, Spolsky and Shohamy argue that "in order to study a community's "deducible and implicit rules" one needs to study their "nonobservance" (2000: 29). As they put it, the community's rules "are not always observable, but...their nonobservance is noticeable, in the way that a car driving faster than the speed limit is noticeable but does not disprove the existence of a law controlling speed" (2000: 29). This reference to nonobservance echoes a specific methodology used by Conversation Analysts, known as Deviant Case Analysis (Heritage 1984, 1988). Deviant Case Analysis involves as its name suggests at looking at cases that are deviant, i.e. that depart from an already established rule/norm (ibid). It becomes evident then that although Spolsky did not explicitly state what methodological approach one can adopt to reveal the 'practiced language policy' followed by a given speech community, there are plenty of hints in his work to suggest that the adoption of a Conversation Analytic approach could be useful towards this direction.

Indeed previous work has demonstrated (Papageorgiou 2009b, Papageorgiou and Gafaranga 2011, Bonacina 2010) that a broad CA methodological framework that includes both a sequential and categorization analysis of bilingual talk can be successfully used in order to reveal ‘practiced language policies’. More specifically, this previous work has shown that the methodological gap in Spolsky’s work can be addressed if ‘practiced language policies’ are viewed as interactional norms and then the CA approach to language choice is adopted in order to reveal these norms (Papageorgiou 2009b, Bonacina 2010).

Drawing on the previous successful applications of CA in the discovery of ‘practiced language policies’, in this dissertation, a broad CA approach to language choice will be used in the investigation of the language choice practices followed in the RK Reception classroom at BES. This broad CA approach draws on both the ‘Conversation Analytic model of code-switching’ (Auer 1984, Gafaranga 2007a, 2009, Li Wei 2002, 2005) and the MCA perspective to language choice (Gafaranga 2001, 2005). Each of these models/perspectives is described in the two following sections. More specifically, in the next section (4.6.1), I briefly describe the basic tenets of Conversation Analysis that have permeated the CA model of code-switching and then move on to the two different organisational explanations that have been offered within this model, namely the “local order” and the “overall order” explanation of language alternation (Gafaranga 2007a, 2007b). I then provide examples of play interaction and classroom discourse studies whereby the CA approach to language choice has been applied. In the following section (4.6.2), I present the MCA approach to language choice and the basic MCA principles that have permeated this approach. Finally, I talk about studies that have adopted this perspective in the study of classroom talk.

4.6.1 The Conversation Analytic Approach to Language Choice

Conversation Analysis (henceforth CA) has been characterised as a “mentality” (Schenkein 1978), as an “attitude” (Psathas 1995) and as a “style of work” (Wooffitt

2005)³⁵. Even though it has its origins in sociology (Sacks 1984: 26) and more specifically in that branch of sociology called Ethnomethodology (developed by Harold Garfinkel) the CA ‘mentality’ has also been adopted in other disciplines such as linguistics, discursive psychology, childhood studies etc. As Gafaranga notes, although CA has expanded to other disciplines, its main concern remains the same (Gafaranga 2007b: 115). Namely, the CA’s central aim is to study “the order/organization/orderliness of social action, particularly those social actions that are located in everyday interaction, in discursive practices, in the sayings/tellings/doings of members of society” (Psathas 1995: 2). This interest in the orderliness of social action points to two of the major assumptions that permeate CA. Firstly, CA is based on the assumption that “*talk is social action* i.e. that people do things while talking” (Gafaranga 2007b:115, emphasis in the original). In fact, Conversation analysts are not only interested in the acts accomplished by interlocutors during interaction but also in the organisation of interlocutors’ acts, i.e. they have a specific interest “in the syntactical relations among the acts of different persons mutually present to one another” (Goffman 1967: 2). This interest is indissolubly linked to the second assumption that permeates CA, i.e. that “*talk is an orderly activity*” (Gafaranga 2007b: 117, emphasis in the original). Accordingly, Conversation analysts claim that the task of the analyst is to discover and describe that order (ibid). More specifically, Conversation analysts talk about the “sequential organization” of talk (Wilson 1991, Schegloff 2007a), i.e. they maintain that talk is organised in a turn by turn, step by step manner and they therefore propose a sequential analysis of talk in interaction. Another basic tenet of CA is that ‘emic’ rather than ‘etic’ accounts of order need to be provided, i.e. any phenomenon in talk in interaction needs to be interpreted from the participants’ own (emic) rather than the researcher’s (etic) perspective (Pike 1967, Heritage 1988, Gafaranga 2007b, Psathas 1995). Thus in the analysis of any observable phenomenon rather than attempting to answer the question “what does this mean to me, the analyst”, the question in CA is “what does this mean to the actors” (Schutz 1964), i.e. what a given observable phenomenon “mean(s) for participants themselves” (Gafaranga

³⁵ In my review of the basic principles of CA that have permeated the CA model of code-switching, I am following Gafaranga (2009).

2007b: 117). CA's insistence on the adoption of an emic perspective and on conducting a sequential analysis of talk is based on another CA assumption, i.e. the assumption "that conversational orders are resources that participants draw on in organizing their interaction" (Gafaranga 2009: 118). That is, conversational orders are seen as tools used by participants themselves in and during interaction (ibid). These tools can be meaningfully used and accordingly interpreted by interlocutors thanks to the "normative nature of conversational orders" (ibid). This normativity of conversational orders constitutes another central tenet in CA. Namely, according to the CA 'mentality' each conversational structure works as 'scheme of interpretation' (Garfinkel 1967) with reference to which participants interpret each other's acts as being either normative or deviant (Heritage 1984; 1988). In those cases where interlocutors' acts are seen as deviant, participants draw inferences as to why the normative course of action has not been followed (ibid).

Apart from the founding principles described above, CA has also proposed a specific position with regard to the relationship between talk and context. This position is reflected in what is referred to as the issue of "relevance" and "procedural consequentiality" of context (Schegloff 1991). The issue of 'relevance' goes back to Schegloff (1991) who argued that the relevance of any categories for the analysis of talk cannot be assumed. Rather analysts need to show which categories or aspects of the context are demonstrably being oriented by the participants, i.e. which aspects of the context are demonstrably relevant for participants themselves. As Schegloff puts it, the analyst needs to show "from the details of the talk or other conduct in the materials that we are analyzing that those aspects of the scene are what the parties are oriented to. For that is to show how the parties are embodying for one another the relevancies of the interaction and are thereby producing the social structure" (Schegloff 1991: 51). Also Schegloff argues that the analyst needs to show not only which aspects of the context are 'relevant' for the participants but also to investigate if these aspects have some "procedural consequentiality" (Schegloff 1991: 53). That is, the analyst needs to show whether and how the fact that the talk is being conducted in a specific setting (i.e. in a hospital) has any consequences for "the shape, form, trajectory, content, or character of the interaction that the parties conduct" (ibid).

Drawing on these insights from CA, Auer (1984) was the first to introduce the Conversation Analytic (CA) approach to language alternation. Following the CA assumption that “talk is action” (Gafaranga 2009: 119), Auer has proposed to view “bilingualism primarily as a set of complex *linguistic activities*” (Auer 1988: 167; my emphasis). Further, being informed by the CA tenet of the sequential organisation of talk, he emphasized the “sequential implicativeness of language choice in conversation” (Auer 1984: 5). Namely, he drew attention to the fact that speakers’ language choices exert an influence on subsequent language choices of both current and next speaker (ibid). As he puts it: “While the preceding verbal activities provide the contextual frame for a current utterance, the following utterance by a next participant reflects his or her interpretation of that preceding utterance” (Auer 1995: 116). Accordingly, he insisted on taking up a sequential approach to language alternation, i.e. he proposed a turn-by-turn and a turn component by turn component analysis of language alternation, and it is precisely for this reason that his approach has been characterised as the “local order” approach to language choice (Gafaranga 2007a; 2007b). Additionally, by embracing the CA suggestion for the adoption of an emic perspective, Auer has argued that the purpose of any investigation of language choice should be to describe what is “interactionally relevant and real, not just a scientific construct designed to ‘fit the data’... to *“analyze members’ procedures to arrive at local interpretations of language alternation”* (Auer 1984:3; italics in the original). As he notes the advantage of the emic approach is that “it limits the external analysts’ interpretational leeway because it relates his or her interpretations back to the members’ mutual understanding of their utterances as manifest in their behaviour” (Auer 1984: 6). Further, following the CA tenet that concerns the normativity of conversational structures, Auer argued that bilingual participants are able to meaningfully use and accordingly interpret each other’s language choice acts because language alternation works within a normative framework. Auer has termed this normative framework “preference for same language talk” (Auer 1984:23). More specifically, he argued that in bilingual interaction interlocutors can meaningfully use language alternation because the principle of ‘preference for same language talk’ is at work, i.e. he argued that bilingual interaction is organised around the principle of ‘preference for same

language talk' (Auer 1984; 1988; 1995). According to this principle that works for bilingual participants as their 'scheme of interpretation' (Garfinkel 1967), once a turn or a turn constructional unit is delivered in one language, participants have two options, either to keep using that same language or to use a different language. Auer maintains that the preferred course of action is to continue in the same language. Since every language choice act is interpreted with reference to this 'preference for same language talk', any divergences from the language of the preceding turn can be meaningfully used and accordingly interpreted in and during bilingual conversation³⁶.

Based on his principle of 'preference for same language talk', Auer distinguishes between two different types of language alternation. He talks about "discourse-related" alternation, i.e. alternation that is related to "the organization of the ongoing interaction" (Auer 1984: 12) and "participant-related" alternation, i.e. alternation that is related to the participants' "language preference" (Auer 1984: 12 and 24). To fully understand what Auer means when he talks about language alternation that has to do with the 'language preference' of the participants, it has to be pointed out that 'language preference' is not taken here to mean "any kind of psychological concept...What the term refers to are rather the interactional processes of displaying and ascribing predicates to individuals" (Auer 1998: 8). According to Auer, there are two different types of 'language preference', i.e. preference that has to do with the participant's linguistic competence and preference linked to ideological reasons (Auer 1995: 125). Accordingly, Torras and Gafaranga speak of "competence-related" or "ideology-related" language preference (Torras and Gafaranga 2002). In this dissertation, in order to account for what is going in my data, the term '*institutionally-assigned language preference*' will also be used. This term (and third type of preference) will be used to refer to the preference observed in the institutional context at hand for the use of a particular language in and during the enactment of the institutional identity of 'teacher' and 'pupil'. Apart from the type of preference and no matter whether it is competence or ideology-related, Auer has also

³⁶ Note that it is against the 'preference for same language talk' that Auer defines language alternation, i.e. he conceptualises language alternation as any divergence from the language of the prior turn or turn construction unit (Auer 1988: 137).

noted that when participants in interaction have diverging ‘language preferences’, “a tension between participants using different languages” (Auer 1984: 23) may arise in interaction and participants may engage in what Auer calls “language negotiation sequences” (Auer 1984: 20). These are sequences that “begin with a disagreement between two or more parties about which language to use for interaction, and end as soon as one of them ‘gives in’ to the other’s preferred language” (Auer 1984: 20-21).

Finally, based on structural considerations, Auer proposes a distinction between transfer and code-switching. Transfer refers to language alternation that is “tied to a particular conversational structure (for instance, a word, a sentence, or larger unit)”, while code switching refers to language alternation that is “tied to a particular point in conversation” (Auer 1984: 12). Both code-switching and transfer may be participant or discourse related (Auer 1984:24 and 26).

In summary, as we have seen on the basis of his principle of ‘preference for same language talk’ Auer conceptualised the norm of bilingual interaction to be the use of only one language per turn or TCU while on the basis of this monolingual norm language alternation (code-switching or transfer) is seen as a case of functional deviance that is either participant-related or discourse-related. This ‘local order’ approach to language choice has been criticised by Gafaranga (2000b, 2007a) mainly for three reasons. Firstly, as Gafaranga notes, although Auer’s aim was to develop an account of language alternation that does “justice to bilingual participants’ conversational practices” (Auer 2000: 137 cited in Gafaranga 2007a: 133), his category of ‘participant-related transfer’ (Auer 1984) is particularly problematic in that respect since on some occasions transfer may be oriented to by bilingual participants as repairable while in others it is not (Gafaranga 2000: 330-331). Hence, it is apparent that the bilingual participants’ differential orientation to language alternation and particularly the possibility for them to orient to language alternation as an instance of repairable deviance are not captured in Auer’s model and in the categories he developed (Gafaranga 2007a: 146). Secondly, Gafaranga criticised Auer’s framework for its insistence on a turn component by turn component analysis of code switching on the basis that such sequential analysis fails to account for language alternation that takes place within turn constructional units (TCU)

(Gafaranga 2007a). As he puts it, “it is not clear how sequential analysis can be used to describe language alternation which occurs within the same TCU, either by the same speaker or by two speakers” (Gafaranga 2007a: 133-134). Thirdly, as Gafaranga observed, Auer’s view of language alternation as an instance of deviance from the language of the preceding turn or TCU fails to account for “language negotiation sequences” since “deviance presupposes an already established norm” (Gafaranga 2007a: 148). In those sequences however, as Gafaranga demonstrates, precisely because there is no established norm, bilingual participants attempt in and through language alternation to achieve alignment at the level of language choice, i.e. bilingual participants are negotiating what the norm they are orienting to is (ibid). Therefore by seeing in those cases language alternation “merely as a case of deviance”, Auer fails to “adequately capture participants’ work” (ibid).

In order to address the problems inherent in Auer’s ‘local order’ approach, Gafaranga (Gafaranga 1999, 2000b, 2001, 2007a, 2007b, 2009, Gafaranga and Torras 2001; 2002; Torras and Gafaranga 2002) went on to develop an alternative “overall order” framework for language choice. One of the central tenets in this approach is that “while it is true that many aspects of conversational organisation can be explained locally, there are others for which reference must be made to the overall organisation” (Gafaranga 2007a: 135). In other words, Gafaranga has argued that apart from the ‘local level’ organisation of bilingual talk, i.e. its step by step, turn by turn organisation, bilingual interaction, like any other interaction, is also organised at the overall level. Gafaranga’s ‘overall order’ approach is based on the notion of “medium” (Gafaranga 2007a: 138). The ‘medium’ refers to the base code (Gafaranga 2007a: 145) of interaction that works as a type of social norm, i.e. as a ‘scheme of interpretation’ with reference to which both analysts and bilingual participants themselves interpret language alternation acts (Gafaranga 2007a: 138-140). Since the medium works as a grid with reference to which language choice acts are interpreted, determining the base language of interaction constitutes a constant concern both for analysts and bilingual participants (Gafaranga 2007a: 139). As Gafaranga puts it:

“analysts need to determine the base language in order to carry out their analyses of language alternation in an accountably orderly manner, and

participants need to establish the base language for their interaction in order to go about talking in an orderly manner” (ibid).

In fact, the bilingual participants’ need for establishing the base language of interaction is evident in ‘language negotiation sequences’ (ibid). In these sequences, bilingual participants attempt to settle the issue of language choice, i.e. they attempt to reach some agreement with regard to what the base code of their interaction is. However, since these sequences “are the exception rather the norm” (Gafaranga 2007a: 142) (i.e. in most cases bilingual participants deal with the issue of the base language of their interaction implicitly), analysts cannot rely only on those sequences in order to “witness the base language as it has been decided by participants themselves” (ibid). To address this methodological problem of telling the base language of interaction from the emic perspective, Gafaranga has developed and suggested the following methodological approach. Drawing on Heritage’s (1988) ‘Deviant Case analysis’, he argued that since the medium works as a social norm, any language choice act is seen by bilingual participants as either normative or deviant with respect to the relevant norm and accordingly informs participants’ acts in two ways (Gafaranga 2007a: 142). If the act is normative, it goes unnoticed by participants. If the act is deviant, participants notice the deviance and either repair³⁷ it, i.e. they engage in what Gafaranga calls “medium repair activities” (Gafaranga 2000; 2007a; 2009), or they take it to be functional. Particularly useful for the discovery of the ‘medium’ are those instances of repairable deviance, because “by repairing an act, participants reveal what they themselves hold the norm to be” (Gafaranga 2007a: 142). Thus, by observing the bilingual participants’ own activities, and in particular their repair activities, it becomes possible to discover the base language that participants are orienting to for the purposes of current interaction.

Gafaranga’s point that participants are orienting to a particular norm, to a particular base language, for their interaction is indissolubly linked with his argument that “language choice is an aspect, not of the local order, but rather of the overall order in talk organisation” (Gafaranga 2007a: 143). This is not however the

³⁷ For a discussion on ‘repair’ and ‘medium repair’ see also Chapter 5, section 5.1.

only difference between Gafaranga's 'overall order' and Auer's 'local order' approach to language choice. Their frameworks differ in one more very important respect. As Gafaranga demonstrates the norm that informs bilingual participants' acts need not necessarily be monolingual (Gafaranga 2007a: 144). It can also be bilingual (ibid). Therefore he concludes that actually "speakers don't speak a language" (Gafaranga and Torras 1998). They use a "code" which may be monolingual just as it may be bilingual (Gafaranga and Torras 2001). And it is precisely for this reason, i.e. in order to be able to capture the possibility open to all bilingual participants to orient to a bilingual norm, to a bilingual "base code", that he uses the term 'medium' (Gafaranga 2007a: 145). Accordingly, he reformulates Auer's 'preference for same language talk' to "preference for same medium talk" (Gafaranga and Torras 2002, Gafaranga 2007a; 2007b; 2009). It is against the backdrop of this 'preference of same medium talk' that all language choice practices are interpreted in interaction.

Considering language choice to be an aspect of the overall organisation of bilingual interaction, Gafaranga (2007a) has been able to identify the following types of language alternation. Firstly, he talks about alternation that takes place "in the context of negotiating the medium" (Gafaranga 2007a: 148), i.e. in the context of "medium negotiation" sequences (Gafaranga and Torras 2001). In this way Gafaranga addresses the gap of Auer's approach that, as shown above, failed to capture the work accomplished by bilingual interlocutors during these negotiation sequences. Secondly, Gafaranga talks about language alternation which occurs "in the context of an already established medium" (Gafaranga 2007a: 148). In this case, there are two different possibilities:

- a) The alternate use of two languages being itself the norm, the medium, the participants are using. This possibility is referred to as "alternation itself as the medium" (ibid) or as the "bilingual medium" (Gafaranga and Torras 2001: 206). Thus contrary to Auer's categories that are based on the assumption that participants use only one language at a time, in and through this 'bilingual medium' category, Gafaranga manages to account for the possibility open to all bilingual participants to normatively orient to their two languages as the norm of their interaction.

- b) Language alternation being oriented to as an instance of deviance from the medium. For those instances where any deviance from the medium is oriented to by participants as repairable, Gafaranga uses (as shown above) the term “medium repair” (Gafaranga 2007a: 148). In and through his category of ‘medium repair’, Gafaranga paves the way for the description of repair phenomena in bilingual interaction that were left unaccounted for in Auer’s approach. Further, for those cases where any deviance from the medium is oriented by participants as non repairable, i.e. as functional, Gafaranga (2007a) uses the term “medium suspension” (the term “interactional otherness” is also used to refer to those cases of functional deviance (Gafaranga and Torras 2002: 19)). Gafaranga’s category of ‘medium suspension’ can be seen as being equivalent to Auer’s category of ‘discourse-related transfer’ (Gafaranga 2007a: 146). However, it needs to be emphasized that in and through ‘discourse-related transfer’ Auer accounted only for the possibility of departing, suspending a monolingual medium (ibid). On the other hand, in and through ‘medium suspension’, Gafaranga accounts both for the possibility of departing from a monolingual medium and the possibility of departing from a bilingual medium. In fact, as he explicitly states “the departed-from medium just like the deviated-into medium” may be monolingual just as it may be bilingual (Gafaranga 2007a: 206).

To summarize, within the CA approach to language choice and language alternation, two different models have been developed, i.e. the so-called ‘local order’ (Auer’s model) and the so-called ‘overall order’ model (Gafaranga’s model). Although the first one suggests that bilingual interaction is organized around the principle of ‘preference for same language talk’, the second one suggests that bilingual interaction is organized around the principle of ‘preference for same medium talk’.

4.6.2 Conversation Analysis, Bilingual Classroom Talk and Child-Child Bilingual Interaction

As already mentioned in Chapter 2, this study focuses on an investigation of how the conflict brought about by the school's policies is actually lived during RK participants' language choice acts in the CPAs. This involves an exploration of language choice during teacher-child interaction (i.e. of language choice in classroom talk) and during child-child interaction. Given this fact, in this section, I turn to a review of studies that have drawn on CA in order to investigate: a) code switching and language choice in the classroom and b) child-child interaction.

As we have seen in section 4.6.1 above, Auer was the first to introduce the study of language choice and language alternation from an organizational perspective. Drawing on CA's founding principles, he argued that language alternation is a conversational activity that needs to be studied in its sequential environment, i.e. on a turn-by-turn basis (Auer 1984, 1995). Further, as already mentioned in the previous section, based on their function, Auer has identified two different types of language alternation, i.e. 'discourse-related' and 'participant-related' code-switching. Auer's framework and particularly his distinction between 'discourse-related' and 'participant-related' language alternation has been taken up in various studies of bilingual classroom talk (see for example Arthur 1996, Martin 1999, 2003, Liebscher and Dailey-O' Cain 2005). As Martin-Jones has noted, particularly Auer's notion of 'participant-related' code switching turned out to be a very useful one for the study of bilingual classroom talk since "classrooms are settings where conversational participants typically have differing language abilities and communicative repertoires" (Martin-Jones 1995: 99-100).

An example of bilingual classroom talk that embraces Auer's model and his distinction between discourse-related and participant-related code-switching (Auer 1984) is the study conducted by Arthur in two English-medium primary schools in Botswana (Arthur 1996). Based on an exploration of the functions accomplished in and through code contrast in the classroom, Arthur noted that teachers used code contrast both for discourse-related and participant-related purposes. With regard to the discourse-related functions accomplished in and through code-switching, Arthur

claims that teachers used code-contrast for “addressee specification” purposes particularly when they wanted to encourage or praise their students. Further, she noted that code-switching was used by teachers as a “framing device” typically used to get pupils’ attention when the teacher wanted to move to “the next stage of the lesson or back to the central agenda” (Arthur 1996: 21). Apart from these discourse-related functions, Arthur talks about participant-related functions. She argues that code-switching was used by teachers in order to encourage pupils’ participation and in order to “ensure understanding” (Arthur 1996: 22). Another example of classroom code-switching research whereby Auer’s model has been applied is the (2005) study conducted by Liebscher and Dailey-O’ Cain in a foreign language classroom. Contrary to previous classroom code-switching studies that created the impression that it is only teachers who code switch for discourse-related functions, Liebscher and Dailey-O’ Cain (2005) provide evidence for the fact that learners as well may use code-switching to perform a number of different discourse-related functions such as using code-switching to add emphasis to their answer, to shift between classroom contexts and more informal ones, to contextualize what they are saying as the summary or punch line, to make an aside etc (Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain 2005: 237-241). Moreover, Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain provide examples which show that in fact a single switch may have both discourse-related and participant-related functions at the same time (2005: 237).

Auer’s model has also been embraced by researchers who have investigated bilingual child-child interaction outside the context of the classroom but still within an institutional context, i.e. in school premises. The most representative example of this type of research is the study conducted by Cromdal in the schoolyard of an English-medium school in Sweden. With the overall aim being to describe how kids organize their everyday play activities in and through their two languages, Cromdal engaged in four different empirical studies (Cromdal 2001a; 2001b; 2004; Cromdal and Aronsson 2000). Each of these studies focuses on a different aspect of the practical use of code switching in organizing play interaction, namely Cromdal shows how kids use code-switching in order to:

- a) negotiate play entry;
- b) manage different footings during various play activities;

- c) manage argumentative exchanges that emerge during play;
- d) manage simultaneous talk during play.

Drawing on Auer's (1984) notion of 'preference for same language talk', Cromdal has argued that it is by virtue of this organizing principle of bilingual conversation that the kids accomplish all the aforementioned activities (Cromdal 2000: 101). That is, 'preference for same language talk' (Auer 1984) works for the kids as their 'scheme of interpretation' (Garfinkel 1967) so that when a given language has been established as the language of their play episode, all players stick to it so that any departure from this language is noticeable and is therefore used by the kids to contextualize various actions during their play interaction.

However, as already mentioned in section 4.6.1 above, Auer's model has been criticised on the basis that it fails to account for instances in which participants normatively orient to the use of two languages in conversation and that an alternative framework that addresses this limitation has been developed by Gafaranga (Gafaranga 1999, 2000b, 2001, 2007a, 2007b, 2009, Gafaranga and Torras 2001; 2002; Torras and Gafaranga 2002). One of the major tenets of this alternative framework of language choice and language alternation is that the grammarian's notion of 'language' cannot account for those instances whereby participants use two languages as one code and that the notion of the "medium of interaction" is a more preferable notion. This alternative framework has also been applied by researchers to the study of bilingual classroom talk (Bonacina 2005, Bonacina and Gafaranga 2010; Faltzi 2007). More specifically, drawing on this overall order approach to language choice and language alternation, Bonacina (2005) investigated language choice in a French complementary school classroom in Scotland. Based on the frequent alternation she observed between the two available languages (i.e. French and English) in this context, she concluded as well that the notion of 'language' cannot adequately capture the classroom participants' orientation to their two languages as one code and that the notion of 'medium of classroom interaction' would be a more relevant "scheme of interpretation" (Garfinkel 1967) for the study of language choice in bilingual classroom talk (Bonacina 2005, Bonacina and Gafaranga 2010). Further, another application of the 'overall order' approach to language choice and language

alternation can be found in the research conducted by Faltzi (2007) in a Greek complementary school in Scotland. With the overall aim being to see whether “different functions (namely the curriculum access, classroom management and interpersonal relations, according to Ferguson 2003) correspond to different organizational patterns”, Faltzi demonstrated that there is a correlation between certain functions and the adoption of a monolingual or a bilingual medium (Faltzi 2007: 44-45). That is, when it comes to curriculum access, classroom participants were shown to orient to a monolingual medium while when it comes to interpersonal relations classroom participants were shown to adopt a bilingual medium (Faltzi 2007: 45-46).

I have thus far offered a description of the two different organisational explanations that have been offered within the CA model of code-switching, i.e. I have reviewed the “local order” and the “overall order” explanation of language alternation (Gafaranga 2007a, 2007b). Then given the fact that the study in question will be dealing with language choice during adult-child interaction and child-child interaction in the CPAs and given the fact that both types of interaction will be treated as instances of informall classroom talk, I have then gone on to review studies that have adopted CA to study bilingual classroom talk and child-child bilingual interaction. As already mentioned though the study in question will adopt a broad CA approach that also includes categorization analysis. In the following section, I describe some of the salient properties of Membership Categorisation Analysis (MCA) (Sacks 1966, 1974, 1992) (for more detailed reviews of MCA see Antaki and Widdicombe 1998, Butler 2008, Hester and Eglin 1997, Silverman 1998) and then move on to Gafaranga’s (2001, 2005) MCA approach to language choice. Finally, I briefly review studies that have followed this approach to analyse bilingual interaction and bilingual classroom interaction.

4.6.3 The Membership Categorisation Analysis Approach to Language Choice

With its origins going back to ethnomethodology and Sacks’s categorization work (Sacks 1972, 1974), MCA has developed quite independently from the CA’s

preoccupation with sequential organisation and sequential analysis and it is primarily for this reason that MCA came to be seen as a distinct analytic method (Butler 2008, Eglin and Hester 1992), i.e. as a method different from CA. Most of the salient properties of MCA can be found in Sacks' work (1972, 1974, 1995). Sacks argued that social actors organise their world into categories (such as male/female, teacher/pupil), i.e. into "collections of things". To refer to these "collection of things", Sacks used the term "Membership Categorisation Device". (Sacks 1972, 1974). For example, the categories Greek/English could in that respect be seen as categories within a Membership Categorization Device such as 'nationality'. Or to give an example related to the study at hand, teacher/pupil could be seen as categories within the device 'classroom participants'. Sacks further argued that categories are not static but may change in the course of interaction. In other words, categories are not simply labels but constitute a *doing being*. In the course of interaction, social actors may shift from doing being a certain category to doing being a member of another category. In that respect, the aim of the analysis is to reveal which categories are being oriented to by participants here and now. A further property of MCA is that membership in a particular categorisation device is associated with (it is bound to) specific activities and rights and obligations that are referred to in the literature as "category bound activities" (Sacks 1974). Therefore claiming membership in a particular category involves behaving in certain ways. It is on the basis of this bound relationship that exists between categories and activities that Sacks claimed that categories are inference-rich (Sacks 1995). Certain activities evoke certain categories and vice versa. For example, taking the register evokes 'doing being' membership to the category teacher. On the other hand, claiming membership to the category 'teacher' involves performing specific activities, one of them being taking the register (other could be disciplining students, giving instructions etc). A further important property of MCA is that each person simultaneously belongs to many categories; namely, each person has multiple identities. However, not all of those identities will be relevant on a specific occasion. Therefore, an important task for the analyst is to show which category/identity is relevant at a specific moment of social action. According to MCA, an identity/category can be seen as relevant if and only if this identity/category has been

used by participants themselves to accomplish specific activities in interaction, i.e. if and only if it has been used to accomplish relevant category-bound activities. Finally, Sacks argued that members themselves can produce and make sense of categories, i.e. they can tell which categories are relevant a given moment, thanks to a set of rules that are referred to as ‘application rules’. (Sacks 1974). The first of these rules is the “economy rule”. This rule holds that although participants may be described as belonging to multiple categories, reference to just one of these categories is enough to identify a person on a given occasion (Sacks 1974: 219). In other words, the use of one category is “referentially adequate” (Sacks 1995: 246). The second rule is called the “consistency rule” (Sacks 1974:219). According to Sacks, the consistency rule holds that

“If some population of persons is being categorised and if a category from some device’s collection has been used to categorise first a Member of the population, then that category or other categories of the same collection may be used to categorise further members of the population” (ibid).

So, if a person is seen to be claiming membership to a particular category, the rest of the participants will also claim membership to the same category or to another category that falls within the same categorisation device. A corollary to this rule is what is referred to by Sacks as the “hearer’s maxim” (Sacks 1974, 1995). According to this maxim, if on a particular moment, there seems to be a bound relationship between an activity and a category, hearers “hear it that way” (Sacks 1974: 221). The hearer’s maxim refers to recognition procedures followed by members. In order to account for members’ production of categories, Sacks talked about the “viewer’s maxim” (1974, 1995). This maxim holds that since categories and activities are co-selective, based on the category one can tell the activity and vice versa. As Sacks puts it, “ If a Member sees a category-bound activity being done, then, if one can see it being done by a member of a category to which the activity is bound, see it that way” (Sacks 1995: 259).

In brief, according to the MCA perspective, for analysts to make reference to any category/identity they need first to show how this category is demonstrably relevant and consequential for the participants themselves (see section 4.6.1 above

for a discussion of the issue of relevance and procedural consequentiality). As already mentioned, a category can be taken to be relevant only if it can be shown that this category has been used to accomplish certain activities in talk-in-interaction. Conversely, certain aspects of talk may be shaped by certain categories. In that respect, although CA and MCA have traditionally been viewed as distinct approaches (Schegloff 2007b), there has recently been a growing awareness that CA and MCA are actually “two sides of the same coin” (Silverman 1998: 152). Namely, there is now a growing awareness that CA and MCA are not competitive approaches but complementary to each other. Accordingly, scholars have talked about an “integrated analysis of talk” (Housley and Fitzgerald 2002: 61) and have combined CA with MCA in order to “examine not just how categories invoke certain bound activities, but how categories and their associated predicates can be made relevant and consequential for producing specific sorts of actions” (Butler 2008: 40).

Drawing on MCA, Gafaranga has offered an alternative identity-related account for language alternation. Similarly to the CA approach to language choice, in the MCA approach to language choice as well, language choice is seen as a social activity. Gafaranga has further suggested that, as an activity language choice is a category bound activity and more specifically an activity bound to the category of language preference (Gafaranga 2001, 2005). More specifically, in order to account for the orderliness of language alternation from an MCA perspective, Gafaranga draws on Auer’s “language preference” (Auer 1998) and Sacks’ Membership Categorisation Device (Sacks 1966, 1974). According to Auer, language preference is the “interactional process of displaying and ascribing predicates” (1998:8). Gafaranga takes this to mean ascribing language-based predicates, such as monolingual, bilingual and in which language(s) (Gafaranga 2001: 1916). As we have seen, the term Membership Categorisation Device refers to “the ordered collections such as male/female...tutor/student...” to which interactants evoke their membership in talk-in-interaction (Gafaranga 2001: 1913). Gafaranga argues that language preference itself can be seen as a Membership Categorisation Device. As he puts it, “Because...in talk-in-interaction, participants occasionally display their language preference and ascribe co-participants language-based predicates, it is not far fetched to claim that language preference is a categorisation device” (Gafaranga

2001: 1918). In other words, insofar as language preference is used in interaction to “sort people into ‘collection of things’, it can be seen as a Membership Categorisation Device (ibid). Further, Gafaranga, emphasizes the fact that the “language-based categorisation work” (as monolingual, bilingual etc) participants engage in is occasioned by “a local interactional demand” that the interactants are facing in a particular moment in conversation, and that it “does not necessarily correspond to what participants really are” (2001: 1918). It is done with the purpose of accomplishing the activity of talking, with the purpose of doing “medium-related activities” (ibid). Language choice and language alternation then can be accounted for on the basis of “the locally relevant linguistic identities participants have adopted” (Gafaranga 2001: 1916). In Gafaranga’s data, the fact that French–Kinyarwanda alternation is oriented to by participants themselves as normative, can be accounted for on the basis of the local *linguistic identity* that the participants have adopted, i.e. that of “doing being bilingual in French and Kinyarwanda” (Gafaranga 2001: 1922; my emphasis).

4.6.4 Membership Categorization Analysis, Bilingual Classroom Talk and Child-Child Bilingual Interaction

The MCA approach has been adopted by researchers investigating children’s play talk (Butler 2008, Butler and Weatherall 2006) but also for the purposes of investigating teacher-pupil interaction in classroom settings (see for example Dashwood 2005, Richards 2006, He 2004, Talmy 2009). In these classroom discourse studies, researchers have embraced a dynamic view of context and identity and have provided evidence for the relevance of the participants’ institutional roles (teachers/students) and the procedural consequentiality of these roles for the talk produced in the contexts under investigation. By conducting categorisation analysis (MCA) and sequential analysis (CA), specific patterns of talk were related to specific aspects of the interlocutors’ identity (professional identity) and/or the institutional context at hand. In this way, researchers conducting MCA in classroom settings have

shown how a professional identity/institutional context is “talked into being” (Heritage 1984).

An example of classroom discourse study conducted from an MCA perspective is that of Richards (2006). By analysing classroom extracts collected in a variety of educational settings, Richards demonstrates how “shifts in orientation to different aspects of identity produce distinctively different interactional patterns” (Richards 2006: 51). Richards’s significant contribution to classroom discourse research is that he deviates from previous research on classroom talk whereby the categories of ‘teacher’ and ‘student’ have been treated as analytically given. Instead, his starting point is that the category of ‘teacher’ and ‘student’ are categories produced in and through the actions accomplished by participants during interaction (Richards 2006: 59). In his work, Richards draws on and builds on Zimmerman’s (1998) three types of identity (that of a) “discourse”; b) “situated” and c) “transportable” identity) by proposing the concept of a “default identity” (Richards 2006: 60). He argues that in every institutional setting there is a default position that is “characterised by orientation to situated identities, realized through their characteristic discourse identities and with no evidence of transportable identity” (Richards 2006: 61). In the classroom context for example, Richards argues, the default positions are those of teacher and student while each of them is bound to specific activities and rights and obligations. As he puts it, “it is the teacher who, as teacher, controls the floor, asks questions, issues instructions, prompts, and evaluates, while the students, addressing their responses to the teacher, respond directly to these turns” (ibid). Another significant MCA study on bilingual classroom talk this time is that conducted by He (2004) in two Chinese Heritage Language Schools in the US. By combining sequential with categorisation analysis, He demonstrates how participants “ratify, reject or make irrelevant” their institutional identities in the moment-to-moment unfolding course of interaction (He 2004: 205). More specifically, by analysing repair sequences and the use of personal pronouns, she shows how pupils who attended these heritage schools challenged the authority of their teacher and how they accomplished identity shifts, i.e. how they moved from doing being “an American pupil” to a “Chinese learner” (He 2004: 212). In summing up the major findings of her investigation, He concludes that although students

categorised themselves “as members of simultaneously-existing multiple groups” (one of them being the Chinese Heritage School Community) and constantly moved in and out of these groups, the teacher was constantly trying to impose on the pupils a single category/identity, that of the member of the Chinese community school (ibid).

For the purposes of my analysis of language choice in Reception and for the purposes of identifying any interactional norms (practiced language policies) that Reception participants are orienting to, the Conversation Analytic approach to language choice and more specifically Gafaranga’s ‘overall order’ and the MCA perspective to language choice and language alternation will be adopted. As previous work has shown (Papageorgiou and Gafaranga 2011, Bonacina 2010) such a broad CA approach that includes both a sequential and a categorisation analysis can be helpful towards discovering the interactional norms, “the practiced language policies” followed by a bilingual community of speakers.

4.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, I presented the different types of data used for the purposes of this study and then discussed the methods I followed in collecting each of these types of data. Next, I described which conceptual and methodological framework will be adopted in order to analyse these data and thus address the issues investigated in this study. As shown in Chapter 2, my research at BES focuses on how the school’s conflicting policies are actually lived in the RK participants’ language choice practices in the CPAs. To address this aim, I will follow a sociolinguistic orientation that is inspired by Spolsky’s (2004) view of language policy (see Chapter 3) and by the methodological framework offered by the Conversation Analytic approach to language choice. More specifically, for the purposes of my exploration of how the conflicting policies at BES’s Reception are actually lived in the RK participants’ language choice practices in the CPAs, I will be drawing on Spolsky’s (2004) conceptualisation of ‘language policy’ and on the methodological framework of the

'CA approach to language choice' as it is described in Gafaranga (1999, 2000, 2007a, 2007b, 2009). By seeing language choice first and foremost as a conversational activity that is organised at the overall level of talk, such an approach places emphasis on the participants' own perspective (i.e. promotes 'emic' rather than 'etic' accounts (Pike 1967)) and accordingly allows the discovery of the medium that bilingual conversationalists are orienting to here and now as this is revealed in their own orientation to their own language choice acts. Further, my analysis of Reception participants' language choice behaviour will also be informed by the MCA perspective to language choice as introduced by Gafaranga (2001, 2005). According to this perspective, for the purposes of talking and accomplishing their various language choice activities, bilingual participants use 'language preference' as a membership categorization device, i.e. they ascribe each other to language-based predicates, such as monolingual, bilingual and in which language(s) (ibid).

Chapter Five: Normative and Repairable Language Choice Acts in the CPAs as Evidence of the Three Different Media Available in Reception

5.0 Introduction

As we have seen in chapter 2, BES's pedagogical approach to learning in Reception aims at promoting learner autonomy and encouraging 'free interaction' in and through the creation of designated play areas, i.e. the so-called 'Continuous Provision Areas' (CPAs). At the same time, we have seen that BES's Reception has adopted English as the official medium of instruction and interaction (language policy) although it is heavily populated by kids of a Greek linguistic background. As a result of these policies, a conflicting situation has emerged. One whereby the pedagogical approach to learning calls for the participants' attendance to 'free' interaction, while its language policy calls for the promotion of the use of English throughout school. In this chapter, my aim is to investigate exactly this issue, namely to see how the school's conflicting policy demands are actually lived in the kids' language choice acts in the CPAs (research question 1). More specifically, drawing on Gafaranga's notion of "medium" (Gafaranga 2000; 2007a), I describe what the 'medium' is, i.e. what the "actually oriented to linguistic code" (Gafaranga and Torras 2001: 196) that Reception kids attend to in the play areas is. Inspired by Ethnomethodology and the "overall order" Conversation Analytic approach to language choice (Gafaranga 2000, 2007a; 2009), this issue is addressed by examining how kids orient to each other's language choice acts in and during their interaction in the play areas.

Additionally, informed by previous work on language play and language learning (Broner and Tarone 2001, Bongartz and Schneider 2003, Aronsson and Cekaite 2005) and drawing on Cook's definition of language play (Cook 1997, 2000), data is also approached from a language play perspective and where relevant the kids' language play practices are briefly discussed.

The Chapter is organised as follows. I first talk about repair activities. More specifically, since as we shall see both in this Chapter and in Chapter 7, Reception participants regularly engage in repair activities, I provide here a brief review of the phenomenon of repair in interaction by looking at how repair activities are organised. Then, taking pupils' language choice acts as a starting point, I go on with the analysis of the participants' language choice behaviour in the CPAs.

5.1 On the Organization of 'Repair' in Interaction

As we have seen in Chapter 4 (section 4.6.1), Heritage (1988) has argued that one of the most reliable methods in order to discover the norm is to do 'deviant case analysis', because it is in deviant cases and particularly cases of repairable deviance that the norm becomes even more visible. Repairable deviance is important, since by repairing an act, the participants themselves reveal what they themselves consider the norm to be (*ibid*). It is because of this importance that repair activities have for the discovery of the norm that the phenomenon of repair in interaction has been at the centre of Conversation Analytic research (see Jefferson 1987; Schegloff 1987; Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977). According to the findings of Schegloff's et al (1987) research, repair is an orderly activity³⁸. More specifically, Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) claim that repair work can be initiated either by current speaker, i.e. cases of "self-initiated repair", or it may be initiated by the recipient of the trouble item, i.e. cases of "other-initiated repair". In a similar way, a distinction is drawn based on who actually makes the repair. Namely, Schegloff et al talk about instances of "self-repair" when the repair is accomplished by current speaker, and instances of "other-repair" when the repair is accomplished by other participants (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977). In combining then these two factors, i.e. who

³⁸ For a detailed discussion of the organisation of repair in conversation see Jefferson 1987, Liddicoat 2007 and Sidnell 2010. For a discussion of repair organisation in L1 classroom talk see McHoul (1990) while for a discussion of the organisation of repair in L2 classrooms see Kasper (1985), Seedhouse (1999), and Van Lier (1988).

initiates and who actually repairs a given trouble source, we reach four different possibilities for the accomplishment of repair in interaction:

- 1) 'self-initiated self-repair': current speaker both indicates a problem in his own talk and proceeds to resolving the problem himself
- 2) 'self-initiated other-repair': current speaker indicates that there is a problem in his talk but it is the recipient that resolves the problem
- 3) 'other-initiated self-repair': the recipient of a trouble source initiates repair but it is the producer of the trouble source that resolves the problem
- 4) 'other-initiated other-repair'³⁹: the recipient of a trouble source both indicates that there is a problem in prior talk and proceeds to resolving the problem (ibid).

With regard to the different techniques available "for locating the trouble source" (Sidnell 2010: 113), i.e. that of other-initiated and self-initiated repair, Schegloff et al (1977) have further argued that these interact with the available positions for repair. More specifically, the position of repair refers to the sequential position where a repair act is accomplished, with the sequential position being defined in terms of where a given repair act stands in relation to the trouble source that constitutes its target. Thus, the authors talk about: a) 'same turn repair', i.e. a repair accomplished within the same constructional unit as the trouble source; b) 'transition space repair', i.e. a repair accomplished in the transition space following the problematic item, c) 'second', 'third' and 'fourth' position repair, i.e. with a repair being accomplished in the second, third and fourth turn respectively following a given trouble source (ibid). What is important here is that the aforementioned positions for repair interact with and affect the way that repair initiation is accomplished. Same turn, transition space and third turn repair provide opportunities for self-repair, while the second and fourth positions provide opportunities for other-initiation (ibid). In other words, as the

³⁹ In L2 classroom interaction, "other-initiated other-repair" may take a specific form where the "other-repair" is being performed by a third party, i.e. a party different from the one that has initiated repair (Seedhouse 1999: 65). Seedhouse termed this "teacher-initiated peer repair" and argued that this is a "context-specific repair trajectory" in that it appears only in L2 classroom contexts/activities where the focus is on "form and accuracy" (ibid).

authors put it, the two types of repair initiation are “ordered so that possibilities for self-initiation precede possibilities of other initiation” (Schegloff et al. 1977 cited in Liddicoat 2007: 174). Further, when other-initiation is accomplished, Schegloff et al (1977) maintain that certain types of other-initiation are preferred. They argue that in terms of the techniques used to accomplish other-initiation, there seems to be a preference for stronger over weaker forms of repair-initiations, i.e. a preference for certain types of ‘other-initiations’ (e.g. who, where, when) that do not only indicate that there is some problem in the preceding talk but also signal what the problem might be, over other types of ‘other-initiations’ (e.g. huh, what) that may indicate that there is some problem in prior talk without further signalling what the nature of the problem might be (Schegloff et al. 1977). Moreover, very importantly, the activity of conversational repair seems to be organised primarily around who actually repairs what is oriented to by interlocutors as a problem in interaction. As Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) have argued, although both the option of self-repair and other-repair is available to interlocutors, there is a strong preference for self-repair⁴⁰. As they put it, “Self-correction and other-correction are related organizationally with self-correction being preferred to other correction” (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977: 362). Finally, in those cases where the repair is effected by other participants, repair work is accomplished in the following three-step sequence (X, Y, Y), i.e.

- 1) a participant other than the speaker locates a problem in some object (X) produced by the speaker
- 2) he suggests an alternative (Y) and
- 3) “prior speaker produces the alternative (Y)” (Jefferson 1987: 88).

However, the aforementioned three-step sequence can also take the form of (X, Y, X) in cases where the correction offered is rejected by prior speaker (ibid).

Applying the aforementioned Ethnomethodological ideas (and in particular Heritage’s ‘Deviant Case Analysis’ (1988)), into the study of bilingual interaction

40 McHoul has pointed out though that in L1 classroom interaction, a structural preference for “other-initiation” is observed (McHoul 1990). More specifically, McHoul has argued that the format teacher(other)-initiated student(self) -repair is “the prevalent repair trajectory for classrooms” (McHoul 1990: 332). With regard to the organization of repair in L2 classroom interaction, researchers have argued that the organization of repair depends on the context/ activity and the pedagogical focus that is bound with that context/activity (Kasper 1985, Seedhouse 1999, Van Lier 1988).

and drawing from previous Conversation Analytic work on repair (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977; Jefferson 1987), Gafaranga has introduced the notion of “medium repair” (Gafaranga 2000, 2007a, 2009; Gafaranga and Torras 2001) (already discussed in Chapter 4) and has demonstrated its analytical significance for the investigation of bilingual conversation from the speaker’s own perspective. In brief, as we have already seen in chapter 4 (section 4.6.2), Gafaranga has argued that “language choice among bilingual speakers must be seen as an instance of practical social action” (Gafaranga 2000: 328). As an instance of social action, bilingual talk is ‘informed’ by a particular norm that works for the speakers as a ‘scheme of interpretation’ “with respect to which speakers themselves make sense of their language alternation activities” (ibid). In fact, Gafaranga claims that the base code of a bilingual conversation, what he calls the ‘medium’ of bilingual interaction is that norm, that scheme of interpretation that informs participants’ acts (ibid). Accordingly, he has proposed an alternative methodology for telling the base code of interaction as it has been decided by participants themselves and has stressed the analytic significance of participants’ own orientations to each other’s language acts and particularly the analytical significance of their ‘medium repair activities’ (see Chapter 4, section 4.6.2).

As I show in this Chapter, in and during their play interaction in the CPAs, the kids’ orient to certain language choice acts as normative and to others as deviant. The first pass unnoticed while the latter lead to ‘medium repair activities’. This differential orientation to language choices can therefore be used in determining the media that the kids are attending to in their talk.

5.2 Greek Monolingual Medium Talk

In the corpus of interaction audio-recorded in the CPAs of the target classroom, children often adopt Greek as the medium of interaction. That is, children orient to the use of Greek as normative, i.e. as being the default language of their interaction in the play areas, against which the use of languages other than Greek is seen as

deviant. For an example of the kids' orientation to the use of Greek as normative, consider extract 2 below.

Extract 2

Sand Play Area: Alexander, Marianthi, Katerina, Europi

1. Europi: pedia ftiahnume vuno?
2. (0.2)
3. Europi: ftiahnume vuno?
4. Alexander: ohi
5. Europi: ne ftiahnume?
6. Marianthi: ne
7. (.)
8. Katerina: oti po ego oti po ego e?
9. Alexander: to diko mu tha gini pio psilo vuno
10. Europi: ah (.) ah prepi na to rikso (.) na to rikso?
11. Katerina: ne
12. (0.1)
13. Katerina: gia na ftiaksume vuno
14. Europi: na ftiaksume vuno na ftiaksume vuno {in a singing voice}
15. Alexander: vrika mia vomva (na ti rihno)
16. Katerina: na ftiaksume to vuno poli psilo ke (asto edo) {in a singing voice}

-
1. Europi: guys would you like to make a mountain?
 2. (0.2)
 3. Europi: would you like to make a mountain?
 4. Alexander: no
 5. Europi: yes would you like to make one?
 6. Marianthi: yes
 7. (.)
 8. Katerina: whatever I say whatever I say ok?
 9. Alexander: my mountain is going to be taller
 10. Europi: ah ah I need to throw it can I throw it?
 11. Katerina: yes
 12. (0.1)
 13. Katerina: so that we can make a mountain
 14. Europi: let's make a mountain let's make a mountain {in a singing voice}
 15. Alexander: I found a bomb (there you go I am throwing it)
 16. Katerina: let's make the mountain very tall very tall and (leave it here) {in a singing voice}

The extract above starts with Europi's suggestion of making a mountain formulated in Greek. In the subsequent turns, not only do the rest of the sand play co-participants use Greek but they also orient to each other's Greek language choice acts as normative conduct, i.e. there is no noticing and no indication in the kids' behaviour here that something unusual has happened at the level of language choice.

Similarly in the following extract, the kids' negotiation of the plot of their game takes place in Greek without any indication in the kids' conduct that the use of Greek here constitutes a noticeable event, i.e. in this case as well, all participants orient to each other's Greek language choice acts as being instances of normative conduct.

Extract 3

Water Play Area: Hrusa, Kyriaki, Anna, Marianthi

1. Hrusa: tha ime ego i megali aderfi pu pai ena taksidi
2. Kyriaki: boro? na ime (.) i megali aderfi ki ego?
3. Hrusa: ohi
4. Marianthi: ego ime i mama
5. Kyriaki: ego ime i ali aderfi tote
6. Anna: i mikri?
7. Kyriaki: ne
8. Anna: boro na ime i mikri aderfi pu kani ataksies?
9. Kyriaki: i dio mikres aderfes tis
10. Anna: a den tha ekana ataksies

-
1. Hrusa: I am going to be the big sister who is about to go on a trip
 2. Kyriaki: can I be the big sister as well?
 3. Hrusa: no
 4. Marianthi: I am going to be the mother
 5. Kyriaki: then I am going to be the second sister
 6. Anna: the younger one?
 7. Kyriaki: yes
 8. Anna: can I be the young sister who gets involved in goings-on?
 9. Kyriaki: her two younger sisters
 10. Anna: ah ok I wouldn't get involved in goings-on⁴¹

⁴¹ Further examples of the kids' orientation to the use of Greek as normative conduct can be found in Appendix 4 (extracts 1-4).

However, the adoption of a Greek monolingual medium does not necessarily mean that only one language will be used by the kids. As the following extracts demonstrate, English may be used as well, but when it is used, kids systematically orient to it as deviant. Consider extract 4 below.

Extract 4

Computer Area: Anna, Stella, Roksani

1. Stella: to kitrino
2. Roksani: ah tora tha valis to kitrino
3. Stella: enoo sto prasino ine- ine pio **difficult**
4. Roksani: ne
5. (.)
6. Anna: **difficult** simeni pio diskolo
7. (0.2)
8. Stella: **easy** simeni (.) kati kapos kalitero (.) **easy**
9. (0.2)
10. Anna: ipe efkolo
11. Stella: prasino afto ine e?
12. Roksani: ne to prasino (.) to diafano
13. Stella: ne
14. Roksani: ne

-
1. Stella: the yellow one
 2. Roksani: ah now you are going to use the yellow one
 3. Stella: I mean the green one it s it s more **difficult**
 4. Roksani: yea
 5. (.)
 6. Anna: **difficult** means more difficult
 7. (0.2)
 8. Stella: **easy** means something a little better **easy**
 9. (0.2)
 10. Anna: she said easy
 11. Stella: this is the green one right?
 12. Roksani: yes the green one the transparent one
 13. Stella: yes
 14. Roksani: yes

In this extract, a group of girls is engaged in a drawing activity. The episode starts in Greek with the girls being involved in a discussion about the colours they are going to use and there seems to be no problem up to turn (2). In (3), Stella experiences

some trouble and switches into English (“difficult”) to specify what she is having problem with. More specifically, the cut off intonation and the repetition of “ine” which precede the switch into English signal that Stella is experiencing a problem. Van Lier talks about “try *marking*” (Van Lier 1988: 202), while Gafaranga talks about “trouble markers” (Gafaranga 2000: 333) in those cases. Further, by using an English item Stella specifies what the trouble is and engages in self-initiated other repair, i.e. she invites her co-participants to offer a solution to that problem. Accordingly, in (6), having recognised the ‘trouble markers’, Anna repairs Stella’s English item by providing a Greek translation (“difficult simeni pio diskolo”). Through these repair activities the girls indicate that they hold the use of English to be deviant. Conversely, they confirm that Greek is the medium they are currently using. Further in (8), Stella ratifies the repair by providing the antonym of “difficult” in English. Stella uses herself another English element here (‘easy’), which is immediately followed by her own attempt to translate the item into Greek, i.e. by her own attempt to repair⁴² her own use of English (‘easy simeni kati kapos kalitero’). Having repaired the item, Stella reinforces it back in English (‘easy’). Note that by repairing here her own use of English, Stella reveals here her orientation to the use of English as deviant. Finally in (10), Anna provides the exact translation (‘efkolo’), the Greek equivalent of the English element used by Stella. From (11) onwards, the girls return to the interactional activity they were engaged in before the first use of English in (3), i.e. to their discussion about colours. Notice that throughout this episode, whenever there is use of an English item it is followed by an attempt to translate the item into Greek i.e. by an attempt to repair the ‘languageness’ of the English item used. In engaging in all this repair work, the girls reveal their orientation to the use of English as deviant conduct and confirm to each other that English is not part of the code they are using for the purposes of current interaction. At the same time, through their orientation to the use of English as a repairable matter, the girls reflexively reveal what the norm they orient to is, i.e. Greek monolingual.

⁴² Repair and more specifically ‘medium repair’ (Gafaranga 2000) is accomplished here in and through the acts of translating English. Gafaranga (2000: 338) has also provided several examples of medium repair accomplished in and through acts of translation.

The extract above is also interesting in terms of the language play practices that the kids' engage in that lead on to a "peer run language lesson" (Cekaite and Aronsson 2005) or to be more precise to a peer run vocabulary lesson. In (3), Stella uses the L2 lexical item "difficult". In (5), Anna engages in a repetition of this L2 item while within the same turn she provides a definition for this item in Greek ("simeni pio diskolo"). Further, interestingly enough the kids' language play goes on in the following turn whereby Stella provides the antonym of difficult ("easy"), attempts to provide a definition of this L2 item in Greek and then reiterates "easy" drawing attention to its form. Clearly, in and through the kids' L2 word definitions (lines 6 and 8), their reiteration of L2 forms (lines 6 and 8) and their use of antonyms (line 6), the kids have engaged here in a peer run vocabulary lesson that focuses on the form and meaning of the L2 lexical item "difficult". This learner peer run vocabulary lesson promotes 'noticing' of the lexical form and of the meaning of the target lexical item. Further, note that throughout this form-based play the kids keep switching between their L1 (Greek) and their L2 (English). In and through this bilingual form-based play the kids' growing "multicompetence"⁴³ (Cook 1991, 1992) comes to the fore.

Going back to the language choice norm that the kids orient to, another interesting example of the kids' orientation to the use of English as an instance of deviant conduct is extract 5 below. In this case, a group of children in the workshop area are playing with play dough.

Extract 5

Workshop Area: Steve, Alexander

1. Steve: tha ftiakso **car**
2. (0.1)
3. Alexander: ti tha ftiaksis pes mu?
4. Steve: eh tha ftiakso aftokinito
5. Alexander: afokinito?
6. Steve: aftokinito

⁴³ Multicompetence has been defined as "the distinct state of mind with two or more grammars" (Cook 1991, 1992).

-
1. Steve: I am going to make **car**
 2. (0.1)
 3. Alexander: what are you going to make tell me?
 4. Steve: eh I am going to make car
 5. Alexander: car?
 6. Steve: car

In (1), Steve announces what he is going to make by using an English item ('car'). In (3), Alexander in and through his "what are you going to make tell me" utterance, initiates repair. Further, in and through his turn in (3), Alexander initiates repair by asking Steve to reformulate what he has just said. Since there could be any problem with Steve's utterance, a problem of mishearing for example, it is interesting here that Steve himself interprets Alexander's initiation to repair as an initiation to repair the use of English in (1). In translating the English item into Greek, Steve indicates that he has taken the problem of his utterance in (1) to be related to the 'languageness' of the item he used. The repair is then taken up and although Alexander misheard 'afokinito' instead of 'aftokinito', Steve comes back in Greek using the Greek equivalent. In what the kids are doing here, i.e. in the initiation to repair and the actual repair of the English item, they reveal that they orient to the use of English as deviant conduct, as something that needs to be repaired. In this way, the kids confirm that they share the same perspective towards the use of English in conversation i.e. they show that English is not part of the norm they are orienting to. At the same time, by repairing English and not repairing Greek, the boys confirm what they themselves hold the norm to be i.e. Greek.

In the extracts above, medium repair is explicitly other-initiated. The following two examples, on the other hand, are instances of "embedded correction" (Jefferson 1983) and of "embedded medium repair" (Gafaranga 2010) to be precise.

Extract 6

Sand Play area: Nikos, Sofoklis, Europi, Elli

1. Europi: aftos tha itan (.)aftos tha itan o magiras (.) pu tha pige na tus pi (.) ena **problem** pu ihe gini

2. (0.1)
3. → Elli: ti provlima?
4. Europi: ena provlima pu eGINE sto kastro
5. Elli: ti?
6. Europi: to provlima itane tha eprepe na ine eki o vasilias ke i vasilisa
7. Nikos: ksero ti provlima
8. Europi: ti?
9. (0.2)
10. Nikos: tha erhontusan pirates
11. (0.1)
12. Europi: ne gia na tus skotosune

-
1. Europi: he would be he would be the cook that would go there to talk to them about a **problem** related to
 2. (0.1)
 3. Elli: what problem?
 4. Europi: a problem related to the castle
 5. Elli: what?
 6. Europi: the problem would be that the King and the Queen would have to be there
 7. Nikos: I know what problem
 8. Europi: what?
 9. (0.2)
 10. Nikos: pirates would be coming
 11. (0.1)
 12. Europi: yes so that that we can kill them

In the extract, Europi comes up with a plot about their game and uses the English item “problem” in (1). In (3), Elli produces what one may call content repair initiation requesting Europi to specify the nature of the problem. At the same time, she other-repairs Europi’s use of English by providing the Greek equivalent of the English item she used. In (4), Europi implicitly acknowledges the repair, using the Greek equivalent herself. In fact, for the rest of this episode the Greek equivalent “provlima” is used which shows that Elli’s repair has been taken up by all participants. Notice however that contrary to what happens in extracts 4 and 5, where the interactional activity that the kids were engaged in before the use of English was discontinued in order to do the repair work, in this case, the talk in progress (plot negotiation) continues and the kids’ repair of English is embedded in their ongoing talk.

Here is another example.

Extract 7

Workshop Area: Alexander, Steve, Christos

1. Steve: kano **snowman**
2. → Christos: ine hionanthropos aftos ine hionanthropos eh?
3. Alexander: kano afto gia na (.) kano ena keik
4. Christos: ego tha kano keik
5. Alexander: ki ego tha kano keik

-
1. Steve: I am making a **snowman**
 2. Christos: he is a snowman he is a snowman right?
 3. Alexander: I am doing this in order to make a cake
 4. Christos: I am going to make a cake
 5. Alexander: I am also going to make a cake

In the extract, a group of boys are playing with play dough. In (1), Steve announces what he is making and, in doing so, uses the English element “snowman”. In (2), Christos repairs Steve’s use of English, translating the English item into Greek. As in extract 6, the business of correcting English is done here in a very subtle and implicit way, i.e. without disrupting the interactional business in hand.

To summarize, as we have seen in the extracts discussed in this section, while the use of Greek is oriented to by the kids as normative (extracts 2-7), any use of English is systematically oriented to as deviant and repaired. In turn repair work can be accomplished explicitly (as in extracts 4 and 5) or implicitly (as in extracts 6 and 7). Through this repair work, the children reveal their orientation to the use of English as deviant and, conversely, to the use of Greek as normative. That is to say, through this repair work, the kids confirm that Greek is the medium they are using.

5.3 English Monolingual Medium Talk

As the following extracts demonstrate, another pattern observed in the data is the use of English as a monolingual medium. This pattern is observed both during child-child talk and child-adult talk in the CPAs.

With regard to the adoption of an English medium during child-child talk in the CPAs, extracts 8 and 9 below are self-evident.

Extract 8

Sand Play Area: Nikos, Stephano , Odysseas, Dimitris

1. Nikos: **everyone who wants to do a zoo raise his hands**
2. (0.10)
3. Stephano: **let s put here animals**
4. Nikos: **no they (.) they are trying to coming for the zoo here we will make the zoo ok?**
5. (0.1)
6. Stephano: **coming out**
7. (.)
8. Nikos: **let s make the zoo let s make the zoo**
9. Stephano: **yes and here we will put the animals**

Extract 9

Sand Play Area: Odysseas, Nikos, Stephano

1. Stephano: **break the car all here the car**
2. Nikos: **yes**
3. (.)
4. Nikos: **look it s very strong now here**
5. (0.1)
6. Stephano: **yes**
7. Nikos: **the bad guys they will go like that (look Odysseas) aha:**
8. Odysseas: **now we need this closed there**
9. Nikos: **why?**
10. Odysseas: **cause the bad guy will get out**
11. Nikos: **what?**
12. Odysseas: **the bad guy will get out ok?**
13. (.)
14. Odysseas: **ei**
15. Nikos: **I want to put that here**

Further, when a monolingual English medium has been chosen, the use of Greek is oriented to as deviant and repaired. Consider the excerpt below.

Extract 10

Water Play Area: Alexander, Stephano

1. Alexander: kunupi (0.1) ine mes sto sholio to kunupi
2. (0.4)
3. → Alexander: **there s a mosquito**
4. Stephano: **lalala**

-
1. Alexander: a mosquito there s a mosquito in the school

In the extract, Alexander sees a huge mosquito flying close to the area where he is playing. As soon as he sees that, he informs his co-participants by using Greek (turn 1). Note here that the act of informing the group constitutes the first pair part of an adjacency pair (Schegloff and Sacks 1973). As such it calls for a second pair part. In the particular case, no second pair part is forthcoming (0.4 silence in 2). This absence of a response is noticed by Alexander, who analyses it as having to do with his choice of Greek in line 1, this in turn leading him to repair it (use of English in 3).

Further, another situation where Reception children adopt a monolingual English medium is when adult participants are present in the CPAs. In extract 11 below, the sand play area participants present to Miss Karavanta what they have made by using English.

Extract 11

Sand Play Area: Dimitris, Nikos, Miss Karavanta

1. Nikos: **look what we have made (.) all these and biscuits**
2. Miss Karavanta: **what did you make?**
3. Nikos: **a castle (.) castle and this is the cake**
4. Miss Karavanta: **which which is the cake?**
5. Nikos: **that**
6. Miss Karavanta: **what kind of cake is it?**
7. Nikos: **it s chocolate**
8. Dimitris: **chocolate**

However, the fact that classroom participants orient to the use of English-only as the norm of child-adult interaction in the CPAs becomes even more evident in the “medium repair activities” (Gafaranga 2007a) observed in the following extract.

Extract 12

Water Play Area: Stelios, Alexander, Miss Karavanta, Ifigenia

1. Alexander: **the ship they are so nice the ship**
2. Miss Karavanta: **boats the boats aren t they?**
3. (.)
4. Alexander: **yes the boats they are so:: nice (.) they make it to go that way**
5. Miss Karavanta: **all right (.) thank you hang up the aprons**
6. Alexander: **how is (.) it called (.) in English** (anemistiras ti) timoni⁴⁴ ?
7. Miss Karavanta: **steering wheel**
8. (0.2)
9. Miss Karavanta: **steering wheel**
10. (0.3)
11. Alexander: **and the steering wheel**
12. Miss Karavanta: **yes?**
13. Alexander: **it makes to dry**
14. Miss Karavanta: **right**
15. <Stelios: **Efigenia**>
16. Miss Karavanta: **hang them up please** {refers to apron}
17. Alexander: **what is called in English propela?**
18. Miss Karavanta: **the same thing propela (.) you can remember that one it s exactly the same**
19. Alexander: **what it s called in English propela?**
20. Miss Karavanta: **it s called the same thing it s called propela**
21. (0.2)
22. Alexander: **propela**
23. Miss Karavanta: **it s the same thing so now you can remember it**

In this extract, this water play group is engaged in the routine of ‘tidying up’ the water play area. Miss Karavanta has left the classroom and joined this group in order to help them tidy up the water play. However, one member of this group, Alexander, is still engaged in playing with one of his water toys (a boat in that case). The episode starts with his attempt to communicate to the adult his enthusiasm about his boat. However, in (6), Alexander experiences a difficulty in expressing himself. He

⁴⁴ (Fun) steering wheel

cannot find the mot juste and switches into Greek in order to signal what the problem is. Further evidence for Alexander's attempt to find the mot juste is found in the two micro pauses (.) that occur within the same turn and before the switch into Greek. Notice also that within the same turn and before switching into Greek, Alexander points to the 'otherness' of the Greek element he is about to use and invites Miss Karavanta to repair it through his question "how is it called". Moreover, before the actual switch, Alexander produces a "formulation" (Garfinkel and Sacks 1970) ("in English"), namely he "states in so many words" (ibid) what the medium for current interaction is. Interlocutors do not always "formulate" the activity they are accomplishing (Garfinkel and Sacks 1970). In this case however, Alexander explicitly states what he perceives the medium to be and by implication shows that his switch into Greek constitutes an instance of deviance from this medium. Miss Karavanta provides the English equivalent in (7) and in the absence of any response she reiterates it in (9). In (11), the repair is taken up by Alexander who resumes talk in English. However, this is only temporary because in (17), Alexander faces another word problem and switches into Greek. Notice that Alexander engages here in the same process as in (6). Before switching into Greek, he requests a repair ("how is it called") and produces a formulation ("in English"). In this way, he signals that the item he is about to use comes from a different language and that he is aware of the fact that this 'other' language is not part of the medium they are using. In (18), the adult goes on with the repair and provides the English equivalent. However, because the same term is used both in Greek and English, Alexander doesn't treat the item provided by Miss Karavanta as a repair and comes back in (19) demanding a repair of his Greek item. This time, Alexander emphasizes the fact that he is in need of the English equivalent (this time "in English" is delivered with emphasis). In (18), Miss Karavanta reiterates the repair and tries to raise metalinguistic awareness by pointing out the similarity between Greek and English when it comes to this particular item. Finally, the repair is taken up by Alexander in (22), while in (23) the adult attempts to promote further metalinguistic awareness by suggesting a way of how Alexander can remember this word. Notice that in what the participants are doing here, i.e. in Alexander's "formulation" practices and initiations of repair and Miss Karavanta's subsequent repair acts, it becomes evident that the use of Greek constitutes a

noticeable event that is oriented to here as deviant conduct. In this way, the participants' attendance to an English monolingual norm becomes evident in their own orientations to their own language choice acts and in the subsequent medium repair activities they engage in.

To summarize, contrary to what we have seen in section 5.2, where the use of Greek was oriented to by classroom participants as normative, children and adults were shown here to orient to the use of Greek as an instance of deviance. More specifically, in this section, the analysis of Reception participants' conduct has shown that they orient to the use of Greek as deviant and to the use of English as normative, i.e. they orient to an English monolingual medium

5.4 Bilingual Medium Talk

The analysis of the kids' conduct during their interaction in the play areas has so far revealed that the kids orient to the use of only one of their two available languages, either Greek or English, as the norm of their interaction. In this section, I am moving on to a discussion of cases where a bilingual medium is adopted. In this case, although the kids use both English and Greek, nothing in their conduct indicates that they are orienting to any of the two languages used as deviant.

Consider extract 13 below. A group of children are playing here in the polydron area.

Extract 13

Polydron Area: Steve, Elli , Nikos, Stelios

1. Stelios: ego thelo **squares**
2. (0.1)
3. Stelios: ena **square** thelo
4. (0.2)
5. Steve: thelo eh
6. Stelios: thelo ena **square**

7. (.)
8. Nikos: na parume tora?
9. Elli: ena **square** thelo
10. (0.3)
11. Elli: thelo ena **square**
12. Stelios: ne **for me**
13. Steve: na min paris kanena giati de m afinis na paro (.) ute ena **square**
14. (0.3)
15. Elli: fer to
16. Steve: den boro
17. (0.1)
18. Elli: ta hete pari ola
19. Steve: ne giati thelume na kanume **surprise** ti **Miss Karavanta** (.) tis kaname **yesterday**

-
1. Stelios: I need **squares**
 2. (0.1)
 3. Stelios: one **square** I need
 4. (0.2)
 5. Steve: I need eh
 6. Stelios: I need one **square**
 7. (.)
 8. Nikos: can we take one now?
 9. Elli: I need one **square**
 10. (0.3)
 11. Elli: I need one **square**
 12. Stelios: yes **for me**
 13. Steve: no don t take any cause you didn t let me take not even one **square**
 14. (0.3)
 15. Elli: give it to me
 16. Steve: I can't
 17. (0.1)
 18. Elli: you took it all
 19. Steve: yes because we want to make a **surprise** to **miss Karavanta** we made one **yesterday**

The episode above starts with a series of requests for squares issued by Stelio, Niko and Elli (turns 1-9). Notice that both Stelios and Elli alternate between English and Greek in formulating their requests while Nikos uses Greek. Throughout these repeated requests no noticing of the use of the English item “square” takes place. In (10), while using another English expression (“for me”) and without noticing the ‘linguageness’ of the item used in (11), Stelios confirms that the use of English along with Greek constitutes normative conduct. In (12), without paying any

attention to Elli's and Stelios' use of English items, Steve responds to Elli's request by reproducing himself the English element that Elli used in (9). In this way, he confirms as well that English is part of the code they are using. Further, Elli and Steve use Greek in turns (13), (14), and (15) while in (16), Steve finally provides an account for his reluctance to share his squares by engaging in frequent intra-turn alternation. The account that Steve provides here brings this negotiation sequence to an end, while his own use of English items is not reacted to by any of the participants. In short, throughout this episode, two languages are used, but nothing in the kids' conduct indicates that they are orienting to the two languages they are using as different. No noticing and no repair acts are performed. In this case, we may say that the kids have chosen to use both languages as the norm of their interaction, i.e. they have adopted a "bilingual medium" (Gafaranga and Torras 2001: 206).

Similarly, in the extract that follows, the kids' orientation to the use of their two languages as the norm can be empirically demonstrated. This extract comes from the polydron area, and this time, the members of a group of children playing in the polydron area are explaining to each other what they are making.

Extract 14

Polydron Area: Steve, Christos, Marianthi

1. Marianthi: ti ine afto?
2. Steve: ego to ftiaksa ine **space rocket**
3. Christos: ne **space rocket** (.) ine
4. (.)
5. Marianthi: aha (.) (afto pios to ftiakse)?
6. Steve: ne afto ine **star**
7. Christos: ne klisto

-
1. Marianthi: what is this?
 2. Steve: I made it it s a **space rocket**
 3. Christos: yes it s a **space rocket**
 4. (.)
 5. Marianthi: aha (who made this one)?
 6. Steve: yes this is a **star**
 7. Christos: yes a closed one

As in extract 13, in this extract, both Greek and English are used but neither is oriented to as deviant. Hence it becomes apparent that from the participants' own perspective, only one code has been used in interaction. However, insofar as from the analyst's perspective two languages are used, following Gafaranga and Torras (2001), I am talking here about a '*bilingual medium*'.

Another example of the adoption of the bilingual medium can be observed below. This time switching to English entails not only individual phrases but whole sentences. In this extract as well, alternation between English and Greek is taken by the kids to be itself the norm they are attending to.

Extract 15

Sand Play Area: Sofoklis, Nikos; Roksani

{Interaction taking place between the Sand Play and the Water Play Area people}

1. Nikos: eh pedia na valo na valo to **baking sand**?
2. Roksani: emis ehume **glitter** edo
3. Nikos: to ksero (.) to ksero
4. (.)
5. Sofoklis: pio **baking sand**? we are making flour (to **baking flour**)
6. (0.3)
7. Nikos: ne ehume vali **dry sand**
8. Sofoklis: ne ke kanume **flour**
9. (.)
10. Roksani: to **flour** den ftiahnete me **dry sand**
11. Nikos: ftiahnete
12. Sofoklis: theleta ne dite pos? thelete na kanete **feel**? thelete thelete na kanete **feel**? ine toso poli malako afto

-
1. Nikos: hey guys shall I put some **baking sand**?
 2. Roksani: we have **glitter** here
 3. Nikos: I know I know
 4. (.)
 5. Sofoklis: which **baking sand**? we are making flour (some **baking flour**)
 6. (0.3)
 7. Nikos: yes we have put **dry sand**
 8. Sofoklis: yes and we are making **flour**
 9. (.)
 10. Roksani: you can't make **flour** with **dry sand**

11. Nikos: yes you can
12. Sofoklis: would you like to see how? Would you like to make **feel**?
Would you like would you like to make **feel**? this is so soft

For further examples of the adoption of the bilingual medium, consider extracts 16 and 17 below.

Extract 16

Sand Play Area: Steve, Sofoklis

1. Steve: tora prepri na to ksanakanume **bury it**
2. Sofoklis: a:
3. (0.2)
4. Steve: ego tha to kano
5. Sofoklis: (xx)to kalitero (xx)
6. Steve: tha to kanume **very slow**
7. Sofoklis: (ego thelo na to kano)

-
1. Steve: now we have to make **bury it** again
 2. Sofoklis: a:
 3. (0.2)
 4. Steve: I am going to do it
 5. Sofoklis: (xx) the best one (xx)
 6. Steve: we are going to do it **very slow**
 7. Sofoklis: (I am going to do it)

Extract 17

Sand Play Area: Dimitris, Nikos

1. Nikos: pu ine **white sand**?
2. (.)
3. Nikos: eh thelo thelo ki alo Dimitri ego ti vrika ti **white sand**
4. Dimitris: ohi den tin pires (xx) pare to vetex
5. (.)
6. Nikos: ! **white sand white sand please oh yes**
7. (0.2)
8. Dimitris: vrikame **white sand**
9. (0.2)
10. Nikos: vrikame **white sand** {singing voice}
11. (0.15)

12. Nikos: Dimitri ine edo

1. Nikos: where is the **white sand**?
 2. (.)
 3. Nikos: hey I would like I would like more Dimitri I discovered some **white sand**
 4. Dimitris: no you didn't take it (xx) take the vetex
 5. (.)
 6. Nikos: **white sand white sand please oh yes**
 7. (0.2)
 8. Dimitris: we discovered some **white sand**
 9. (0.2)
 10. Nikos: **white sand** {singing voice}
 11. (0.15)
 12. Nikos: Dimitri it's over here

We have so far seen examples whereby the bilingual medium adopted is 'Greek-based', i.e. it is a medium in which the embedding of English elements takes the direction of Greek. However, as the following two extracts show, the bilingual medium adopted may also be 'English-based', i.e. Greek elements are embedded in English.

Also, in terms of language play, lines (6) and (10) in the extract above can be seen as an instance of sound play that involves the variable repetition of the phrase "white sand". In (6), Nikos' adoption of a high pitched and loud voice in the delivery of 'white sand' and the delivery of the same phrase in and through a singing voice in (10) indicates that the use of English is at least partially driven here by the intrinsic pleasures of vocalisation and sound.

Consider extract 18 below.

Extract 18

Sand Play Area: Marianthi, Stephano, Christos

1. Christos: **look I make (.) I make (0.2) I make one** turta
2. (0.1)
3. Stephano: **I made two** turta
4. (.)

5. Stephano: turta **I make big big** turta
 6. (0.7)
 7. Stephano: turta (**make big**) **it is for John** (.) **very good** (.) **very** (.) **is very good and** (.) **we do it we are all doing** (xx) **so we are doing big big turtes for John**
 8. Christos: **yes**
 9. (0.8)
 10. Stephano: **no no no the turta bigger we put here and after the big turta is more bigger**
 11. (0.2)
 12. Marianthi: **ok**
-
1. Christos: **Look I make I make I make one** cake
 2. (0.1)
 3. Stephano: **I made two** cakes
 4. (.)
 5. Stephano: cake **I make big big** cake
 6. (0.7)
 7. Stephano: cake (**make big**) **it is for John very good very is very good and we do it we are all doing** (xx) **so we are doing big big cakes for John**
 8. Christos: **yes**
 9. (0.8)
 10. Stephano: **no no no the cake bigger we put here and after the big cake is more bigger**
 11. (0.2)
 12. Marianthi: **ok**

In the extract, Christos engages in same turn self-repair which is accomplished bilingually; hence the use of the Greek item ‘turta’ along with English in (1). Interestingly, in the following turns, none of the participants attempts to repair the use of this Greek item which is taken up from turn 3 onwards. More specifically, from that turn onwards the Greek item ‘turta’ is adopted (turns 5, 7 and 10) with participants orienting to the use of this Greek item along with English as normative conduct. Namely, from that turn onwards the participants attend to the use of both English and Greek as the norm of their interaction.

In sum, contrary to what we have seen in section 5.2 and 5.3, where participants oriented to their interlocutors’ language alternation acts as instances of repairable deviance, in this section, the analysis of the kids’ conduct has revealed an additional possibility, that of orienting to switching between the two available

languages as normative conduct. Namely, participants were shown to adopt a bilingual medium which is either Greek-based or English-based.

5.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I set out to explore how the contradictions and conflicting demands of the school's policies are actually lived in the kids' language choice acts in the play areas of their classroom. More specifically, following Gafaranga's notion of 'medium', my analysis of the kids' interactional conduct in the CPAs has focused on an investigation of the "linguistic code" (Gafaranga and Torras 2001: 196) that Reception kids actually orient to in and during their interaction in the play areas. Drawing on Ethnomethodology and the Conversation Analytic approach to language choice (Gafaranga 2007a, 2009) I addressed this issue by looking at how kids' orient to each other's language choice acts during their interaction in the play areas. As the findings of this investigation have shown, Reception kids attend to three different media. More specifically, as we have seen in section 5.2 of this chapter, there were occasions where the kids oriented to the use of Greek as normative and to the use of English as deviant. In fact, as demonstrated, any use of English in the cases of child-child interaction examined in that section was oriented to by the kids as an instance of repairable deviance with the kids engaging in acts of repairing, i.e. translating, any English items used into Greek. In other words, it became evident in the kids' own orientation to their own use of English and Greek and in the subsequent acts of correcting any use of English that the kids were in those cases attending to a Greek monolingual medium. On the contrary, as shown in section 5.3, there were occasions that the kids oriented to the use of English as normative and to the use of Greek as deviant. Similarly however to the cases discussed in section 5.2, in the extracts examined here as well, use of one of the two available languages was oriented to by the kids as something that needed to be repaired, i.e. classroom participants were shown to engage in acts of repairing any use of Greek. As I have already argued, in those occasions, the kids' own behaviour pointed to the English monolingual

medium they had adopted. Finally, as the discussion of extracts in section 5.4 has shown, there were instances where kids themselves have not revealed any orientation to the two languages they were using as deviant. Kids were shown to orient to the use of both English and Greek as the norm of their interaction. In other words, the kids were in those cases using a bilingual medium which was either Greek-based or English-based. Overall then, it became evident in the kids' own differential orientation to their own language choice acts that there are three different media available in the Reception CPAs:

- a Greek monolingual medium
- an English monolingual medium
- a bilingual medium which may be Greek-based or English-based

Because as we have seen, these language choice activities, i.e. the adoption of a Greek monolingual, an English monolingual or a bilingual medium in the CPAs, occur frequently in the data, I will refer to them as 'practices' in the sense that they represent what is 'usually done' in the play areas.

Additionally, I have talked about two different types of language play present in the data analysed so far. The first type of language play was an instance of form-based play that provided opportunities for noticing the lexical form of an L2 (English) item and opportunities for making form-meaning connections. The second type of language play observed was an instance of sound play in which kids engaged just for the intrinsic pleasure of vocalization and sound.

In the next Chapter (Chapter 6), I provide more examples of language play and further evidence for the participants' attendance to a Greek monolingual medium, while in Chapter 7, I provide further evidence for their attendance to an English monolingual medium. Finally, in Chapter 8, I offer an account for the norms that kids and adults orient to when they engage in the language choice practices presented in this Chapter and in Chapters 6 and 7. That is, I argue that the observed language choice practices are not random but informed by specific interactional norms.

Chapter Six: Functional Deviance as Further Evidence of the Greek Monolingual Medium

6.0 Introduction

In the last Chapter, I have explored how the conflicting demands of the school's policies are lived in the kids' actual daily interaction in the Reception play areas (research question 1). More specifically, I have demonstrated the media, i.e. the codes that children attend to in their moment to moment interaction in the CPAs. That is, the investigation of the participants' own orientation to their own language choice acts has revealed three different possibilities: a) participants may adopt a Greek monolingual medium; b) they may adopt an English monolingual medium or c) they may adopt a bilingual medium which is either Greek-based or English-based. With regard to language alternation, two possibilities were observed: a) language alternation can be normative (in the case of bilingual medium) or b) it can be oriented to as repairable deviance (in the case of monolingual media). In this Chapter, I describe yet another type of language alternation I have observed in the data, namely language alternation which is functionally motivated. Drawing on Goffman's notion of "footing" (Goffman 1981) to explain this type of language alternation, I show how functional language alternation provides further evidence for the kids' attendance to a Greek monolingual medium when talking in the CPAs.

Additionally, similarly to chapter 5, drawing on Cook's definition of language play (Cook 1997, 2000) and on previous research on language play and language learning (Peck 1980, Bongartz and Schneider 2003, Aronsson and Cekaite 2005, Broner and Tarone 2001) kids' practices in the CPAs are also analysed from a language play perspective and where relevant the kids' language play practices are briefly discussed.

This chapter is organised as follows. I first review concepts that are essential for the understanding of the kids' conduct. Namely, I briefly touch on Goffman's notion of "footing" (1981) and the conceptual apparatus he introduced in order to analyse shifts in footing, i.e. I talk about his concept of "participation framework"

and that of “production formats” (ibid) (section 6.1). In the section that follows (6.2), I briefly touch on bilingual interaction studies that have applied Goffman’s notion of footing. Next (section 6.3), I move on to a discussion of cases where kids systematically orient to their co-participants’ switches into English as accomplishing shifts in the ‘participation framework’, while in the next section (section 6.4), I look at cases where kids orient to their co-participants’ switches into English as accomplishing a shift in ‘production formats’. Finally, I show how the kids’ systematic orientation to the use of English as accomplishing shifts in footing, i.e. as being functionally motivated, provides further evidence for: a) their attendance to a Greek monolingual medium during child-child talk and b) their attendance to an English monolingual medium during child-adult talk (already discussed in Chapter 5, see section 5.2 and 5.3 respectively).

6.1 From the notion of Hearer and Speaker to That of ‘Participation Framework’ and ‘Production Format’

In his seminal work on “footing”, which he defined as “the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the ways we manage the production or reception of an utterance” (Goffman 1981:128), Goffman has radically questioned the categories of ‘speaker’ and ‘hearer’. He argued that in talk in interaction there are more possibilities involved with interactants acting as speakers or recipients to different degrees (Goffman 1974, 1981). To account for shifts in ‘footing’, Goffman introduced two relevant notions, i.e. he introduced the notion of “participation framework” to account for changes in recipients’ changes in footing and the notion of “production format” to account for changes in speaker’s footing. More specifically, by introducing the notion of “participation framework”, i.e. the ‘participation status’ that interactants take in relation to an utterance that is produced within their “perceptual range” (Goffman 1981: 3), he claimed that changes in participation frameworks, whether a recipient is addressed or not, and whether he/she is cast as a ratified or nonratified participant is something achieved by interactants in the course of interaction (Goffman 1981: 128). In other words, recipient design is not

something static, not something to be taken as given, rather it is something that interlocutors construct, negotiate and re-negotiate during interaction. Further, Goffman noted that by taking advantage of the different recipients' footings, interactants may switch from formal to informal talk, i.e. they engage in what he calls "subordinate communication" (1981:133) which may include: a) "byplay" (subordinate communication among ratified participants), b) "crossplay", (informal talk taking place between ratified participants and bystanders), and c) "sideplay" (unofficial talk among bystanders) (Goffman 1981: 134). Moving on to speakership, and in order to account for speaker's changes in footing, Goffman introduced the notion of "production formats" (Goffman 1974; 1981) to refer to the speaker's own involvement in what he/she is saying and the amount of responsibility he/she assumes in relation to his/her own discourse contribution. Further, he identified three different speaker positions, three different speaker identities, namely that of: a) the "animator" (e.g. when a speaker is dramatizing a character), b) the "author" ("someone who has selected the sentiments that are being expressed and the words in which they are encoded") and c) the "principal" ("someone who is committed to what the words say") (Goffman 1981: 144-145). In this way, by stressing the availability of different speaker identities, Goffman pointed out the possibility for a speaker to be "doing' someone other than himself" (Goffman 1974: 539) in and during the course of interaction. Moreover, drawing on the work of Blom and Gumperz (1972), Goffman further suggested that one of the ways that shifts in footing, i.e. changes in participant frameworks and production formats, can be accomplished is in and through code switching (Goffman 1981: 128). As he puts it, "For speakers, code-switching is usually involved, and if not this then at least the sound markers that linguists study: pitch, volume, rhythm, stress, tonal quality" (ibid). In other words, changes in footing can be achieved through the manipulation of different 'contextualisation cues' with code switching constituting a primary cue that interlocutors employ to convey such shifts in footing⁴⁵.

⁴⁵ According to Gumperz, contextualisation cues are "surface features of message form which ...speakers (use to) signal and listeners (to) interpret what the activity is, how semantic content is to be understood and how each sentence relates to what precedes or follows" (Gumperz 1982: 131). Syntactic, grammatical, lexical and phonetic features may be used as contextualisation cues (ibid). In bilingual settings, participants may also use code switching as a contextualisation cue in order to

In this Chapter, I show that the use of English apart from being oriented to by the kids as being part of the norm they are orienting to (i.e. cases whereby a bilingual medium is adopted, see Chapter 5, section 5.3) or as constituting a case of repairable deviance (see chapter 5, section 5.2), it can also be oriented to by Reception participants as an instance of functional deviance. More specifically, I show that another possible orientation towards the use of English is that of orienting to it as accomplishing a shift in footing. Further, I argue that this orientation to the use of English points to and provides further evidence for the kids' orientation to a Greek monolingual medium (see also Chapter 5, section 5.2) in the CPAs.

6.2 Goffman's Notion of Footing in the Study of Bilingual Conversation

Goffman's notion of footing has been taken up by a few researchers investigating talk conducted in two languages (Auer 1984; Alfonzetti 1998) as well as play talk conducted in two languages (Halmari and Smith 1994, Guldal 1997, Cromdal and Aronsson 2000). For example, in his pioneering study of bilingual talk taking place among Italian immigrants in Germany, Auer drew on Goffman's work on footing to analyze speaker alignments and adjustments as well as participation framework changes. These phenomena have been examined in relation to code-switching. Accordingly, Auer (1984) has shown how code switching can be employed to make adjustments with regard to how many addressees (one or more) are being selected in interaction. However, as Cromdal and Aronsson note although Auer (1984) draws on Goffman's (1979) notion of 'footing', he does not further take up the conceptual apparatus introduced by Goffman in order to analyze in a more detail way interlocutors' subtle shifts in footings (Cromdal and Aronsson 2000: 437). Another example of study of bilingual talk where Goffman's notion of 'footing' has been taken up is that conducted by Alfonzetti (1998). More specifically, Alfonzetti looked at code-switching that takes place between standard and regional varieties of Italian among adult speakers in Sicily. She focused in particular on how speakers

signal contextual information that "in monolingual settings is conveyed through prosody or other syntactic or lexical processes" (Gumperz 1982: 98).

accomplish changes in speaker's footing through code-switching and has shown how speakers may use language alternation as a resource in order to set off quotations, virtual quotations (i.e. "the quotation of speech that the speaker imagines he or she will utter") and impersonal remarks (Alfonzetti 1998: 203). Further, as already mentioned above, Goffman's notion of footing has also been applied to the study of bilingual play interaction taking place among children. A representative example of research here is the study of Cromdal and Aronsson (2000) conducted in the schoolyard of an English medium school in Sweden (see also Chapter 4, section 4.6.2). Drawing on the same Swedish corpus, Cromdal and Aronsson (2000) examine how code-switching is used by bilingual children as a resource in contextualising different footings during play interaction. More specifically, drawing on Goffman's notion of 'production format' and 'participation framework' (Goffman 1981), Cromdal and Aronsson demonstrate how children exploit the local availability of two languages in this particular educational context in order to regulate 'production formats' and 'participation frameworks' when involved in a number of different play activities.

Drawing on these previous applications of Goffman's notion of footing to the study of language choice and language alternation in bilingual contexts, in this Chapter, I show how by switching between their two available languages in Reception, kids accomplish shifts in footing during their peer group interaction in the CPAs.

6.3 Changing 'Participation Frameworks' in and through Language Choice

In this section, I provide evidence for the kids' attendance to language alternation as an instance of functional deviance⁴⁶ by looking at cases where any switches into English are oriented to by Reception participants as accomplishing a shift in the

⁴⁶Gafaranga and Torras (2002) talk in those cases about 'medium suspension', i.e. 'language alternation which is not repaired even though it does not lead to a new medium' (Gafaranga and Torras 2002: 16).

recipient design. More specifically, I examine cases where English is used as a resource to initiate shifts in “footing” (Goffman 1981). Such shifts in footing were observed in the data to occur during exchanges that involve attempts at resolving issues of misbehaviour in the play areas. As it will become clear below, when a particular action during play time in the CPAs is oriented to as a problem or as misbehaviour by members of a particular group then appealing to the adults of the classroom (i.e. the teacher, the teaching assistant or the researcher) is very often seen by the kids as necessary. In those occasions, as the following extracts demonstrate, kids switch into English, i.e. into the adults’ preferred language, to introduce a new participant constellation. Also very importantly, as the discussion that follows shows, these switches into English are recognised and systematically oriented to by children and adults alike as turning adults from nonratified to ratified participants and inviting their intervention.

Consider extract 19 below. In this particular instance, kids are involved in a “play entry” negotiation⁴⁷, (Cromdal 2000: 139). Note here how peer group members attempt to deal with Marianthi’s attempt to enter the kids’ play dough activity by switching into what they consider to be the adults’ preferred language i.e. English.

Extract 19

Workshop Area: Katerina, Steve, Nantia, Marianthi, Miss Charalampidou, Miss Karavanta

{Marianthi has just entered the Workshop area}

1. Marianthi: afiste me na paro afto edo
2. Nantia: tis Ellis ine pes tis
3. <Katerina: thelis na mu tragudisis to **happy birthday**?>
4. Steve: ine **full**
5. Marianthi : ki ego eho toso ligo **play dough**
6. → Nantia: **ah stop Marianthi ah:**
7. (.)
8. Marianthi: poli ligo **play dough** eho
9. Nantia: orea tha vgalo t onoma su

⁴⁷ that is a negotiation taking place between a non-participant seeking entry into the ongoing play activity and actual participants “striving to protect the ongoing activity” from any new participant (Cromdal 2000: 139).

10. Steve: to vgala to vgala to vgala nato ohi afto ine tis Katerinas (.)
signomi pu gvala
11. (0.2)
12. → Nantia: **you know something Marianthi there is no space Marianthi there is no space there is no space and Elli is sitting there**
13. Marianthi: tora pou efige boro
14. (0.2)
15. Steve: den boris den boris den boris katholu
16. Marianthi: boro
17. Steve: den boris
18. Marianthi: boro
19. Steve: gia na do ehis to **name card** su?
20. Marianthi: boro ksekinai apo mu
21. Steve: eh to ksero
22. (0.2)
23. Marianthi: ah den boro den boro na kano turta
24. Steve: i Elli efige kato den ehis to **name card** su den to his den to vlepo
25. Marianthi: ki ego
26. Steve: ego vlepo to diko mu tis Ellis tis Katerinas (.) ke tis Nantias
27. Nantia: ne ki esena eh?
28. Steve: ne to ipa ne to ipa
29. (0.2)
30. Marianthi: ke boro na pekso pu efige (.) den ise esi daskala (.) ante
31. Steve: omos den vlepo to **name card** su
32. Marianthi: den ise esi i daskala
33. Steve: ne to ksero omos (.) i Elli efige eki ke den ehis to **name card** su
gi afto prepi na figis
34. Marianthi: hmhm {indicating negation}
35. Steve: prepi na figis
36. Marianthi: ela: (.) mi mu les tetia (.) psema
37. Steve: psemata ti les
38. (0.2)
39. Nantia: ohi psemata alithia
40. (0.2)
41. Steve: afou den vlepo to **name card** su
42. (0.1)
43. Nantia: tora pos tha to vgalume?
44. → Steve: afto pos ginete Nantia na peksi? **you know (.) Marianthi wants to play wants to play in the play dough but (.) but there s no but there s no room**
45. Nantia: **and Elli**
46. Miss Charalampidou: **why there s no room?**
47. Nantia: **and Elli wants to play**
48. Steve: **because Elli**
49. Miss Karavanta: **Elli is at the sand**
50. Steve: **but (.) not Marianthi**
51. Miss Karavanta: **Katerina where is Katerina?**
52. (0.2)

53. Miss Karavanta: **Marianthi put your name**

-
1. Marianthi: let me take this one
 2. Nantia: tell her it's Elli's
 3. <Katerina: would you like to sing **happy birthday** to me?>
 4. Steve: it s **full**
 5. Marianthi : and I have so little **play dough**
 6. Nantia: **ah stop Marianthi ah:**
 7. (.)
 8. Marianthi: I have so little **play dough**
 9. Nantia: ok I am going to take off your name card
 10. Steve: I took it off I took off your name card oh no this is Katerina's sorry for taking it off
 11. (0.2)
 12. Nantia: **you know something Marianthi there is no space Marianthi there is no space there is no space and Elli is sitting there**
 13. Marianthi: now that she left I can be here
 14. (0.2)
 15. Steve: you can't you can't you can't
 16. Marianthi: I can
 17. Steve: you can't
 18. Marianthi: I can
 19. Steve: let me see do you have your **name card**?
 20. Marianthi: I can it starts with mu
 21. Steve: eh I know that
 22. (0.2)
 23. Marianthi: I can't I can't make a cake
 24. Steve: Elli has left but you don't have your **name card** I can't see it
 25. Marianthi: I have put mine as well
 26. Steve: I can see mine Elli's Katerina's and Nantia's
 27. Nantia: yes and yours right?
 28. Steve: yes I said so
 29. (0.2)
 30. Marianthi: yes and I can play now that she left you are not the teacher leave me alone
 31. Steve: but I cannot see your **name card**
 32. Marianthi: you are not the teacher
 33. Steve: I know but Elli left and you don't have your **name card** that's why you have to go
 34. Marianthi: hmhm {indicating negation}
 35. Steve: you have to go
 36. Marianthi: stop it you are lying
 37. Steve: I am not lying
 38. (0.2)
 39. Nantia: he is not lying it's true
 40. (0.2)
 41. Steve: I can't see your **name card**
 42. (0.1)

43. Nantia: how am I going to take this off?
 44. Steve: Nantia how can she play? **you know** (.) **Marianthi wants to play wants to play in the play dough but** (.) **but there s no but there s no room**
 45. Nantia: **and Elli**
 46. Miss Charalampidou: **why there s no room?**
 47. Nantia: **and Elli wants to play**
 48. Steve: **because Elli**
 49. Miss Karavanta: **Elli is at the sand**
 50. Steve: **but not Marianthi**
 51. Miss Karavanta: **Katerina where is Katerina?**
 52. (0.2)
 53. Miss Karavanta: **Marianthi put your name**

In this episode, Marianthi's entry into the workshop area and her repeated attempts to take more play dough (turns 1 and 5) lead to a negotiation in which the rest of the group demands that Marianthi leaves the area (turns 2 and 4). Notice that in this negotiation, English elements such as "full" (turn 4) and "play dough" (turn 5) are used along with Greek, while none of the kids seems to have noticed the linguistic origin of the elements they are using. In (6) however, Nantia departs from this bilingual medium and produces an English monolingual utterance asking Marianthi to stop. Marianthi seems to be the only addressee here. Nevertheless, by producing her turn in the adults' preferred language (English), i.e. in the language which is associated with the institutional identity of the 'teacher' in this classroom, Nantia initiates a shift in footing and transforms what has started as a private, among the members of the peer group dispute, into a public issue. Thus, although Marianthi is explicitly being addressed here, at the same time Nantia's switch into an English monolingual medium works as a notification for the adults in the classroom that there is an issue with Marianthi in this group. Namely, in and through this switch into English, Nantia attempts to negotiate a new participation framework. She expands participant constellation and includes the adult, who is present here, in the dispute in question in order to get her to intervene. In the absence of any response from Miss Charalampidou, in (12), Nantia produces another English monolingual turn as a way of re-initiating a shift in footing, i.e. as a way of notifying the adult about Marianthi's transgression. In the absence of any response from the adults and in the face of Marianthi's "you are not the teacher" argument (turn 30 and 32), in (44), Steve

switches into English. More specifically, as Marianthi's "you are not the teacher" turns show (turns 30-32), she orients to Steve's actions (in turns 29 and 31) as 'teacher-like' and therefore as noticeable and in breach of the play group members' roles. Steve is not the teacher and therefore it is not part of his role to tell Marianthi what to do⁴⁸. On the face of this argument, Steve appeals to the adults of the classroom by producing himself an English-only turn. More specifically, by switching into English, Steve attempts to recast the adults of the classroom as ratified participants and get them to intervene. In (45), Nantia aligns with Steve's switch into English and footing. Finally, both Miss Charalampidou (in (46)), and Miss Karavanta (in (49), (51) and (53)) intervene and resolve the dispute. The adults' intervention and taking up of the turns that follow the kids' use of English in (44) and (45) are important in that they reveal that adult members themselves have interpreted the kids' English monolingual utterances as an invitation for them to be the next speakers, as an invitation for them to intervene and take action.

Similarly, in extract 20 below notice how the switch into English is perceived by participants as accomplishing a change in the participant constellation, i.e. as changing the participation status of the researcher from unratedified to ratified participant.

Extract 20

Water Play Area: Dimitris, Alexander, Ifigenia

1. {Dimitris takes one of the water toys}
2. Alexander: ei ki ego to thelo
3. (.)
4. → Alexander: **and I want to take that**
5. Dimitris: **and I want to take that**
6. Ifigenia: **you have to share toys so when Dimitris is (.) over (.) when he stops playing with it you can take it Alexander ok?**

⁴⁸ As already mentioned in Chapter 4, according to Sacks, categories/identities and activities are bound to each other, i.e. there is a co-selectivity between certain categories and activities (Sacks 1966, 1974, 1992). For example, here the activity of telling somebody what to do, i.e. to leave the play area, is bound with the category of 'teacher'. Since Steve cannot claim membership to this 'teacher' category, his actions here are interpreted as in breach of the peer group members' roles.

7. Alexander: eh eh: {expressing annoyance}

- 1. {Dimitris takes one of the water toys}
2. Alexander: ei and I want that

In the extract, Dimitris takes one of the water toys available in the water tray. This leads to Alexander's reaction in (2). In (4), in the face of lack of any action from Dimitris as evidenced by the micropause in (3), Alexander departs from his previous language choice (Greek) and switches into English. In (5), Dimitris follows the same course of action, namely he switches into English to issue his complaint. As the researcher's intervention in (6) shows, having been socialised into the RK pupils' interactional norms, Ifigenia has interpreted the kids' English monolingual utterances as an invitation for her to come in and help the kids to resolve the issue in question.

Extract 21 below provides another example of the Reception participants' orientation to the use of English as accomplishing a shift in the participation framework.

Extract 21

Workshop Area: Steve, Nantia, Odysseas, Miss Karavanta

1. {Nantia takes off John's name card}
2. Odysseas: den kanume **take off** to **John name card** giati?
3. (0.1)
4. → Steve: **Nantia took it off**
5. (0.8)
6. Odysseas: **Miss Karavanta Nantia take off John s name card**
7. (0.3)
8. Miss Karavanta: **now there s room for you Nantia**
9. (0.3)
10. Miss Karavanta: **Nantia yea there s room (.) ah (.) Nantia did you take off John s name card?**
11. Nantia: **yes I take it off**
12. (0.2)
13. Miss Karavanta: **well I let you play if you are five and you share play dough**
14. (0.2)
15. Miss Karavanta: **share the play dough Nantia**
16. (0.4)

17. Miss Karavanta: **let me now have all the play dough and I will share out evenly for everybody**
 18. (.)
 19. Miss Karavanta: **thank you**
-
1. {Nantia takes off John's name card}
 2. Odysseas: we don t do **take off John's name card** why?

In this case, Nantia's act of taking off John's name card leads to Odysseas' reaction in (2), where he produces a mixed utterance. However, in the absence of any response from Nantia as evidenced by the (0.1) pause in (3), Steve points to the perpetrator (Nantia) by producing an English monolingual utterance in (4). Note here the design of Steve's turn. Nantia is excluded from possible addressees while of the other two participants present in the setting, the likelihood is higher for the turn to have been addressed to Miss Karavanta than to Odysseas ('language preference' (Auer 1984)). In fact that turn (4) had been addressed to the adult, is confirmed by the direct address in (6), following the absence of a response by Miss Karavanta in (5). Therefore the choice of English in (4) must be concluded to have been meant to select Miss Karavanta as the recipient of the turn⁴⁹.

In the extracts discussed so far, we have seen how the kids switch into English to transform the participation status of adults (Miss Karavanta's, Miss Charalampidou's and Ifigenia's status) from nonratified to ratified participants, leading in this way the adults to intervene and to restore order in the CPAs. The following extract is interesting in that the shift in the 'participation framework' accomplished in and through the use of English leads this time the members of the peer group to restore themselves the order in their play area.

Extract 22

Workshop Area: Elli, Stella, Anna

1. Anna: ei ego den eho **play dough**
2. (.)

⁴⁹ For another example where kids use English in order to change the participation status of adults, see extract 22, Appendix 4.

3. Anna: den eho **play dough** ke den
4. (.)
5. Elli: den (.) ihe ligo eh ?
6. (0.2)
7. → Anna: **they are not giving me**
8. Stella: ego den boro na su doso epidi eho pari poli ligo
9. (.)
10. Anna: **they are not giving me**
11. Elli: oli na tis dosume
12. (0.2)
13. Stella: ego tha tis doso mia stalitsa epidi eho toso ligo
14. (0.7)
15. Stella: su dosa tora ligo

-
1. Anna: ei I don't have any **play dough**
 2. (.)
 3. Anna: I don't have any **play dough** and I don't
 4. (.)
 5. Elli: there is not there is not much right?
 6. (0.2)
 7. Anna: **they are not giving me**
 8. Stella: I can't give you because I have so little
 9. (.)
 10. Anna: **they are not giving me**
 11. Elli: all of us need to give her some
 12. (0.2)
 13. Stella: I am going to give her just that because I have got so little
 14. (0.7)
 15. Stella: I gave you some

In (1), Anna complains about not having any play dough. In the absence of any response from her co-participants as evidenced by the micropause in (2), she reiterates her complaint. After a short pause (turn 4), Elli provides an account of why the other children have not attended to Anna's complaint/ request. This prompts Anna to ask the teacher (adult present) to intervene (turns 7 and 10). As the transcript shows, this invitation is accomplished in English. Apart from language choice, note also here the turn design in (7) and (10). Anna uses 'they' and engages in this way in what one may be referred to as 'participant exclusion' since 'they' cannot be the next speaker. Interestingly though, although they have been excluded, in view of this invitation of adults, other kids undertake to forestall the teacher's intervention by offering to share the little play dough they have (turns 11, 13 and 15).

To summarize, in this section, by grounding Goffman's (1981) notion of 'footing' in the kids' moment-to-moment interaction in the CPAs, I have shown how children systematically use English to select the RK adults as addressees, i.e. their language choice acts are directional with English being systematically used to change the 'participation status' of RK adults from nonratified to ratified recipients of their complaints and thus to implicitly invite their intervention. The fact that adults respond and take up the kids' English turns confirms that this use of English was meant to select adults as the recipients of these turns. Also very importantly, kids themselves know that RK adults will accordingly interpret this use of English and react and therefore engage themselves in attempts to forestall the adult's intervention and reaction (extract 22 above).

6.4 Changing 'Production Formats' in and through Language choice

I have so far focused on cases where Reception participants systematically orient to the use of English as a change in the participation framework, i.e. as a transformation of the participation status of adults from bystanders to ratified participants. In this section, the focus shifts onto cases where the use of English among kids of a Greek 'linguistic identity' (Gafaranga 2001; Torras and Gafaranga 2002) is oriented to as a change in speaker's footing. More specifically, drawing on Goffman's notion of "production formats" (Goffman 1981:145), in this section, I show: a) how kids switch into English in order to manage self and other speaker identity positions and displays, and b) how these switches are accordingly interpreted and oriented to by their co-participants. As the discussion that follows demonstrates, attempts to shift between different speaker identities in and through English monolingual talk emerge: a) in conversational exchanges that involve enacting fictional (imagined) identities, and b) in conversational exchanges that involve enacting real life (institutional) identities. My discussion starts with the former type of situation, i.e. with those cases where English is used to enact an imagined identity.

Consider extract 23 below.

Extract 23

Drawing Area: Anna, Stella, Hrusa, Europi, Roksani, Katerina

1. Europi: kita pos tin kani ti zografia {laughing}
2. Roksani: tha halasis to kitrino
3. Katerina: la la la la {singing}
4. Stella: den pirazi
5. (.)
6. Stella: afu dikia mu ine
7. Katerina: la la la la {singing}
8. Europi: tha harazi (.) tha halasi to galazio pu to halase idi
9. Stella: den to halase idi
10. Katerina: lololo {singing}
11. Europi: ah tora kani tin treli
12. Hrusa: ne kala
13. Girls: iyak ah {expressing disgust}
14. Hrusa: kita pos ta kane
15. {Girls laughing}
16. Katerina: kitakste pianu tu aresi ?
17. Europi: kanunu
18. Katerina: giati burtsu burtsu
19. → Europi: *bonjour comment ca va?*
20. Katerina: *mercy*
21. Europi: *beaucoup*
22. Katerina: *comment ca va* burtsu ba la bulu bala
23. {Girls laughing}
24. Katerina: bu lu bala
25. {Girls laughing}
26. Katerina: buru bala buru bala {singing}
27. Stella: tora mas kani tin treli
28. → Hrusa: **how angry I am I am gona (xx) I will drink all my milkshake**
29. {Girls laughing}
30. Hrusa: **I will drink all my milkshake**
31. {Girls laughing}

-
1. Europi: look what she is doing to her drawing {laughing}
 2. Roksani: you are going to destroy the yellow one
 3. Katerina: la la la la {singing}
 4. Stella: it doesn't matter
 5. (.)
 6. Stella: it is mine
 7. Katerina: la la la la {singing}
 8. Europi: she is going to destroy she is going to destroy the blue one she has already destroyed it
 9. Stella: she hasn't already destroyed it
 10. Katerina: lololo {singing}
 11. Europi: ah now she is doing being crazy

12. Hrusa: yea ok
13. Girls: iyak ah {expressing disgust}
14. Hrusa: look what she did
15. {Girls laughing}
16. Katerina: look at here who likes this?
17. Europi: nobody
18. Katerina: why burtsu burtsu
19. Europi: *goodmorning how are you?*
20. Katerina: *thank you*
21. Europi: *very much*
22. Katerina: *how are you burtsu ba la bulu bala*
23. {Girls laughing}
24. Katerina: bu lu bala
25. {Girls laughing}
26. Katerina: buru bala buru bala {singing}
27. Stella: now she is doing being crazy
28. Hrusa: **how angry I am I am gona (xx) I will drink all my milkshake**
29. {Girls laughing }
30. Hrusa: **I will drink all my milkshake**
31. {Girls laughing}

In this episode, a number of different resources such as sing-song voice (turns 3, 7, and 10), nonsense words (18, 24 and 26), and switching first into French (turns 19-22) and then into English (28 and 30) are used by the kids in their attempt to animate the crazy person's identity. The kids' reactions in the subsequent turns, namely Europi's and Stella's 'formulations' (Garfinkel and Sacks 1970) (turns 11 and 27: "now she is doing being crazy") as well as the girls' laughter (turns 23, 29 and 31), show that the kids have recognised here the animator work, i.e. the 'crazy' identity performed by their co-participants. Further, the girls' laughing reactions (turns 29 and 31) that follow their co-participants' use of English (turns 28 and 30) demonstrate that English serves here as a cue used not only to signal the shift into the animator's footing, i.e. to signal the performance of a particular identity, but also used to "bracket talk" (Goffman 1981) as funny. In short, with regard to the kids' interpretations of each other's language choice acts in this extract, the fact that the girls have interpreted their co-participants' use of English and French as accomplishing a particular interactional task (that of animating the crazy identity) shows that the girls have noticed the use of these languages in interaction and that they have accordingly drawn inferences about why the use of these languages now. In turn, the fact that the girls have noticed and were able to draw inferences about

their interlocutor's language choice acts is important since it confirms that kids may orient to the use of languages other than Greek as an instance of deviant conduct.

From a language play perspective, the extract above is very interesting since it constitutes one of the key instances of multilingual language play attested in the data. Firstly, drawing on Greek phonology the kids engage here (as already mentioned) in the creation of nonsense words such as "burtsu butsu" and "buru bala" (lines 18, 24 and 26). These nonsense word formations can be seen as instances of both sound play and semantic play. On the one hand, they constitute instances of sound play since the kids play here with Greek phonology by creating phonological parallelisms and alliteration. On the other hand, they constitute instances of semantic play since these nonsense words are used by the kids as a creative insult. Now the function of these neologisms is as Cook has put it, to "create worlds that do not exist: fictions" (Cook 1997: 228), while as we have seen in Chapter 1, other researchers of children's language play have also discovered similar nonsense word formations in children's language play (see for example Broner and Tarone (2001) and Cekaite and Aronsson (2005)). Further, the kids draw here on their knowledge of English and French in their creation of the imaginative 'crazy' world of reference. Particularly the use of French here is very interesting since French is neither the kids' L1 nor the language promoted by the school. It is employed though by the kids who display in this way their "multicompetence" (Cook 1992). The kids' multilingual semantic play here is important since, according to Tarone, such instances of semantic language play that involve the creation of imaginative words "may provide for the learners who engage in it, valuable exposure to and practice in "double voicing": using sociolinguistically marked varieties of the L2" (Tarone 2000: 45). Ultimately, instances of play like these contribute to the development of the learners' sociolinguistic competence in L2 (ibid).

For another example of how language choice is used by the kids to animate 'fictional' identities, consider the following extract. In this case, switching to English is employed by the kids as a resource in order to animate a cartoon character.

Extract 24

Drawing Area: Europi, Kyriaki

1. Europi: to eho se dvd
 2. Kyriaki: ne thimase to lagudaki pu ihe agaliase tin aderfi (xx)
 3. Europi: ne
 4. → Kyriaki: ke ipe **yuppie celebrate this**
 5. (0.1)
 6. {kids engage in the register game see extract 28 below }
-
1. Europi: I have it in a DVD
 2. Kyriaki: yes do you remember this little rabbit that gave a hug to its sister (xx)
 3. Europi: yes
 4. Kyriaki: and it said **yuppie celebrate this**
 5. (0.1)
 6. {kids engage in the register game see extract 28 below }

In turns (1)-(3), the girls are using Greek to talk about one of their favourite cartoons. In the middle of her turn in (4), Kyriaki departs from this medium and switches into English in animating one of the cartoon characters that they have been talking about, i.e. in her attempt to initiate a shift from the identity of principal to that of the animator. Note that none of the kids attempts to repair here Kyriaki's switch into English. This absence of medium repair when one was possible⁵⁰ confirms that the other children have oriented to Kyriaki's choice of English as being functionally motivated, i.e. they oriented to it as a case of functional deviance.

A third example where the use of English is oriented to as accomplishing a shift in speaker's footing is provided in extract 25 below.

Extract 25

Drawing Area: Rokساني, Elli, Mary, Europi

1. Rokساني: katse ohi afto {refers to markers}
2. (0.16)

⁵⁰ Conversation Analysts argue that a repair is always a potentially relevant next action (Sidnell 2010: 135). See Sidnell (2010) for the notion of 'omnirelevance of repair' in interaction.

3. → Roksani: **what did do I see here? what do I see here? what do I see here? what do I see here? who can tell me? Capten Hook what do I see here?**
 4. Europi: **do it you have did it**
 5. (.)
 6. Roksani: **your majesty your Highness you are a Queen but Queens don t play with markers**
 7. (0.5)
 8. Europi: **do it quickly now**
 9. (0.1)
 10. Roksani: **I am doing a picture of of mushrooms**
 11. {Girls laughing}
 12. Roksani: **oh please your majesty (.) it has to be in: in in it has to be in** {in a singing voice}
 13. Europi: **do your work now**
 14. Roksani: **your majesty (.) I am not doing work I am drawing**
 15. Europi: **it sucks**
 16. {Girls laughing}
 17. Roksani: mi me htipsis (xx) tha sto paro afto
 18. (0.4)
-
1. Roksani: wait a minute not this one {refers to markers}
 2. (0.16)
 3. (...)
 - 17 Roksani: don't hit me (xx) I am going to take this one {refers to marker}
 18. (0.4)

In the extract, Roksani uses Greek to make a comment about one of the markers she is about to use in her drawing (turn 1). In (3), she switches into English in her attempt to initiate a shift in speaker's footing i.e. in her attempt to move away from the speaker identity of principal. In (4), in and through her switch into English, Europi aligns with Roksani's use of English as well as with her attempt to do "in-character" (Halmari and Smith 1994) talk. Roksani's response in (6), and particularly her use of the address terms "your majesty your Highness" to refer to Europi, reveals her interpretation of Europi's use of English in (4) as the enactment of the Queen identity. For the rest of this episode, both Europi and Roksani engage in animating the characters of Queen and servant respectively (turns 8-15) and they do so in and through the use of English. Further, the other girls' laughter in (11) and (16) provides evidence for the fact that Roksani and Europi are not merely involved in enacting a role. The girls' laughter testifies to the comic performance accomplished in and

through their co-participants' use of English and reveals their orientation to it as a joke. In this way, the effect of Europi's and Roksani's English language choice acts becomes apparent. Not only Europi and Roksani have achieved in and through their use of English to signal a change in speaker's footing (a shift from the speaker identity of principal to that of animator) but they have also managed to "bracket talk" (Goffman 1981) as non-serious play i.e. they have managed to move away from serious play (drawing) to non-serious play (comic performance). However, Roksani's switch into Greek in (17) brings the girls' comic performance to an end and signals their return to the drawing activity i.e. to serious play. In this case as well, the uptake of the use of English is important since it reveals the girls' own stance towards English. Roksani's interpretation of Europi's use of English as the enactment of the Queen identity (turns 6 and 12) as well as the girls' laughing reactions (turns 11 and 16) reveal the girls' orientation towards English as being functionally motivated.

In terms of language play, the girls' use of English can be seen as an instance of semantic language play that creates an imaginative world of reference. As already mentioned, such instances of language play may contribute to second language learning by providing opportunities for the acquisition of different L2 registers. In this case, the girls get the opportunity to practise the formal register associated with Queen-servant talk. The playful aspect of the exchange is also evident in the girls' repetition of "in" and in the singing voice adopted (line 12).

Having talked about how English is used by the kids as a resource in order to animate a number of different fictional identities, I now move on to a discussion of cases where kids switch into English in order to animate real life identities. My discussion starts with instances in which the kids are engaged in enacting a previously experienced classroom routine, the 'Register Routine', during their peer group interaction in the CPAs. As I have already shown (chapter 2, section 2.3.4.2), everyday life in Reception is characterised by a number of classroom routines and activities. One of these routines, the '*Register Routine*', takes place twice a day and it involves the formal whole class gathering for the purposes of taking the register. In terms of language choice, as required by the school's language policy, this routine is predictably conducted in English.

Here is an example.

Extract 26

{Register time: all students are sitting on the red carpet with their legs crossed}

1. Miss Charalampidou: **good afternoon Stella**
2. Stella: **good afternoon Miss Charalampidou**
3. Miss Charalampidou: **good afternoon Alexander**
4. Alexander: **good afternoon Miss Charalampidou happy birthday**
5. (0.2)
6. Miss Charalampidou: **good afternoon Steve**
7. Steve: **good afternoon Miss Charalampidou**
8. (0.4)
9. Miss Charalampidou: **good afternoon Roksani**
10. (0.2)
11. Roksani: **good afternoon Miss Charalampidou**
12. Miss Charalampidou : **good afternoon Europi**
13. Europi: **good afternoon Charalampidou**
14. {interaction between the assistant and the rest of the pupils in English omitted}
15. Miss Charalampidou: **good afternoon John**
16. John: **good afternoon Miss Charalampidou**
17. {students start talking, the class gets noisy}
18. Miss Charalampidou : **good afternoon Elli**
19. Elli: **good afternoon Miss Charalampidou**
20. {the class gets really noisy}
21. Miss charalampidou: **good afternoon Dimitris**
22. Dimitris: **good afternoon Miss Charalampidou**
23. Miss Charalampidou: **what do we do during register time?**
24. (0.1)
25. Miss Charalampidou: **what do we do during register time?**
26. Steve: **we don t talk and sit down properly**
27. Miss Charalampidou: **unless you hear your name some people are still talking**
28. (0.2)
29. Anna: **yes**
30. Miss Charalampidou : **that s the rule**
31. Anna: **yes**
32. Miss Charalampidou: **all right you may go and choose an activity**

As extract 27 below shows, Reception kids transform the institutional routine of taking the register into a game they play among themselves when in the CPAs. As the transcript shows, the kids switch into English in order to mark the change of footing.

Extract 27

Drawing Area: Europi, Hrusa, Roksani, Katerina

1. Hrusa: kalitera na itane fili
 2. Europi: ne
 3. Hrusa: ke ke na itane ki afto koritsi eh?
 4. Europi: ne
 5. (0.3)
 6. Hrusa: tha kano ke s aftine **lipstick** tote [ihe ke afti erotefti kapion
 7. → Roksani: **[now watch (xx) Europi**
 8. {Roksani takes a list with the names of her classmates, holds her pen and is about to start taking notes. She is standing in front of the table where the rest of the peer group is drawing}
 9. Europi: what?
 10. (0.1)
 11. Roksani: **good morning Europi good aft(.) good morning Europi**
 12. Europi: **good afternoon Miss (.) Roksani eh Miss Karavanta**
 13. (0.4)
 14. Roksani: se (.) pos se lene? pio ine to epitheto su?
 15. Europi: Spiropoulou
 16. Roksani: prepi na isuna
 17. Europi: edo
 18. (0.2)
 19. Roksani: Spiropoulou Spiropoulou
 20. Europi: **I am here**
 21. (0.10)
 22. Hrusa: ihes afto afto ke afto den to ihes teliosi ap afti ti fraula
 23. (0.4)
 24. Roksani: afto ine to onoma su?
 25. Europi: ne
 26. Roksani: ohi esena (.) Hrusa
 27. Hrusa: ti?
 28. Roksani: afto ine to onoma su?
 29. (0.1)
 30. Hrusa: ne
 31. Roksani: **good afternoon good morning Hrusa**
 32. Hrusa: **[good morning Miss Karavanta**
 33. Katerina: **[thelo na sas (diabaso) kati**
 34. (0.2)
 35. Katerina: (xx) na bris (.) edo ime ego
 36. (0.1)
 37. Roksani: gia na tis dihnis tora m ekanes na kano etsi
 38. Europi: Katerina (.) molis girisis na tis zitis signomi
 39. Katerina: signomi
 40. Europi: lipon Roksani theli na su pi kati i Katerina
 41. Katerina: signomi
-

1. Hrusa: it s better if they were friends
2. Europi: yes
3. Hrusa: and and this one would be the girl right?
4. Europi: yes
5. (0.3)
6. Hrusa: I am going to draw **lipstick** for her as well she would have fallen in love with somebody
7. Roksani: **now watch (xx) Europi**
8. {Roksani takes a list with the names of her classmates, holds her pen and is about to start taking notes. She is standing in front of the table where the rest of the peer group is working}
9. Europi: **what?**
10. (0.1)
11. Roksani: **good morning Europi good aft good morning Europi**
12. Europi: **good afternoon Miss Roksani eh Miss Karavanta**
13. (0.4)
14. Roksani: you what s your name? what s your surname?
15. Europi: Spiropoulou
16. Roksani: you must have been
17. Europi: here
18. (0.2)
19. Roksani: Spiropoulou Spiropoulou
20. Europi: **I am here**
21. (0.10)
22. Hrusa: you had this one this one and this one you haven't finished the strawberry
23. (0.4)
24. Roksani: is this your name?
25. Europi: yes
26. Roksani: not you Hrusa
27. Hrusa: what?
28. Roksani: is this your name?
29. (0.1)
30. Hrusa: yes
31. Roksani: **good afternoon good morning Hrusa**
32. Hrusa: **good morning Miss Karavanta**
33. Katerina: I would like to read something to you
34. (0.2)
35. Katerina: (xx) you need to find it I am here
36. (0.1)
37. Roksani: in trying to show her how to do it you made me do like this
38. Europi: Katerina when you come back you need to say sorry
39. Katerina: sorry
40. Europi: hey Roksani Katerina would like to tell you something
41. Katerina: sorry

In the extract, the peer group is engaged in a negotiation about the relationship between the characters they are drawing (turns 1-6). The girls' normative orientation to the use of the English element 'lipstick' (turn 6) along with Greek points to the bilingual medium they have adopted for the purposes of their interaction. In (7) however, Roxani produces a summon, an invitation addressed to her co-participants to notice what she is about to do, and therefore that what she is about to do is a non-sequitur from previous talk. Once, the attention is secured, Roxani starts the mock routine of taking the register and uses English (turns 11 and 12, 31 and 32). Note that, in responding to Roxani's initiations, the other kids refer to her as Miss Karavanta, the teacher of this particular class.

Another example of the mock routine of taking the register can be found below. In this case as well, English is used by the kids to signal the change in footing.

Extract 28

Drawing Area: Europi, Katerina, Kyriaki

1. Europi: to eho se dvd
2. Kyriaki: ne thimase to lagudaki pu ihe agaliase tin aderfi (xx)
3. Europi: ne
4. {Kyriaki's animation of cartoon character omitted see extract 24}
5. (0.1)
6. → Europi: **good afternoon Kyriaki**
7. Kyriaki: **good afternoon [Miss Charalampidou**
8. Katerina: [afto pianu ine? afto pianu ine?
9. (0.3)
10. Katerina: tis Stellas?
11. Europi: ne (0.2) ine ekso (.) nomizo ah ine eki **good afternoon Stella**
12. Katerina: den akui
13. Kyriaki: **she is in the toilet**

-
1. Europi: I have it in a DVD
 2. Kyriaki: yes do you remember this little rabbit that gave a hug to its sister (xx)
 3. Europi: yes
 4. {Kyriaki's animation of cartoon character omitted see extract 24}
 5. (0.1)
 6. Europi: **good afternoon Kyriaki**

7. Kyriaki: **good afternoon Miss Charalampidou**
8. Katerina: whose is this one? whose is this one?
9. (0.3)
10. Katerina: is it Stellas?
11. Europi: yes she is outside I think she is over there **good afternoon Stella**
12. Katerina: she is not listening
13. Kyriaki: **she is in the toilet**

In the extract, Europi departs from the play group's previous use of Greek and switches into English (turn 6) in order to animate the teaching assistant and start the register game. In responding to Europi's act, Kyriaki refers to her as Miss Charalampidou, i.e. the RK teaching assistant.

Finally apart from re-enacting teacher-pupil interaction during the 'Register Routine', English may also be used by the kids in order to animate other types of pupil-teacher interaction. An example is provided in the following extract where the kids switch into English in order to enact the identity of one of their classmates with the purpose of mocking the way she complains to the teacher.

Extract 29

Drawing Area: Europi, Hrusa, Mary, Katerina, Roksani

1. Europi: pedia eftihos pu den ine: i Anna edo gia na mas kani ta:
2. <Katerina: giaa: {saying hi to a third party outside the group}>
3. Hrusa: ne {laughing}
4. (0.1)
5. → Hrusa : ke na pigeni sti daskala na lei ! **Miss Karavanta ! Miss Karavanta**
6. {Europi is laughing}
7. Hrusa: **!Miss Karavanta (xx) ! to say that she will not be my friend**
8. (.)
9. Europi: **!what would you do to help say (0.1) ! be my friend (.)! you can be**
10. (0.1)
11. Hrusa: **!be my friend please ! I (could) (.)! I ! I don't have friends**
12. (0.1)
13. Katerina: pedia tha tis kano kokina malia opos tis thias mu
14. Europi: kitakste posa pola asteria ekane i Ma (.) i Marianthi (.)Marianthi

15. Roksani: Mary ipes Mary to kanoniko tis to onoma ke meta ipes
Marianthi
16. Europi: ohi ipa Marianthi enoo Mary
-
1. Europi: hey guys we are lucky that Anna is not here because she would
do all that stuff
2. <Katerina: hi {{saying hi to a third party outside the group}}>
3. Hrusa: yes {laughing}
4. (0.1)
5. Hrusa : and she would go to the teacher and she would say ! **Miss
Karavanta ! Miss Karavanta**
6. {Europi is laughing}
7. Hrusa: ! **Miss Karavanta (xx) ! to say that she will not be my friend**
8. (.)
9. Europi: ! **what would you do to help say (0.1) ! be my friend (.)! you
can be**
10. (0.1)
11. Hrusa: ! **be my friend please ! I (could) (.)! I ! I don't have friends**
12. (0.1)
13. Katerina: guys I am going to make her hair red exactly like my aunt s
14. Europi: look how many stars Ma has made Marianthi Marianthi
15. Roksani: Mary you said Mary her actual name and then you said
Marianthi
16. Europi: no I said Marianthi I mean Mary

The episode starts with the girls talking about one of their classmates (Anna). Up to turn (5), Greek is used. However, in the middle of her turn in (5), Hrusa switches into English, dropping in this way the identity of principal and switching to that of the animator. This shift into animator footing is preceded by a formal announcement, namely Hrusa explicitly says that she is about to imitate how Anna talks to the teacher. Notice here that in animating Anna, Hrusa switches not only into English but also into an animated tone. In this way, in enacting Anna's character by demonstrating the way she talks to the teacher (use of English) and exaggerating it in a parodic way (animated tone), Hrusa mocks Anna's way of complaining and constructs her utterance as something funny. This mocking stance towards Anna's way of complaining to the teacher and the enactment of her character in and through the switch into English on the one hand and the switch into an animated tone on the other lead to Europi's laughing reaction in (6). Actually Europi's laughter in (6) may be seen as Europi's recognition of the new footing initiated by Hrusa in (5). Europi's reaction here is important since it reveals her own interpretation of what Hrusa's

switch into English is doing in (5), namely her recognition and orientation to Hrusa's new footing. In (7), Hrusa goes on with the performance of Anna's character in English. In (9), the change of production format brought about by Hrusa's English utterances in (5) and (7) is not only recognised but also picked up by Europi herself. By switching herself into English and into an animated voice quality, Europi goes on enacting Anna's character and mocking the way she complains to the teacher. In this way, she moves as well from the position of principal to that of animator. Finally in (11), Hrusa goes on dramatizing the way Anna talks to the teacher by using English and an animated tone of voice. The girls' return back to the Greek monolingual medium from line (13) onwards, as well as the return to the drawing activity provides further evidence for the fact that the switch into English and into an animated tone of voice in the previous lines served to signal the girls' animator footing. Further, the girls' conduct here and particularly the fact that they have been able to recognise the animation work accomplished in and through these switches is important since it reveals what the girls' own stance towards the use of these resources is, i.e. it reveals the girls' orientation towards English (and animated tone of voice) as instances of functional deviance.

From the language play perspective, Hrusa and Europi are engaging here in Cook's semantic play, the creation of fiction. They do not simply reproduce Anna's utterances. Rather, they engage in a performance and dramatization for comic effect; hence their adoption of a high pitched and exaggerated tone of voice in lines (5)-(11). This is an instance of parody, ridicule and "double voicing" (Bakhtin 1981).

To summarize, in this section, I have shown how kids playing in the CPAs switch into English in order to display different speaker identities and positions. More specifically, kids were shown to switch into English monolingual talk in their attempt: a) to enact a number of different fictional identities (such as the crazy identity, the Queen and servant identity), b) to animate real life, institutional identities for the purposes of either playing the Register game or mocking the way one of their classmates complains to the teacher. It is interesting here to notice that contrary to what we have seen in the previous section (6.3), where the kids' language choice practices seemed to be directional with English being systematically used to

mark changes in the participation framework, in this section, as the kids' attempts to enact fictional identities show, it is not directionality but language contrast that matters. That is, in the case of animating fictional identities, the kids seem to draw on the fact that English (or French) goes against what normally occurs among themselves (i.e. use of Greek). On the other hand, in the case of animating institutional identities with the purpose of re-constructing institutional activities (e.g. register routine, complaining to the teacher) during play, they draw on the association between English and the institutional identities of teacher and pupil, i.e. on the co-selectivity between English and particular identities/activities. In other words, similarly to the case of shifting 'participation frameworks' it is directionality that matters here as well. Further, this use of English for the purposes of re-enacting pupil-teacher interaction during free play in the areas is particularly interesting since it reveals the Reception kids' knowledge of the linguistic norm that is associated with this type of interaction. Previous research on preschoolers' play interaction (Björk-Willén and Cromdal 2009) has also shown that indeed preschoolers are aware of the linguistic norms that are bound with certain classroom routines and are able to draw on these norms when they are re-constructing these routines during play with the peer group.

Finally, I have also examined the data from a language play perspective and provided three examples of semantic language play (extracts 23, 25 and 29) whereby the kids created fictions, worlds that do not exist (Cook 1997: 228). In one of those instances (extract 23), drawing on Greek phonology, children engaged in nonsense word formation while they also used both English and French to create an alternative reality. This multilingual language play example is particularly interesting since it reveals the kids' emerging 'multicompetence' (Cook 1992). Finally, overall, instances of semantic language play like those discussed here, as other researchers of language play as well have argued (Broner and Tarone 2001, Tarone 2000) afford to children opportunities for practising "double voicing" (Bakhtin 1981) and getting valuable exposure to several L2 registers. Ultimately, this type of language play enhances the development of the kids' sociolinguistic competence in L2 (i.e. which is English in that case).

6.5 Conclusion

In Chapter 5, I have demonstrated the media, i.e. the codes that children attend to in their moment to moment interaction in the CPAs. Namely, by investigating the participants' own orientation to their own language choice acts, I have shown that three different media may be adopted by the kids in the play areas: a) a Greek monolingual medium; b) an English monolingual medium and c) a bilingual medium which may be Greek or English-based. Further, with regard to language alternation, two different possibilities were observed in the previous Chapter. That is:

- a) kids oriented to alternation between their two languages as normative conduct;
- b) kids oriented to alternation between their two available languages as an instance of repairable deviance.

In this Chapter, the analysis of the kids' own orientations to their own language choice acts has revealed yet another possibility. The kids may orient to each other's language alternation acts as functionally motivated deviance (Auer 1984, Gafaranga and Torras 2002). More specifically, drawing on Goffman's notion of 'footing' (Goffman 1981), I have shown that switching between the two available languages may be oriented to by the kids as accomplishing a shift in footing. As we have seen in section 6.3, when faced with a problem of misconduct in the play areas, kids switch into English in their attempt to change the 'participation framework' (Goffman 1981), i.e. in their attempt to turn the participation status of adults from bystanders to ratified participants and implicitly invite their intervention (extracts 19-22). Further, in section 6.4, I have demonstrated that switching into English may also be used by the kids as a resource in order to signal changes in the 'production format' of an utterance (ibid), i.e. to manage self and other speaker identities and positions. The kids were shown to switch to English in order to signal shifts in speaker's footing in two different situations, namely in animating fictional (non-existent in real life) identities (extracts 23-25) and institutional (real life) identities (extracts 26-29).

As already pointed out, in each of these situations of initiating shifts in footing a different mechanism is involved. More specifically, as demonstrated in section 6.3 above, in shifting the participation status of adults, children's language choice acts are directional with English being systematically used for the purposes of shifting 'participation frameworks'. Further, directionality has also been observed in the case of animating institutional identities whereby kids were shown to systematically use one of their two languages, i.e. English, in order to enact the identity of 'teacher' and 'pupil' during play in the CPAs. That is, as we have seen in 6.4, in those cases kids have drawn on the association that exists in this setting between institutional identities and activities (i.e. the 'teacher', 'taking the register') and the use of English, i.e. on the co-selectivity between certain identities/activities and language choice. In turn, by drawing on this co-selectivity and systematically using English to enact teacher-pupil talk in the play areas, the RK kids have revealed their knowledge of the linguistic norm (English) that is bound with these identities and routines. Finally, in animating imaginative characters, it is not directionality, i.e. it is not the particular language being used by the kids that matters (i.e. English or French) but the fact that the language being used to perform a particular fictional identity is seen as 'other'. In other words, it is by virtue of 'other-languageness' (Auer 1999: 314) that the kids manage to animate fictional characters.

Further, the analysis of the kids' conduct both in 6.3 and 6.4 shows that no matter whether directionality or language contrast is involved, children orient to any switches to English monolingual talk as an instance of functional deviance. In turn, the kids' orientation to the use of English as functional deviance is revealing in two respects. Firstly, the fact that kids orient to any switches into English as being functionally motivated is important since it reflexively reveals what the kids' own sense of norm is. Reflexively English can be seen as functionally motivated only by reference to what the kids perceive to be normative, namely the use of Greek. More specifically, by systematically orienting to the use of English as accomplishing a shift in footing, children reveal not only their orientation towards the use of English but also towards the use of Greek. They reveal that for the purposes of their peer group interaction in the CPAs (at least for those occasions discussed in this Chapter; see also Chapter 5, section 5.2) English is perceived as deviant (as an instance of

functional deviance in the cases examined here) while Greek is perceived as normative. In that sense therefore, the kids' functional language choices provide further evidence for the possibility of adopting a Greek monolingual medium in and during their interaction with the peer group in the CPAs (already discussed in Chapter 5, section 5.2). In addition, the adults' interpretation of the kids' use of English as an invitation to intervene in the areas, i.e. as being functionally motivated, shows some awareness on the part of adult school members of the kids' attendance to a Greek monolingual medium during peer group talk; hence the ability to recognise the kids' use of English as accomplishing a particular function in interaction. Also, the fact that English is systematically adopted to re-enact adult-child (teacher-pupil) interaction provides further evidence for the type of medium that is typically adopted for the purposes of this type of interaction (see also Chapter 5, section 5.3). That is, it provides further evidence for the fact that an English monolingual medium is typically adopted in and during adult-child talk. Further, the fact that kids adopt the English monolingual medium to re-enact adult-child interaction when playing with the peer group reveals the kids' awareness of this norm.

Finally, examination of the data from a language play perspective has revealed three cases of semantic language play whereby the kids engaged in "double voicing" (Bakhtin 1981) and created imaginary worlds. In line with previous studies of children's language play (Broner and Tarone 2001, Tarone 2000), I have also argued that such instances of language play provide children with opportunities to experiment with, practise and acquire different L2 registers. In turn, this kind of play may contribute to the development of the kids' sociolinguistic competence in L2.

Chapter Seven: Medium Requests as Further Evidence of the English Monolingual Medium

7.0 Introduction

In Chapters 5 and 6, I have explored the issue of ‘how RK Reception children respond to the conflicting situation imposed on them by the school’s language policy and its pedagogical approach (Research Question 1). I have therefore primarily focused on children’s language choice practices. In this Chapter, I am moving on to the second issue that I have set out to explore in this study. Namely, the aim here is to see how adult school members respond to children’s actions that have resulted from the conflicting situation observed in Reception (Research Question 2). To address this issue, I focus here on a specific interactional practice that constitutes a routine feature of adult-child interactions in the corpus collected. This activity consists in the fact that adult school members intervene in the CPAs to request the kids to “medium switch” (Gafaranga 2010) from Greek into English. Following Gafaranga (2010), I will refer to the activity observed as “medium request”. Thus the aim of this chapter is to describe the adults’ practices of requesting the use of English in the areas where the kids are playing and examine the various strategies that they follow to accomplish these requests. Further, in this Chapter, I also examine how children themselves respond to the adults’ medium request practices in the play areas (Research Question 3). Based on the analysis of the adults’ requests for the use of English and the kids’ uptake of these requests, I argue here that very often Reception adults and children orient to different media of interaction, i.e. as the adults’ requests reveal adult school members orient to an English monolingual medium while as the kids’ responses to these requests demonstrate children orient to a Greek monolingual medium.

Additionally, I go on here with the examination of data from a language play perspective and where relevant the types of language play that kids engage in are briefly discussed.

The chapter is organised as follows. I first provide a brief review of concepts that are essential for the understanding of adults' activities in the CPAs. I briefly discuss the phenomenon of 'medium request' and situate it in the general framework of discourse-pragmatic work on requests in conversation. Next, I go on with the analysis of the various request strategies followed by adult school members in and during their linguistic interventions in the CPAs. I then examine the kids' own responses to the different intervention strategies employed by adults. Finally, I demonstrate how the adults' medium request practices and the kids' responses to these practices point to the fact that children and adults may very often attend to different media.

7.1 From Language Negotiation Sequences to 'Medium Requests'

7.1.1 The Interactional Activity of 'Medium Request'

Drawing on previous Conversation Analytic work on bilingual interaction and in particular on Auer's notion of 'language negotiation'⁵¹ (Auer 1984, 1995) (later on respecified as 'medium negotiation' (Gafaranga and Torras 2001)), Gafaranga (2010) has recently introduced the notion of "medium request" to refer to a specific interactional activity that he observed in the Rwandan community in Belgium. In investigating language shift in this particular community, Gafaranga observed that a recurrent feature of the conversations taking place among young members and adult members of the community was that children "constantly (albeit indirectly) request(ed) the latter to "medium-switch" from Kinyarwanda to French" (Gafaranga 2010: 241). As he notes, although this practice of requesting adults to 'medium-switch' bears significant structural similarities with language/medium negotiation sequences, it needs to be seen as a very specific type of activity for three main

⁵¹ As already mentioned in Chapter 4, according to Auer, a 'language negotiation' sequence is a sequence that "begins with a disagreement between two or more parties about which language to use for interaction and, ends as soon as one of them 'gives in' to the other preferred language" (Auer 1984: 20-21).

reasons (Gafaranga 2010: 253). Firstly, in language negotiation sequences, any of the interlocutors can initiate the negotiation, while in the Rwandan corpus, it is only children that invite adults to switch. Secondly, the starting point and the outcome of language negotiation sequences cannot be predicted, while in Gafaranga's corpus, "the starting point is a turn by an adult participant in Kinyarwanda followed by a turn in French by the child" and as for the outcome Kinyarwanda is never adopted (Gafaranga 2010: 255). Finally, according to Auer, a language negotiation sequence "ends as soon as one of (the participants) 'gives in' to the other preferred language" (Auer 1984: 20-21). In Gafaranga's data, the outcome involves two possibilities, either adoption of French, or the adoption of the parallel mode⁵². Therefore in order to describe more accurately the phenomenon he observed in his Rwandan data, and to firmly focus attention on the act of requesting performed by the kids, Gafaranga introduced the notion of "medium request" (Gafaranga 2010: 256). He further went on to identify four different strategies that kids followed in accomplishing their requests. The first strategy he talks about is that of "embedded medium repair" in which the child may attend "to the ideational content of what the first speaker has said", but, at the same time, implicitly requests the use of French (Gafaranga 2010: 258). The second strategy referred to as "generalised content repair" consists of "claiming not to have heard or understood, but using a different language", while in the so-called "targeted content repair" the child displays lack of understanding of only one specific item (Gafaranga 2010: 259). Finally, in and through the "understanding check" strategy, the child calls for a confirmation of his/her interpretation of what the adult said (ibid). As most of the labels given to the strategies suggest and as Gafaranga himself points out, all of the aforementioned strategies can be thought of as 'repairs' and more specifically as cases of 'other-initiated medium repair'⁵³ (Gafaranga 2010: 256). In addition, Gafaranga claimed that in and through the medium requests he observed in his data, language shift "is talked into being" (Gafaranga 2010: 266). Namely, he maintains that the participants' requests point to an underlying conversational order which in turn indexes the wider

⁵² The 'parallel mode' of the bilingual medium refers to those cases in which interaction goes on with speaker A using language 1 and speaker B using language 2 (Gafaranga 2000).

⁵³ The notion of 'repair' and 'medium repair' have already been discussed in Chapters 4 and 5.

macro-sociological order (whereby language shift from Kinyarwanda-French bilingualism to monolingualism is taking place) (ibid).

As I show in this chapter, the Reception educators' 'medium requests' in the CPAs as cases of 'other-initiated medium repair' have great analytical significance since they point to the fact that the adoption of Greek by the kids in the CPAs is often oriented to by adult school members as deviant conduct while what adults expect is the use of English. Before proceeding to the analysis of these medium request sequences, I will briefly touch on the different request types that previous discourse pragmatic research has identified. As already mentioned (Chapter 4, section 4.6.1), for the purposes of this study a Conversation Analytic methodology has been adopted. At this point however, in order to analyse the various medium request practices followed by Reception adult school members I am moving beyond Conversation Analysis to Discourse Analysis. Although Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis differ in terms of their foci and methods, I found Blum-Kulka's (1987, 1989) discourse pragmatic work on requests very useful for the description of the phenomenon of medium requests present in my data. In the next section, I am moving on to a brief review of this work.

7.1.2 Request Strategy Types and Their Level of (In)Directness

The speech act of requesting has been at the centre of discourse pragmatic research for years (see Searle 1975, House and Kasper 1981, Blum-Kulka 1982, Sangpil Byon 2004, Marti 2006, Economidou-Kogetsidis 2010) and it is not my intention here to review that literature. I will very briefly touch on the different request strategy types that have been identified and the classification of those request types in terms of their directness.

Following Færch and Kasper (1984), Blum-Kulka (1987) and Blum-Kulka et al (1989) have argued that every sequence that realizes a request can be seen as consisting of two parts: the 'Head Act', i.e. "the minimal part that can potentially

serve to realize the act” and other peripheral elements that can be used to mitigate or aggravate the force of the request (Blum-Kulka 1987: 135). Focusing on the realization of the Head Act of requesting, Blum-Kulka et al (1989) have⁵⁴ developed a typology of different request patterns and have designed a scale⁵⁵ that rates different request types according to their level of (in) directness. The request patterns classified as the most direct are the ones in which “the requestive force is either marked syntactically, or indicated explicitly” (Blum-Kulka 1987: 134). Examples of direct request strategies ordered according to their degree of directness (moving from the most direct to the least direct one) include:

- Mood derivables (e.g. when an imperative is used: Clean up the kitchen)
- Performatives (I am asking you to move your car)
- Hedged performatives (I would like to ask you to move your car)
- Obligation statements (You’ll have to move your car)
- Want statements (I would like you to clean the kitchen) (Blum-Kulka et al 1989).

At the other end of the scale, there are request strategy types (“non-conventionally indirect” ones) in which the “requestive force is not indicated by any conventional verbal means and hence has to be inferred” (ibid). Examples of these strategies include the so-called “Strong Hints” (You have left the kitchen in a right mess) and “Mild Hints” (We don’t want any crowding (as a request to move the car)) (Blum-Kulka et al 1989). In between these two extremes, there are request strategies that are “conventionally indirect” (ibid). Those “are characterised both by conventions of means and conventions of form” (Blum-Kulka 1987: 134). Examples include what Blum-Kulka et al (1989) call the “Suggestory Formulae” (How about cleaning up?) and the “Query Preparatory” (Could you clean up the mess?, Would you mind moving your car?).

As it will become evident in the discussion that follows, in requesting the use of English in the play areas, adults in Reception use a variety of different request

⁵⁴ based on the results of a Discourse Completion Test

⁵⁵ As the researchers themselves point out their scale is based on “previous classification of request strategies on scales of indirectness (Searle 1975, Ervin-Tripp 1976, House and Kasper 1981, Blum-Kulka 1982, Blum-Kulka et al 1985)” (Blum-Kulka 1987: 133).

strategies that differ at their level of (in)directness. Taking into consideration then the different request types identified by Blum-Kulka et al (1989), and drawing on previous Conversation analytic work on repair, as well as on Gafaranga's (2010) notion of 'medium request', in the next section, I move on to a detailed description of the different request strategies that adult school members use in their attempt to get Reception children to switch from Greek into English.

7.2 The Adults' Strategies of Requesting the Use of English in the CPAs

Similarly to the structure referred to by Gafaranga (2010) as 'medium request', in my data as well, the structure that emerges during the adult school members' activity of requesting the use of English in the areas is the following:

- It is always adults that initiate negotiation to use English rather than Greek (see turn 2 in extract 35 below)
- The starting point is some previous talk by a child in Greek which is not addressed to the adult that intervenes in the area (see turn 1 in extract 35 below)
- This is followed by a turn in English by the adult (see turn 2 in extract 35 below)
- As for the outcome, English is not necessarily adopted by the kids (see turns 6-7 in extract 35 below).

However, unlike Gafaranga (2010) where medium switches are always requested *implicitly*, in my data, requests to switch to English can also be accomplished explicitly. My discussion starts with this latter type of medium request.

7.2.1 'Formulating the Medium': the Adults' Explicit Medium Request Strategy

The first strategy observed and described below can be referred to as '*formulating the medium*'. It consists of 'stating in so many words' (Garfinkel and Sacks 1970) what medium adult school members would like to see adopted. In this strategy, explicit reference to 'English' or 'speaking English' is done one way or another. And it is precisely because adults engage in the act of explicitly naming the desired behaviour (i.e. the adoption of English) that the strategy can be classified as 'explicit'. In turn, three formats are available for this strategy, namely:

- 1) The Positive format
- 2) The Negative format
- 3) The 'Query preparatory' format

My discussion of the 'formulation' strategy starts with the 'positive format'. For an example of this, consider extract 30 below. A group of girls are using Greek as the medium of their interaction.

Extract 30

Drawing Area: Europi, Stella, Katerina, Roksani, Miss Karavanta

1. Katerina: na to stamatiso? {refers to her drawing}
2. Europi: pedia
3. → Miss Karavanta: **I would really like you Europi that I heard you speaking English**
4. Roksani: **I am writing the [(xx)**
5. Europi: [Stella
6. Miss Karavanta: **excellent**
7. Europi: **Stella? Stella? (.) I am gonna make another one for you ok?**
8. Stella: thelo na mu kanis ena edo ki ena edo
9. (0.1)
10. Europi: **I can do many (xx)**
11. (0.2)
12. Stella: **ok**

-
1. Katerina: shall I stop this one?
 2. Europi: hey guys

3. Miss Karavanta: **I would really like you Europi that I heard you speaking English**
4. Roksani: **I am writing the [(xx)**
5. Europi: **[Stella**
6. Miss Karavanta: **excellent**
7. Europi: **Stella? Stella? (.) I am gonna make another one for you ok?**
8. Stella: I would like you to draw one over here and one over there for me
9. (0.1)
10. Europi: **I can do many (xx)**
11. (0.2)
12. Stella: **ok**

In the extract, the girls' turns in Greek (turns 1-2), are followed by Miss Karavanta's request for the use of English in (3) which is realised here in and through a "Want Statement" (Blum-Kulka et al 1989) ("I would really like you Europi") further followed by a 'formulation' of the medium that she would like to see adopted ('Speaking English'). In this way, Miss Karavanta directly calls for a repair of Europi's use of Greek in (2) and the adoption of English. Also note that although Miss Karavanta explicitly addresses her direct request for the use of English to Europi (turn 3), it is not Europi but Roksani who responds and takes up the teacher's medium repair initiation (turn 4). As the lack of any repair action⁵⁶ on the part of the adult shows, Roksani's response does not seem to be interpreted by Miss Karavanta as a failure of her direct medium request. In other words, Roksani's response here is taken by the adult to be a relevant contribution. Thus, both the kids' and Miss Karavanta's behavior here provides evidence for the fact that the adult may 'mask' her request for the use of English as if it is addressed only to an individual child but in the presence and with the assumed attention of the rest of the class she implicitly casts all of the children to be ratified listeners⁵⁷.

⁵⁶ As already mentioned in Chapter 6, Conversation Analysts claim that a "repair is always a potentially relevant next action" (Sidnell 2010: 135), i.e. they talk about the 'omnirelevance' of repair in interaction (ibid). In this case, the lack of a repair on the part of the adult when one was possible is important since it reveals Miss Karavanta's own stance here towards Roksani's contribution.

⁵⁷ Similar practices have also been reported by other researchers who have investigated the 'participant structures' that emerge in the context of the classroom (see Hammersley 1976, Phillips 1972, Jones and Thornborrow 2004). Susan Phillips (1972) for example has noticed that in one of the 'participant structures' she identified, the teacher may address only one pupil but in the presence and with the assumed attention of the rest of the class, she simultaneously invites contributions from (an)other pupil(s). Similarly, Jones and Thornborrow (2004) have shown that in the context of

For another example of the positive format of the ‘formulation’ strategy consider the extract below.

Extract 31

Workshop Area: Nantia, Hrusa, Mary, Miss Christopoulou

1. Nantia: telos pedia
 2. → Miss Christopoulou: **English**
 3. Mary: **not in Greece we are wanting Greek**
 4. Miss Christopoulou: **you are supposed to speak English**
 5. (.)
 6. Mary: **no**
 7. (0.2)
 8. Nantia: ei dos mu ligo
 9. Mary: perimene Nantia
 10. Hrusa: perimene buzuki
-
1. Nantia: that’s it guys
 2. Miss Christopoulou: **English**
 3. Mary: **not in Greece we are wanting Greek**
 4. Miss Christopoulou: **you are supposed to speak English**
 5. (.)
 6. Mary: **no**
 7. (0.2)
 8. Nantia: hey give me some
 9. Mary: wait Nantia
 10. Hrusa: wait buzuki

As in extract 30, here Miss Christopoulou intervenes in the area and requests the use of English, explicitly naming the language that she would like to see adopted.

A further example of the positive format of the ‘formulation’ strategy can be found in turn (4) in the extract below.

Extract 32

Sand Play Area: Alexander, Marianthi, Katerina, Miss Tsiamtsika

“repeating instructions for a task”, although the teacher may explicitly nominate a particular pupil, the contributions from other pupils who are not explicitly cast as ratified listeners are also seen as relevant (Jones and Thornborrow 2004: 412). Finally, Hammersley suggests that teachers may address attention demands to specific pupils, while in reality these attention demands constitute “implicit warnings to all pupils” (Hammersley 1976: 107).

1. Katerina: parte ta zoa
2. Marianthi: parte ta ola tha mas halasun afto pu kanume
3. Katerina: ne
4. → Miss Tsiamtsika: **English guys**
5. Alexander : hihi {laughing}
6. Miss Tsiamtsika: **you don t want other people to say you are not speaking English (0.1) you are supposed to speak English aren t you?**
7. Marianthi: ti vazis edo?
8. (0.4)

-
1. Katerina: take the animals away
 2. Marianthi: take them away they are going to destroy what we have made
 3. Katerina: yes
 4. Miss Tsiamtsika: **English guys**
 5. Alexander : hihi {laughing}
 6. Miss Tsiamtsika: **you don t want other people to say you are not speaking English (0.1) you are supposed to speak English aren t you?**
 7. Marianthi: what are we gonna put over here?
 8. (0.4)

Alternatively, as I have already mentioned, the ‘formulating the medium’ strategy may adopt a ‘negative format’. For an example of this, consider the following extract.

Extract 33

Sand Play Area: Alexander, Marianthi, Katerina, Europi, Miss Tsiamtsika

1. Marianthi: ela Alexander afti ine diki mas thesi
 2. Alexander: anevenun
 3. Marianthi: tha thimosi omos i daskala
 4. → Miss Tsiamtsika: **aren t you guys supposed to speak English?**
 5. Alexander: **no (.) we don t we can t speaking English we don t know how to speak English**
 6. Miss Tsiamtsika: **yes you do you are speaking English now**
 7. (0.1)
 8. Alexander: **ah (.) ah**
-
1. Marianthi: come on Alexander this is our seat
 2. Alexander: they are climbing
 3. Marianthi: the teacher will get angry

4. Miss Tsiamtsika: **aren t you guys supposed to speak English?**
5. Alexander: **no (.) we don t we can t speaking English we don t know how to speak English**
6. Miss Tsiamtsika: **yes you do you are speaking English now**
7. (0.1)
8. Alexander: **ah (.) ah**

In this case, Marianthi's and Alexander's turns in Greek (turns 1-3) are followed by Miss Tsiamtsika's intervention in (4) where a negative "obligation statement" (Blum-Kulka et al 1989) is used with the force of requesting the kids to switch into English.

Another example of the 'negative format' can be found in turn (2) in the extract that follows. In this case, Miss Charalampidou calls for a repair of the girls' behaviour by 'stating in so many words' what the kids have not been doing at the level of language choice (i.e. not speaking English).

Extract 34

Drawing Area: Roksani, Stella, Steve, Europi, Miss Charalampidou

{The kids have just arrived in the Drawing area}

1. Stella: e tora emis irthame edo edo (ine) to **name card** mu
2. → Miss Charalampidou: **eh girls I don t hear any English over there**

1. Stella: hey we have now moved here this (this) is my **name card**
2. Miss Charalampidou: **eh girls I don t hear any English over there**

Finally, with regard to the realisation of the 'formulating the medium' strategy, the third format observed in the data is the 'Query preparatory' (Blum-Kulka et al 1989) format. For an example of this, consider extract 35 below.

Extract 35

Drawing Area: Europi, Marianthi, Katerina, Miss Charalampidou

{The girls are talking about which material picture they like better from those hanging on the board}

1. Europi: tis Katerinas ine afto (.) pu les
2. (0.6)
3. Marianthi: ine hazi? tis Mairis
4. → Miss Charalampidou: **Marianthi can you speak in English please?**
5. Marianthi: **ok**
6. Miss Charalampidou: **all right ok hm**
7. (0.5)
8. Katerina: pios tha kani gialia ston ilio?
9. (.)
10. Europi: ego
11. Katerina: entaksi (.) tha ston fero meta ton ilio
12. Marianthi: ah kita to Stelio
13. {Girls laughing}

-
1. Europi: The one you are talking about is Katerina's
 2. (0.6)
 3. Marianthi: Is she crazy? It s Mary's
 4. Miss Charalampidou: **Marianthi can you speak in English please?**
 5. Marianthi: **ok**
 6. Miss Charalampidou: **all right ok hm**
 7. (0.5)
 8. Katerina: who is going to draw sunglasses for the sun?
 9. (.)
 10. Europi: me
 11. Katerina: ok I will give you the sun later on
 12. Marianthi: ah look at Stelio
 13. {Girls laughing}

In turns (1) and (3), Europi and Marianthi use Greek to talk about the material pictures that their classmates have constructed. In (4), Miss Charalampidou comes in, directly addresses Marianthi and calls for the use of English. This time, the medium request strategy of 'stating in so many words' what the medium that the adult would like to see adopted is used along with what Blum-Kulka et al (1989) call the 'Query Preparatory' formula ("Can you speak in English please?").

Another example of the "Query preparatory" construction (ibid) can be found in turn 4 in the extract below.

Extract 36

Workshop Area: Stelios, Odysseas, John, Miss Charalampidou

1. Stelios: na ftiaksume spageti? na ftiaksume Odysseas?
 2. Odysseas: ne (.) na ftiaksume (0.1) spageti
 3. (0.2)
 4. → Miss Charalampidou: **Stelio? Stelio? can you speak English so John can understand you as well?**
 5. (0.1)
 6. Miss Charalampidou: **ok?**
 7. (0.7)
-
1. Stelios: Shall we make spaghetti? Shall we make Odysseas?
 2. Odysseas: yes let s make spaghetti
 3. (0.2)
 4. Miss Charalampidou: **Stelio? Stelio? can you speak English so that John can understand you as well?**
 5. (0.1)
 6. Miss Charalampidou: **ok?**
 7. (0.7)

In summary, in all the cases of requesting the use of English in the CPAs examined above, adults were shown to follow the same explicit strategy i.e. that of *'formulating the medium'* that they would like to see adopted in the area where they intervened. Further, as I demonstrated, this strategy can take a number of different formats, namely:

- 1) The Positive format (extracts 30-33)
- 2) The Negative format (extracts 34-35)
- 3) The 'Query preparatory' (Blum-Kulka et al 1989) format (extracts 35-36)

To the extent that, independently of the format adopted, the intended medium was named, *'formulating the medium'* can be seen as an explicit request strategy. In the section below, I examine the adults' less direct strategies for requesting the medium.

7.2.2 The Adults' Implicit Medium Request Strategies

We have so far seen examples of medium requests that are accomplished explicitly, i.e. examples of intervention episodes where adults explicitly indicate what linguistic behavior they would like to see adopted in a particular conversation. However, as I demonstrate in this section, very often adults attempt to settle the issue of 'Speaking English' in the areas implicitly, i.e. by requesting the use of English in an implicit way. Four different strategies for implicitly requesting the use of English were observed, namely:

- 1) The '*Hinting*' strategy
- 2) The '*Open-Class Repair Initiator*' strategy
- 3) The '*Summoning*' strategy
- 4) The '*Candidate solution*' strategy

My discussion of the adults' implicit requests starts with the 'hinting' strategy. This strategy consists of providing a hint that something may be wrong with the kids' conduct without further specifying what the desired behavior is.

Consider the extract below.

Extract 37

Drawing area: Europi, Stella, Nikos, Roksani, Miss Karavanta

1. Europi : ise pente ke mi ikosi
2. Roksani: o: hi ime pente
3. (0.2)
4. Nikos: ego ime pente ke miso
5. (0.3)
6. → Miss Karavanta: **writing table look at me all of you (0.1) I am giving you a warning**
7. (0.2)
8. → Miss Karavanta: **(keep your voices down) (xx) and more English please**

9. Europi: **more**
 10. Stella: **Ok (.) (I don t want) this I want this (.) not this**

 1. Europi : you are five years and twenty old
 2. Roksani: no I am five years old
 3. (0.2)
 4. Nikos: I am five years and six months old
 5. (0.3)
 6. Miss Karavanta: **writing table look at me all of you (0.1) I am giving you a warning**
 7. (0.2)
 8. Miss Karavanta: **(keep your voices down) (xx) and more English please**
 9. Europi: **more**
 10. Stella: **Ok (.) (I don t want) this I want this (.) not this**

In this case, the drawing group members are engaged in a discussion about age conducted in Greek (turns 1-4). Following this use of Greek, in (6), the adult directly addresses the whole group (“writing table”), explicitly asks for their attention (“look at me all of you”) and produces a warning (“I am giving you a warning”) in English. The adult’s warning here by itself can be seen as an implicit request and repair initiation, i.e. as a hint that there is some problem with some aspect of the kids’ conduct. Notice that, contrary to the cases of medium requests discussed in the last section, where adults very clearly specified which aspect of the kids’ conduct constituted the target of their repair initiations and what the desired behaviour is, in this case, Miss Karavanta only ‘hints’ that there is something wrong with the kids’ conduct without further specifying what kind of conduct she would like to see adopted. However, since as evidenced by the subsequent (0.2) pause in (7) there is no sign in the kids’ conduct that they have understood the meaning of her hint, in (8), the adult goes on to specify the request, i.e. to explicitly state what the desired behavior is (“more English please”). The ‘formulation’ here provided by the adult is important since it provides evidence for the fact that the ‘warning’ in the previous turn was actually meant by Miss Karavanta as a request for the use of English. In the following turns, the kids switch into English and respond in this way to the adult’s request.

For another example of the ‘hinting’ strategy but also for an example of the second implicit strategy (the “open-class repair initiator” (Drew 1997) strategy) observed in the data, consider the extract below.

Extract 38

Drawing Area: Europi, Stella, Katerina, Nikos, Roksani, Miss Karavanta

1. Nikos: pedia (.) pios kseri oti den ehume mavro [na sikosi to heri
2. Stella: [tha vrume meta
3. (.)
4. Nikos: ti? den ehume mavro kafe ine
5. → Miss Karavanta: **excuse me Niko?**
6. (.)
7. → Miss Karavanta: **what am I gonna say?**
8. Europi: **English please**
9. (0.2)
10. Nikos: fere afto
11. Europi: **no English I am going to do this**
12. (.)
13. Europi: **oh no I don t want it I want this I don t want it**
14. (0.2)
15. Stella: **ei I took this (.) first**
16. (0.4)
17. Europi: dosto tis Roksanis ke I Roksani tha to dosi sti: Katerina
18. (0.1)
19. Stella: **Katerina (for you)**
20. Europi: Katerina Katerina
21. Roksani: tha to paro spiti mu
22. Europi: Katerina Katerina Katerina

-
1. Nikos: hey guys who knows that we don t have any black markers raise your hand
 2. Stella: we are gonna find later on
 3. (.)
 4. Nikos: what? we don’t have any black markers this is brown
 5. Miss Karavanta: **excuse me Niko?**
 6. (.)
 7. Miss Karavanta: **what am I gonna say?**
 8. Europi: **English please**
 9. (0.2)
 10. Nikos: take this one
 11. Europi: **no English I am going to do this**
 12. (.)
 13. Europi: **oh no I don t want it I want this I don t want it**

14. (0.2)
15. Stella: **ei I took this (.) first**
16. (0.4)
17. Europi: give it to Roksani and Roksani will give it to Katerina
18. (0.1)
19. Stella: **Katerina (for you)**
20. Europi: Katerina Katerina
21. Roksani: I will take it home
22. Europi: Katerina Katerina Katerina

In the extract, Nikos' turn in Greek (turn 4) which is addressed to his co-participants is followed by the adult's intervention in (5). More specifically, Miss Karavanta initially employs what Drew (1997) calls an "open-class repair initiator"⁵⁸ ("excuse me") to indicate that there is some problem with Nikos' previous turn. The "open class repair initiator" employed here by Miss Karavanta by itself can be seen as an implicit request and call for Nikos to repair his previous use of Greek. However, in the absence of any response from Nikos as evidenced by the micropause in (6), in (7), the adult proceeds with the 'hinting' strategy. Namely, she requests the use of English by formulating a query in which she asks Nikos to figure out himself what is the reason for her intervention in the area⁵⁹ ('what am I gonna say?'). In the following turn, Europi responds to the adult's implicit 'hinting' strategy by 'formulating the medium' ("English please"). Europi's formulation here has a double meaning and significance. Firstly, she displays her understanding of the adult's hint as a request for the use of English. Secondly, she reveals here her willingness to comply with Miss Karavanta's request by acting herself as the English norm enforcer. More specifically, notice that apart from responding to the adult's hint, in and through her 'English please' turn, Europi explicitly asks her co-participants to adopt English as the medium of their play interaction. In reproducing here what is routinely formulated by the adult⁶⁰, Europi assumes herself the role of the one who is policing linguistic conduct in the areas, i.e. she assumes herself the role of the adult school member. Also note that similarly to extract 30, although Miss Karavanta

⁵⁸ According to Drew, an "open-class repair initiator" is a form of repair initiation (typical examples include "pardon", "sorry", "what") through which "a speaker indicates that he/she has some difficulty with the other's prior turn, but without locating specifically where or what the difficulty is" (Drew 1997: 71).

⁵⁹ More on the "what am I gonna say" strategy in section 7.2.3 below.

⁶⁰ This is an instance of "intertextuality" (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999: 49). Europi is reproducing here what is routinely said by adult school members.

addressed here her medium request to a particular child, Nikos, it is not Nikos but another child (Europi) who responds and takes up the adult's medium repair initiation. Since there is no repair⁶¹ of what the kids are doing here, it must be concluded that Europi's contribution is seen by the adult as relevant. In other words, it must be concluded that the adult school member may masquerade here her requests as if they were addressed only to Nikos but in reality she implicitly holds the whole class to be ratified recipients of her requests.

For another example of the 'hinting' strategy but also for an example of the third implicit strategy observed in the data (i.e. an example of the 'summoning' strategy), consider extract 39 below.

Extract 39

Drawing Area: Europi, Stella, Nikos, Hrusa, Katerina, Miss Karavanta

1. Katerina: opios mu dosi ena kenurio tetio tha ton kaleso sto parti mu
2. (.)
3. Europi: (ego tha kaleso ton Niko)
4. Katerina: kitakste (xx)
5. Nikos: tha kalesis ke ton aderfo mu e?
6. (.)
7. Europi: ne
8. (0.1)
9. → Miss Karavanta: **Niko?**
10. (.)
11. Miss Karavanta: **Niko?**
12. (0.2)
13. Miss Karavanta: **Niko?**
14. (0.1)
15. → Miss Karavanta: **are you remembering?**
16. Hrusa: **English please**
17. (0.4)
18. Nikos: opios⁶² **gives me the green he will he will come in my party**
19. Stella: **who is going to give me the: other green? (.) this one I will**
[invite him
20. Europi: **[the black?**
21. Stella: **no**

⁶¹ Similarly to extract 30, the lack of a repair on the part of the adult when one was possible is important since it reveals the adult's own stance here towards Europi's contribution.

⁶² whoever

22. Hrusa and Europi: **which?**
23. Stella: **this**
24. Europi: **this?**
25. Stella: **yes**
26. (0.2)
27. Europi: **this is not working and this is not working**
28. (0.1)
29. Stella: **which this?**
30. Nikos: **not anymore**
31. (0.2)
32. Katerina: **help here**
33. Stella: **this is not**
34. (0.1)
35. Hrusa: **which?**
36. (0.2)
37. Europi: **(all in the pot) do you see that (0.1) blue?**
38. Nikos: **no (xx)**

1. Katerina: who can give me a new one I will invite him to my party
2. (.)
3. Europi: (I am going to invite Nikos)
4. Katerina: look (xx)
5. Nikos: you are going to invite my brother as well right?
6. (.)
7. Europi: yes

In this case, the kids' use of Greek is followed by the adult's act of addressing an individual child (Nikos) (turns 9-13). In 'summoning' Nikos' attention here, Miss Karavanta indicates that there is some problem with Nikos' previous conduct. In that sense, the adult's act of '*summoning*⁶³' here can by itself be seen as an implicit request and implicit repair initiator of Nikos' use of Greek. However, as evidenced by the pauses in the subsequent turns (10, 12 and 14), Nikos does not respond to Miss Karavanta's implicit request. Therefore, in (15), the adult proceeds with a different strategy; she asks Nikos if he is 'remembering' by way of '*hinting*' that there is something wrong with his conduct. In and through her formulation of the medium ("English please") in the following turn, the child displays to Miss

⁶³ The fact that 'summoning attention' may be employed for the purposes of initiating repair is also reported in Hauser (2010). More specifically, in analysing conversations taking place among ESL students and native speakers of English at a conversational club (organised by an English language school in Honolulu), Hauser demonstrates how an ESL student (D) uses 'summoning' along with 'reformulation' in order to initiate repair of a procedural feature (the name tag of the native speaker the student is interacting with is not visible) (Hauser 2010: 284).

Karavanta her understanding of the previous hint as a request to switch the medium⁶⁴.

We have so far seen three different implicit request strategies. The ‘*hinting*’ strategy (extracts 37-39), the ‘*open-class repair initiator*’ strategy (extract 38) and the ‘*summoning*’ strategy (extract 39). With the following extract, I am moving on to a discussion of the fourth implicit strategy observed in the data, which following Sidnell (2010) will be referred to here as the providing a “*candidate solution*” strategy. This strategy consists of implicitly initiating repair of the kids’ use of Greek by providing an alternative solution, i.e. providing the English equivalent of their Greek utterances. Consider extract 40 below.

Extract 40

Sand Play Area: Hrusa, Elli, Marianthi, Christos, Nantia, Miss Charalampidou

1. Elli: diko su ine to **name card**? diko su ine?
2. (.)
3. Elli: ei
4. (0.1)
5. → Miss Charalampidou: **Elli is it your name card?**
6. (.)
7. Miss Charalampidou: **ask no ask her is it your name card?**
8. (0.5)
9. Miss Charalampidou: **is it your name card? ask her in English**
10. Elli: **what?**
11. Miss Charalampidou: **is it? (.) ask her please**
12. <Nantia: oho: kita ti eftiakses
13. Marianthi: ne bazo sto [trail mu>
14. Miss Charalampidou: [**is it** na milame sosta **is it your name card** ela Marianthi (.) **is it?**
15. Elli: **is it your name [card?**
16. Miss Charalampidou: [**bravo that s (it)**
17. Hrusa: **no**
18. Miss Charalampidou: **no it is not**
19. (0.4)
20. Christos: pedia kitakste to diko mu pos ine (0.2) ine me to Gali kitahte

⁶⁴ More on Hrusa’s “English please” response here in Section 7.3.1 below.

-
1. Elli: Is this your **name card**? Is it yours?
 2. (.)
 3. Elli: hey
 4. (0.1)
 5. Miss Charalampidou: **Elli is it your name card?**
 6. (.)
 7. Miss Charalampidou: **ask no ask her is it your name card?**
 8. (0.5)
 9. Miss Charalampidou: **is it your name card? ask her in English**
 10. Elli: **what?**
 11. Miss Charalampidou: **is it? ask her please**
 12. <Nantia: oho: look what you have done
 13. Marianthi: yes I am going to put it in my **trail**>
 14. Miss Charalampidou: **is it** we need to speak correctly **is it your name card** come on Marianthi **is it?**
 15. Elli: **is it your name [card?**
 16. Miss Charalampidou: **[bravo that s (it)**
 17. Hrusa: **no**
 18. Miss Charalampidou: **no it is not**
 19. (0.4)
 20. Christos: hey guys look how she made mine it is with Gali⁶⁵ look

In the extract, Elli's bilingual utterance⁶⁶ in (1) leads to Miss Charalampidou's linguistic intervention in (5). More specifically, in (5), Miss Charalampidou directly addresses Elli and implicitly initiates repair of her bilingual utterance by proffering the English equivalent of Elli's utterance ("Elli is it your name card"). However, the absence of any response from Elli evidenced in the micropause in (6), leads the adult to formulate the force of her previous utterance ("ask no ask her") before repeating the English alternative ("is it your name card"). Note that by offering the English equivalent of Elli's utterance, i.e. by offering a 'candidate solution' (Sidnell 2010: 117-118) to the problem of Greek, Miss Charalampidou initiates here medium repair in an implicit way. In (9) however, in the face of the (0.5) pause that follows her implicit request, Miss Charalampidou proceeds to a reiteration of her 'candidate solution' followed this time by a 'formulation' of the medium that she would like to see adopted ("is it your name card? ask her in English"). The formulation is important here since it provides evidence for the fact that her previous act was meant to be a request for the use of English while at the same time it reveals Miss

⁶⁵ Gali is a famous basketball player in Greece.

⁶⁶ Notice here Elli's use of the English element "name card" along with Greek.

Charalampidou's orientation to the (0.5) pause in (8) as a failure of that request. Further, in (10), Elli switches into English to produce a repair initiation ("what?"). However, although produced in English, Elli's repair initiation is addressed to the adult and not to Hrusa. In other words, Elli does not seem to have adopted English for the purposes of interacting with one of her co-participants which is exactly what Miss Charalampidou has attempted to get her to do through her previous request strategies (turns (5)-(9)). Therefore, Elli's conduct here leads the adult to reformulate her implicit request (turns 11 and 14) with Marianthi also being directly addressed in (14). Notice here that Marianthi's use of Greek (turn 13), that overlaps with a part of the adult's reformulation of the previous request, leads to a suspension of the activity of initiating repair of Elli's speech with Miss Charalampidou moving on to a repair initiation of Marianthi's use of Greek. Finally, in (15), Elli reproduces the adult's 'candidate solution' ("Is it your name card") to talk to one of her co-participants (Hrusa), responding in this way to Miss Charalampidou's request for the use of English.

In sum, the adults' conduct in the extracts discussed in this section shows that, contrary to what we have seen in section 7.2.1, initiating repair of the kids' language choice acts and requesting the use of English in the CPAs can be accomplished in a very implicit and subtle way, i.e. without any specification of what the desired behaviour is. More specifically, in their attempt to get the kids to switch into English, adults were shown to employ four different strategies: a) the 'hinting' (extracts 37-39), b) the 'open-class repair initiator' (extract 38), c) the 'summoning' (extract 39) and d) the providing a "candidate solution" (extract 40), strategy. As I have demonstrated, none of these strategies involves any reference to 'English' or 'Speaking English'. Yet in all cases, as the childrens' own reactions reveal, the requestive force behind the different implicit medium request strategies followed by adult school members has been recognized by the kids. In other words, although accomplished in a very implicit way, the adults' implicit repair initiations have been interpreted and oriented to by the kids as an invitation to repair their Greek language choice acts.

7.2.3. On the Repair of Medium Request Strategies

In the two previous sections, I have looked at the variety of strategies adult school members in Reception use in order to request the use of English in the play areas. Further, I have identified different types of request strategies which were further classified as ‘explicit’ (section 7.2.1) or ‘implicit’ (section 7.2.2) based on whether they involved explicit reference to the linguistic behavior desired (‘Speaking English’) or not. As I show in this section, the distinction between different types of strategies and the classification of these strategies as explicit or implicit does not mean that only one type of strategy is employed during the adults’ interventions in the areas. Rather, as I show below, when a strategy fails, it is repaired and replaced by another strategy, i.e. different strategies may be employed within the same intervention episode.

For an example of this, consider extract 37 reproduced below as 41 for convenience.

Extract 41

Drawing Area: Europi, Stella, Nikos, Roksani, Miss Karavanta

1. Europi : ise pente ke mi ikosi
 2. Roksani: o: hi ime pente
 3. (0.2)
 4. Nikos: ego ime pente ke miso
 5. (0.3)
 6. → Miss Karavanta: **writing table look at me all of you (0.1) I am giving you a warning**
 7. (0.2)
 8. → Miss Karavanta: **(keep your voices down) (xx) and more English please**
 9. Europi: **more**
 10. Stella: **ok (.) (I don t want) this I want this (.) not this**
-
1. Europi : you are five years and twenty old
 2. Roksani: no I am five years old
 3. (0.2)
 4. Nikos: I am five years and six months old

5. (0.3)
6. Miss Karavanta: **writing table look at me all of you (0.1) I am giving you a warning**
7. (0.2)
8. Miss Karavanta: **(keep your voices down) (xx) and more English please**
9. Europi: **more**
10. Stella: **ok (.) (I don t want) this I want this (.) not this**

In this case, Miss Karavanta intervenes and implicitly requests the use of English in and through a ‘warning’. As we have already seen, in and through this warning the adult ‘hints’ that there is some problem with the kids’ previous conduct without further specifying what the desired behaviour is. However, in view of the (0.2) pause in (7) and the ambiguity inherent in the warning, in (8), Miss Karavanta goes on to specify the request by ‘formulating’ the linguistic behavior that she would like to see adopted (“more English please”). It is interesting to note that there is a movement here from an implicit to an explicit medium request strategy. In other words, there is a movement here from a less (just ‘hinting’) to a more specific (explicitly stating what the desired behavior is) strategy of requesting the use of English.

The same practice, that of replacing a less specific (an implicit) medium request strategy with a more specific one (a direct one), can also be observed in extract 40 reproduced below as 42 for convenience.

Extract 42

Sand Play Area: Hrusa, Elli, Marianthi, Christos, Nantia, Miss Charalampidou

1. Elli: diko su ine to **name card**? diko su ine?
2. (.)
3. Elli: ei
4. (0.1)
5. → Miss Charalampidou: **Elli is it your name card?**
6. (.)
7. Miss Charalampidou: **ask no ask her is it your name card?**
8. (0.5)
9. → Miss Charalampidou: **is it your name card? ask her in English**
10. Elli: **what?**
11. Miss Charalampidou: **is it? (.) ask her please**
12. <Nantia: oho: kita ti eftiakses
13. Marianthi: ne bazo sto [**trail** mu>

14. Miss Charalampidou: [**is it** na milame sosta **is it your name card** ela Marianthi (.) **is it**?
15. Elli: **is it your name** [card?
16. Miss Charalampidou: [**bravo that s (it)**
17. Hrusa: **no**
18. Miss Charalampidou: **no it is not**
19. (0.4)
20. Christos: pedia kitakste to diko mu pos ine (0.2) ine me to Gali kitahte
-
1. Elli: Is this your **name card**? Is it yours?
2. (.)
3. Elli: hey
4. (0.1)
5. Miss Charalampidou: **Elli is it your name card?**
6. (.)
7. Miss Charalampidou: **ask no ask her is it your name card?**
8. (0.5)
9. Miss Charalampidou: **is it your name card? ask her in English**
10. Elli: **what?**
11. Miss Charalampidou: **is it? ask her please**
12. <Nantia: oho: look what you have done
13. Marianthi: yes I am going to put it in my **trail**>
14. Miss Charalampidou: **is it** we need to speak correctly **is it your name card** come on Marianthi (.) **is it**?
15. Elli: **is it your name** [card?
16. Miss Charalampidou: [**bravo that s (it)**
17. Hrusa: **no**
18. Miss Charalampidou: **no it is not**
19. (0.4)
20. Christos: hey guys look how she made mine it is with Gali look

In this case, the implicit strategy of ‘*providing a candidate solution*’ is initially employed by Miss Charalampidou in order to get Elli to switch into English (turn 5). However as evidenced by the micropause in (6), this does not elicit any response from Elli. This leads the adult to formulate the force of her previous utterance (“ask no ask her”) before repeating the English alternative (“is it your name card”) (turn 7). Nevertheless in view of another pause in (8), in (9), Miss Charalampidou proceeds with another reiteration of her ‘candidate solution’ followed this time by a ‘formulation’ of the medium (“Is it your name card? Ask her in English”) that she would like to see adopted. This formulation of the medium is important here since it shows that the adult has interpreted the (0.5) pause in (8) as a failure of her previous request. Namely, it shows that for Miss Charalampidou the expected outcome of her

previous request has failed to come off and that in the face of this failure she has decided to repair it and proceed with a more specific form of medium repair initiation, i.e. with the explicit strategy of ‘formulation’.

For a further example of the adult’s movement from a less to a more specific form of medium request consider extract 43 below.

Extract 43

Drawing Area: Roksani, Stella, Steve, Europi, Miss Charalampidou

{The kids have just arrived in the Drawing area}

1. Stella: e tora emis irthame edo edo (ine) to **name card** mu
2. (...)
3. (.)
4. → Miss Charalampidou: **Stella Europi Roksani**
5. (0.2)
6. → Miss Charalampidou: **English**
7. (0.5)
8. Steve: den ginete

-
1. Stella: hey we have now moved here this (this) is my **name card**
 2. (...)
 3. (.)
 4. Miss Charalampidou: **Stella Europi Roksani**
 5. (0.2)
 6. Miss Charalampidou: **English**
 7. (0.5)
 8. Steve: no it s impossible

In this case, Miss Charalampidou intervenes in the drawing area and implicitly initiates repair of the girls’ linguistic conduct in and through the implicit strategy of ‘*summoning*’ (turn 4). However, since as the (0.2) pause in (5) shows the adult’s medium repair initiation is not responded to by any of the kids, she moves on to a more specific strategy, the strategy of ‘formulation’. In this case as well, the formulation of the medium that Miss Charalampidou would like to see adopted is important since it confirms that the summons in (4) were actually meant as a request for the use of English and that the pause in (5) has been interpreted by the adult as a

failure of that request, hence her repair of that request through the ‘formulation’ in (6).

I have so far talked about the adults’ practice of repairing an implicit medium request strategy that has failed by replacing it with the explicit strategy of ‘formulation’. However, as I show below, an alternative course of action is repairing an implicit strategy that has failed by replacing it with another implicit strategy that is more specific.

Consider for example extract 39 reproduced below as 44 for convenience.

Extract 44

Drawing Area: Europi, Stella, Nikos, Hrusa, Katerina, Miss Karavanta

1. Katerina: opios mu dosi ena kenurio tetio tha ton kaleso sto parti mu
2. (.)
3. Europi: (ego tha kaleso ton Niko)
4. Katerina: kitakste (xx)
5. Nikos: tha kalesis ke ton aderfo mu e?
6. (.)
7. Europi: ne
8. (0.1)
9. → Miss Karavanta: **Niko?**
10. (.)
11. Miss Karavanta: **Niko?**
12. (0.2)
13. Miss Karavanta: **Niko?**
14. (0.1)
15. → Miss Karavanta: **are you remembering?**
16. Hrusa: **English please**
17. (0.4)
18. Nikos: opios⁶⁷ **gives me the green he will he will come in my party**
19. Stella: **who is going to give me the: other green? (.) this one I will**
[invite him
20. Europi: [**the black?**
21. Stella: **no**
22. Hrusa and Europi: **which?**
23. Stella: **this**
24. Europi: **this?**
25. Stella: **yes**
26. (0.2)

⁶⁷ whoever

27. Europi: **this is not working and this is not working**
28. (0.1)
29. Stella: **which this?**
30. Nikos: **not anymore**
31. (0.2)
32. Katerina: **help here**
33. Stella: **this is not**
34. (0.1)
35. Hrusa: **which?**
36. (0.2)
37. Europi: **(all in the pot) do you see that (0.1) blue?**
38. Nikos: **no (xx)**

-
1. Katerina: who can give me a new one I will invite him to my party
 2. (.)
 3. Europi: (I am going to invite Nikos)
 4. Katerina: look (xx)
 5. Nikos: you are going to invite my brother as well right?
 6. (.)
 7. Europi: yes

In this case, as we have seen, Miss Karavanta initially employs the implicit strategy of ‘*summoning*’ in order to implicitly initiate repair of Nikos’ linguistic conduct (turns 9, 11 and 13). When this does not elicit any response from Nikos, resulting in pauses in the subsequent turns (turns 10, 12 and 14), the adult proceeds with another implicit strategy, i.e. with the ‘*hinting*’ strategy (turn 13). More specifically, in (13), Miss Karavanta asks Nikos if he is “remembering” therefore referring to something that the kids have already been told. Note that similarly to the ‘*summoning*’ strategy, in and through the ‘are you remembering’ hint, Miss Karavanta does not explicitly state what the desired behavior is. However, contrary to the *summoning* strategy, in and through her ‘are you remembering’ medium request, the adult points to something that has already been stated and thus specifies how the kids can work out what the desired behavior is, i.e. by looking at the previous history of interaction. It is in that respect that the ‘*hinting*’ strategy is more specific as compared to the ‘*summoning*’ strategy. Thus, it becomes evident that in this case as well, once the adult’s medium request has failed, the adult school member has repaired it by replacing it with a more specific request for the use of English.

Consider also extract 38 reproduced below as 45 for convenience.

Extract 45

Drawing area: Europi, Stella, Katerina, Nikos, Roksani, Miss Karavanta

1. Nikos: pedia (.) pios kseri oti den ehume mavro [na sikosi to heri
2. Stella: [tha vrume meta
3. (.)
4. Nikos: ti? den ehume mavro kafe ine
5. → Miss Karavanta: **excuse me Niko?**
6. (.)
7. → Miss Karavanta: **what am I gonna say?**
8. Europi: **English please**
9. (0.2)
10. Nikos: fere afto
11. Europi: **no English I am going to do this**
12. (.)
13. Europi: **oh no I don t want it I want this I don t want it**
14. (0.2)
15. Stella: **ei I took this (.) first**
16. (0.4)
17. Europi: dosto tis Roksanis ke I Roksani tha to dosi sti: Katerina
18. (0.1)
19. Stella: **Katerina (for you)**
20. Europi: Katerina Katerina
21. Roksani: tha to paro spiti mu
22. Europi: Katerina Katerina Katerina

-
1. Nikos: hey guys who knows that we don t have any black markers
raise your hand
 2. Stella: we are gona find later on
 3. (.)
 4. Nikos: what? we don't have any black markers this is brown
 5. Miss Karavanta: **excuse me Niko?**
 6. (.)
 7. Miss Karavanta: **what am I gonna say?**
 8. Europi: **English please**
 9. (0.2)
 10. Nikos: take this one
 11. Europi: **no English I am going to do this**
 12. (.)
 13. Europi: **oh no I don t want it I want this I don t want it**
 14. (0.2)
 15. Stella: **ei I took this (.) first**
 16. (0.4)
 17. Europi: give it to Roksani and Roksani will give it to Katerina
 18. (0.1)
 19. Stella: **Katerina (for you)**

20. Europi: Katerina Katerina
21. Roksani: I will take it home
22. Europi: Katerina Katerina Katerina

In this case, as we have seen, Miss Karavanta implicitly requests the use of English in and through the indirect “*open class repair initiator*” (“excuse me”) strategy. As shown, in and through this strategy the adult signals that there is some problem with the kids’ conduct but the issue of what the desired behaviour is is left open. However, since this does not elicit any response from Nikos as evidenced by the micropause in (6), the adult moves on to the “what am I gonna say” strategy, i.e. to an implicit ‘*hinting*’ strategy. Note the design of Miss Karavanta’s turn here. The adult says “what am I gonna say” therefore referring to something she says all the time. In this way, Miss Karavanta specifies how the kids can work out what the desired behavior is, i.e. by looking at the previous linguistic context. It is in that sense that the ‘*hinting*’ strategy employed here by the adult is more specific as compared to her previous (“excuse me”) strategy. In other words, although none of the strategies involves an explicit statement of what behavior the kids are expected to adopt, contrary to the “*open class repair initiator*”, the adult’s ‘What am I gonna say’ ‘*hint*’ involves a specification of how the kids can figure out what the expected behavior is.

To summarize, in this section, I have shown that different types of strategies may be employed within the same intervention episode. More specifically, when a given strategy fails, it is repaired through a different medium request strategy. Further, as shown the different strategies employed in these repairs are not random but hierarchical. As I have demonstrated, when a given medium request strategy fails, it is replaced by a more specific medium request strategy. In other words, there seems to be a movement from less to more specific requests for the use of English. Thus, it must be concluded that the different medium request strategies both explicit and implicit are ordered around their relative strength to specify what the desired linguistic behaviour is. More specifically, at one end of the scale, ‘*summoning*’ and ‘*open-class repair initiators*’ indicate only that the adult has some problem with the kids’ conduct without further specifying what the desired behaviour is. The adult

school members' "are you remembering" and "what am I gonna say" 'hinting' strategies are more specific in that they make reference to the history of previous interaction, to something that the kids have already been told, specifying in this way how the kids can work out what the desired behaviour is. Finally, the 'formulating the medium' strategy is much more specific in that the desired linguistic behaviour is explicitly stated.

7.3 The Kids' Reactions to Adults' Medium Requests

My analysis of linguistic intervention episodes in the CPAs has so far focused on the different strategies that adult school members employ in their attempt to get children to switch from Greek into English. In this section, the focus shifts onto how children themselves respond to the adults' medium request practices described in section 7.2 above (Research Question 3). As the discussion that follows shows, there are four different types of responses on the part of the kids: a) '*Compliance*' with the adult's request, b) '*Ritualistic 'English please'*', c) '*Interruption of the ongoing activity*' and d) '*Ignoring*' the adult's request. Each of these responses is examined in turn below.

7.3.1 'Compliance' with the Adults' Medium Requests

The first type of response observed in the data is that of switching from Greek into English as a way of 'complying' with the adult's request for the use of English. As I show below, both explicit and implicit medium requests may be met with '*compliance*'.

For an example of the kids' compliance with a direct request, consider extract 30 reproduced below as 46 for convenience.

Extract 46

Drawing area: Europi, Stella, Roksani, Miss Karavanta

(...) {Play interaction taking place in Greek among the members of the Greek-only peer group}

1. Katerina: na to stamatiso? {refers to her drawing}
2. Europi: pedia
3. Miss Karavanta: **I would really like you Europi that I heard you speaking English**
4. Roksani: **I am writing the** [(xx)
5. Europi: [Stella
6. Miss Karavanta: **excellent**
7. Europi: **Stella? Stella? (.) I am gonna make another one for you ok?**
8. Stella: thelo na mu kanis ena edo ki ena edo
9. (0.1)
10. Europi: **I can do many (xx)**
11. (0.2)
12. Stella: **ok**

(....) {Play interaction taking place in Greek among the members of the Greek-only peer group}

1. Katerina: shall I stop this one?
2. Europi: hey guys
3. Miss Karavanta: **I would really like you Europi that I heard you speaking English**
4. Roksani: **I am writing the** [(xx)
5. Europi: [Stella
6. Miss Karavanta: **excellent**
7. Europi: **Stella? Stella? (.) I am gonna make another one for you ok?**
8. Stella: I would like you to draw one over here and one over there for me
9. (0.1)
10. Europi: **I can do many (xx)**
11. (0.2)
12. Stella: **ok**

In the extract, upon the adult's explicit request for the use of English (turn 2), the kids adopt English as the medium of their play interaction in the subsequent turns (turns 6 and 9). In other words, Miss Karavanta's explicit medium request is met here with 'compliance'.

Also consider extract 38 reproduced below as 47 for convenience.

Extract 47

Drawing area: Europi, Stella, Katerina, Nikos, Roksani, Miss Karavanta

1. Nikos: pedia (.) pios kseri oti den ehume mavro [na sikosi to heri
2. Stella: [tha vrume meta
3. (.)
4. Nikos: ti? den ehume mavro kafe ine
5. Miss Karavanta: **excuse me Niko?**
6. (.)
7. Miss Karavanta: **what am I gonna say?**
8. → Europi: **English please**
9. (0.2)
10. Nikos: fere afto
11. → Europi: **no English I am going to do this**
12. (.)
13. Europi: **oh no I don t want it I want this I don t want it**
14. (0.2)
15. Stella: **ei I took this (.) first**
16. (0.4)
17. Europi: dosto tis Roksanis ke i Roksani tha to dosi sti: Katerina
18. (0.1)
19. Stella: **Katerina (for you)**
20. Europi: Katerina Katerina
21. Roksani: tha to paro spiti mu
22. Europi: Katerina Katerina Katerina

-
1. Nikos: hey guys who knows that we don t have any black markers
raise your hand
 2. Stella: we are gonna find later on
 3. (.)
 4. Nikos: what? we don t have any black markers this is brown
 5. Miss Karavanta: **excuse me Niko?**
 6. (.)
 7. Miss Karavanta: **what am I gonna say?**
 8. Europi: **English please**
 9. (0.2)
 10. Nikos: take this one
 11. Europi: **no English I am going to do this**
 12. (.)
 13. Europi: **oh no I don t want it I want this I don t want it**
 14. (0.2)
 15. Stella: **ei I took this (.) first**
 16. (0.4)
 17. Europi: give it to Roksani and Roksani will give it to Katerina
 18. (0.1)
 19. Stella: **Katerina (for you)**
 20. Europi: Katerina Katerina
 21. Roksani: I will take it home

22. Europi: Katerina Katerina Katerina

In this case, the adult's implicit request for the use of English 'what am I gonna say' hint (turn 7) leads to Europi's formulation of the medium ("English please") in the following turn. The child's formulation has a double meaning and significance here. Europi displays her understanding of the adult's hint as a request for the use of English. Secondly, she reveals here her willingness to comply with Miss Karavanta's request by acting herself as the English norm enforcer. More specifically, notice that apart from responding to the adult's hint, in and through her 'English please' turn, Europi explicitly asks her co-participants to adopt English as the medium of their play interaction. In reproducing here what is routinely formulated by the adult⁶⁸, Europi assumes herself the role of the one who is policing linguistic conduct in the areas, i.e. she assumes herself the role of the adult school member. This becomes even more evident in what she does in (11). By reiterating her formulation of the medium ("no English"), Europi initiates repair of Nikos' previous use of Greek, confirming in this way that her previous formulation in (8) was meant as a request for the use of English addressed to the peer group. Upon this explicit formulation of the medium, in the next few turns, the kids adopt English. Notice though that the kids' compliance here with the request for the use of English is temporary. From turn (17) onwards, they return to using Greek as the norm of their interaction.

For another example of the kids' 'compliance' with the adults' implicit medium requests, consider extract 44 below reproduced here as 48 for convenience.

Extract 48

Drawing Area: Europi, Stella, Nikos, Hrusa, Katerina, Miss Karavanta

1. Katerina: opios mu dosi ena kenurio tetio tha ton kaleso sto parti mu
2. (.)
3. Europi: (ego tha kaleso ton Niko)
4. Katerina: kitakste (xx)
5. Nikos: tha kalesis ke ton aderfo mu e?

⁶⁸ This is an instance of "intertextuality" (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999: 49). Europi is reproducing here what is routinely said by adult school members.

6. (.)
7. Europi: ne
8. (0.1)
9. Miss Karavanta: **Niko?**
10. (.)
11. Miss Karavanta: **Niko?**
12. (0.2)
13. Miss Karavanta: **Niko?**
14. (0.1)
15. Miss Karavanta: **are you remembering?**
16. → Hrusa: **English please**
17. (0.4)
18. Nikos: opios⁶⁹ **gives me the green he will he will come in my party**
19. Stella: **who is going to give me the: other green? (.) this one I will**
[invite him
20. Europi: [**the black?**
21. Stella: **no**
22. Hrusa and Europi: **which?**
23. Stella: **this**
24. Europi: **this?**
25. Stella: **yes**
26. (0.2)
27. Europi: **this is not working and this is not working**
28. (0.1)
29. Stella: **which this?**
30. Nikos: **not anymore**
31. (0.2)
32. Katerina: **help here**
33. Stella: **this is not**
34. (0.1)
35. Hrusa: **which?**
36. (0.2)
37. Europi: (**all in the pot**) **do you see that (0.1) blue?**
38. Nikos: **no (xx)**

-
1. Katerina: who can give me a new one I will invite him to my party
 2. (.)
 3. Europi: (I am going to invite Nikos)
 4. Katerina: look (xx)
 5. Nikos: you are going to invite my brother as well right?
 6. (.)
 7. Europi: yes

In this case, the adult's 'are you remembering' hint (turn 13) is followed by Hrusa's formulation of the medium ("English please") in (14). Similarly to extract 47, in and

⁶⁹ whoever

through this formulation, the child reveals here her orientation to the adult's previous 'hinting' act as a request for the use of English while at the same time she displays her willingness to comply with that request by acting herself as the English norm enforcer. Note that in reproducing what is routinely said by adults⁷⁰ and explicitly asking her co-participants to switch into English, Hrusa assumes here the role of the adult school member. As the rest of the kids' conduct in the subsequent turns shows, the drawing group members comply with their co-participant's explicit request for the use of English and adopt English as the medium of their play interaction. It has to be noted that in this case as well 'compliance' with the adult's implicit request (in turn 13) is accomplished indirectly, i.e. the required medium is adopted as a response to Hrusa's explication of the adult's hint (her "English please" formulation) that Miss Karavanta's implicit request has elicited.

7.3.2 Ritualistic 'English please'

In the previous section, we have seen how the kids comply with the adults' implicit ('hinting') medium requests by engaging in an "English please" response. However, as I demonstrate in this section, the kids' 'English please' responses do not necessarily mean that the children have complied with the adult school members' requests for the use of English. As I show below, contrary to the kids' 'English please' responses in the context of implicit requests that lead to 'compliance', the kids' 'English please' responses in the context of explicit requests are 'ritualistic', i.e. the kids' 'English please' responses do not in these cases constitute real requests for the use of English.

For an example of this, consider extract 30 reproduced below as 49.

⁷⁰ This is another case of intertextuality.

Extract 49

Workshop area: Steve, Anna, Elli, Kyriaki, Miss Karavanta

1. Anna: ala ah den to ftiaksa eh tha mu tin edones piso tin **play dough**
mu
2. Steve: ti?
3. Anna: tha tin edines piso giati den tha den tha mu [(xx)den eho
4. Miss Karavanta: {talking to the writing area}: [**I would really like
you Europi that I heard you speaking English**⁷¹
5. (0.9)
6. Elli: tha itane turta
7. (0.3)
8. Anna: ego pios bori na mu dosi ligo ena eh
9. (0.20)
10. → Steve: **English please everybody**
11. (0.5)
12. Kyriaki: **English everybody**
13. Steve: **English Anna**
14. (0.5)
15. Steve: eprepe na mu ftiaksis
16. Anna: su ftiaksa ke to fages
17. Steve: ti? (.) den to faga

-
1. Anna: I haven't made this one yet you have to give my **play dough**
back to me
 2. Steve: what?
 3. Anna: you need to give it back to me because it s not (xx) I don't have
 4. Miss Karavanta: {talking to the writing area} **I would really
like you Europi that I heard you speaking English**
 5. (0.9)
 6. Elli: this would be a cake
 7. (0.3)
 8. Anna: I who could give me some eh
 9. (0.20)
 10. Steve: **English please everybody**
 11. (0.5)
 12. Kyriaki: **English everybody**
 13. Steve: **English Anna**
 14. (0.5)
 15. Steve: you need to make some for me {refers to cookies}
 16. Anna: I made some for you but you didn't eat them
 17. Steve: what? I didn't eat it

⁷¹ Same talk as in extract 30

In this case, Miss Karavanta's explicit request for the use of English is taken up by Steve and Kyriaki who engage in an "English please" and "English everybody" response in turns (10)-(13). Notice however that contrary to what we have seen in extracts 47 and 48, in this case, these 'formulations' are not followed by the kids' adoption of English as the medium. As the children's subsequent conduct shows (turns 15-17), the kids go on playing in Greek. Therefore it must be concluded that the kids' utterances ('English please') do not constitute real requests. Rather, they constitute a ritualistic response to the adult's explicit strategy of 'formulation' (turn 4). Further, note how in and through these ritualistic responses the kids use and subvert the adult's explicit request for the use of English for their own purposes. By speaking English here, the kids display to Miss Karavanta that they conform to her 'Speaking English' demand without however actually using English for the purposes of their interaction.

In terms of language play, the kids' 'English please' responses (lines 10-13) above can be seen as an instance of semantic language play that involves irony and 'double voicing' (Bakhtin 1981).

7.3.3 Interruption of ongoing activity

So far we have seen two different possibilities for responding to medium requests, i.e. 'compliance' and *ritualistic 'English please'*. In this section, I am moving on to a third possibility observed in the data, that of responding to the adult's request for the use of English by suspending current play interactional activity and using English only in order to talk to adults. For an example of this consider extract 31 reproduced below as 50 for convenience.

Extract 50

Workshop area: Nantia, Hrusa, Mary, Miss Christopoulou

1. Nantia: telos pedia

2. Miss Christopoulou: **English**
3. → Mary: **not in Greece we are wanting Greek**
4. Miss Christopoulou: **you are supposed to speak English**
5. (.)
6. Mary: **no**
7. (0.2)
8. Nantia: ei dos mu ligo
9. Mary: perimene Nantia
10. Hrusa: perimene buzuki

-
1. Nantia: that s it guys
 2. Miss Christopoulou: **English**
 3. Mary: **not in Greece we are wanting Greek**
 4. Miss Christopoulou: **you are supposed to speak English**
 5. (.)
 6. Mary: **no**
 7. (0.2)
 8. Nantia: hey give me some
 9. Mary: wait Nantia
 10. Hrusa: wait buzuki

In the extract, Miss Christopoulou's explicit strategy of 'formulation' (turn 2) is taken up by Mary who switches into English in (3) complying in this sense with the request for the use of English. Notice however that compliance with the adult's request leads to a suspension of the ongoing peer group play activity. Namely, Mary switches into English only in order to talk to Miss Christopoulou and not for the purposes of going on with the peer group's activity. Thus, although Miss Christopoulou meant the kids to adopt English to carry on their peer group play interaction, Mary rejects this. She redefines the situation as child-adult talk and switches to what she considers the norm for this type of interaction to be, i.e. English (see also Chapter 5, section 5.2). Further, in this way, by suspending the ongoing play activity and adopting English only for the purposes of child-adult interaction, Mary protects the peer group's activity from the imposition of English attempted by the adult school member.

A similar situation develops in extract 33 reproduced as 51 below.

Extract 51

Sand Play Area: Alexander, Marianthi, Katerina, Europi, Miss Tsiamtsika

1. Marianthi: ela Alexander afti ine diki mas thesi
2. Alexander: anevenun
3. Marianthi: tha thimosi omos i daskala
4. Miss Tsiamtsika: **aren t you guys supposed to speak English?**
5. → Alexander: **no (.) we don t we can t speaking English we don t know how to speak English**
6. Miss Tsiamtsika: **yes you do you are speaking English now**
7. (0.1)
8. Alexander: ah (.) ah

-
1. Marianthi: come on Alexander this is our seat
 2. Alexander: they are climbing
 3. Marianthi: the teacher will get angry
 4. Miss Tsiamtsika: **aren t you guys supposed to speak English?**
 5. Alexander: **no (.) we don t we can t speaking English we don t know how to speak English**
 6. Miss Tsiamtsika: **yes you do you are speaking English now**
 7. (0.1)
 8. Alexander: ah ah

In terms of language play, two examples of semantic language play that entail irony and subversing joking can be found in the two extracts above (extracts 50 and 51). Firstly, in extract 50, Mary's "Not in Greece we are wanting Greek" (in line (3)) utterance entails irony since she is playing here with the idea of the context (local context (school) versus wider context (the country where the school is located)) and its connection to the linguistic norm that is appropriate (English versus Greek). Namely, the school may be an English monolingual school where the use of English-only is the norm, however the wider context where the school is located is Greece and therefore the use of Greek is both acceptable and appropriate. Mary's argument here is that since the wider context is Greece, we would like to use Greek, i.e. the norm that is appropriate for this context. In this way, she challenges the adult's school member rationale (that the local context needs to be taken into consideration and therefore English needs to be used). Secondly, in extract 51, Alexander's utterance "no we don t we can t speaking English we don t know how to speak English" (line (5)) entails irony since Alexander is speaking English (his utterance is

produced in English) while at the same time, he is questioning his ability to do what the assistant has requested (i.e. to speak English).

7.3.4 Ignoring the Educators' Medium Requests

Finally, adults' direct strategy of 'formulation' is ignored completely. For an example of this, consider extract 32 reproduced here as 52 for convenience.

Extract 52

Sand Play Area: Alexander; Marianthi, Katerina, Europi, Miss Tsiamtsika

1. Katerina: parte ta zoa
 2. Marianthi: parte ta ola tha mas halasun afto pu kanume
 3. Katerina: ne
 4. Miss Tsiamtsika: **English guys**
 5. Alexander : hihi {laughing}
 6. Miss Tsiamtsika: **you don t want other people to say you are not speaking English (0.1) you are supposed to speak English aren t you?**
 7. Marianthi: ti vazis edo?
 8. (0.4)
-
1. Katerina: take the animals away
 2. Marianthi: take them away they are going to destroy what we have made
 3. Katerina: yes
 4. Miss Tsiamtsika: **English guys**
 5. Alexander : hihi {laughing}
 6. Miss Tsiamtsika: **you don t want other people to say you are not speaking English (0.1) you are supposed to speak English aren t you?**
 7. Marianthi: what are we gonna put over here?
 8. (0.4)

In this case, as Alexander's laughing reaction (turn 5) and Marianthi's use of Greek (turn 7) show, Miss Tsiamtsika's explicit request for the use of English (turn 4) as well as its "subsequent version" (Davidson 1984) (turn 6) are completely ignored by

the kids who go on playing in Greek. Similarly, in extract 53 below, the kids do not comply with the request to medium-switch and keep on playing in Greek.

Extract 53

Workshop Area: Stelios, Odysseas, John, Miss Charalampidou

1. Stelios: na ftiaksume spageti? na ftiaksume Odysseas?
 2. Odysseas: ne (.) na ftiaksume (0.1) spageti
 3. (...) {adult's talk omitted: see extract 36}
 4. (0.7)
 5. Miss Charalampidou: **here (0.1) here here here (0.2) ok take the box with you (.) speak in English though so John can understand you as well**
 6. (0.1)
 7. Miss Charalampidou: **ok?**
 8. (0.16)
 9. Odysseas: na ftiaksume afta ta dio ta dio ta dio prasina
 10. (0.5)
 11. Odysseas: ohi ohi kokino ohi kokino
 12. (0.3)
 13. Stelios: na kanume
-
1. Stelios: Shall we make spaghetti? shall we make Odysseas?
 2. Odysseas: yes let s make spaghetti
 3. (...) {adult's talk omitted: see extract 36}
 4. (0.7)
 5. Miss Charalampidou: **here (0.1) here here here (0.2) ok take the box with you (.) speak in English though so John can understand you as well**
 6. (0.1)
 7. Miss Charalampidou: **ok?**
 8. (0.16)
 9. Odysseas: let s make those two the green ones
 10. (0.5)
 11. Odysseas: no no not the red one
 12. (0.3)
 13. Stelios: let s make

To summarize, the analysis of the kids' own uptake of the adults' strategies of requesting the use of English has shown that the adults' medium request strategies may be responded to in four different ways. Firstly, explicit and implicit medium requests may be met with '*compliance*' (extracts 46-48). More specifically, in the

case of ‘compliance’ two situations are observed: a) in the context of explicit medium requests ‘compliance’ is accomplished *explicitly*, i.e. by switching into English upon the adult’s request (*direct compliance*), and b) in the context of implicit medium requests ‘compliance’ with the adult’s request is accomplished *implicitly*, i.e. by complying with one of the co-player’s explicit medium request that the adult’s request has elicited (*indirect compliance*). Secondly, an alternative possibility for responding to explicit requests is that of engaging in a *ritualistic ‘English please’* response through which the kids may speak English without however actually using English for the purposes of their peer interaction (extract 49). Thirdly, explicit requests for the use of English may also be responded to by ‘*interrupting current play interactional activity*’ and using English only in order to talk to adults (extracts 50-51). As shown, in this way the kids manage to protect their ongoing play interaction from the imposition of English attempted by adult school members. Fourthly, the kids may ‘*ignore*’ completely the adults’ explicit requests for the use of English and go on playing in Greek (extracts 52-53).

Further, from a language play perspective, children were shown to engage in L2 semantic language play that entailed irony and subversive joking. Such instances of language play in the data can be seen as markers of the kids’ growing proficiency in L2.

7.4 Conclusion

In this Chapter, I set out to explore how adult school members respond to children’s actions that have resulted from the conflicting situation observed in Reception (Research Question 2). To address this issue, I have described a recurrent interactional feature that characterizes adult-child conversations in the CPAs: this is the fact that adults in Reception constantly request kids playing in the areas to ‘medium-switch’ from Greek to English. Because of the structural similarities observed, i.e. a) only adults call for the switch into English, b) the called for switch is always from Greek to English, and c) the request does not necessarily lead to

alignment at the level of language choice, following Gafaranga (2010), I have referred to this activity as “medium request” (ibid) and gone on to examine the specific strategies that adult school members follow in order to accomplish these requests in the play areas. I have been able to identify two different types of strategies, namely explicit and implicit ones. First, I talked about the ‘*formulating the medium*’ explicit medium request strategy which consists of ‘stating in so many words’ what medium the adult would like to see adopted by the kids. I referred to this strategy as explicit, in the sense that, in all the ‘formats’ of the strategy observed (extracts 30-36), adult school members stated explicitly what the desired behavior is, making explicit references to “English” or “Speaking English”. On the other hand, in the other medium request strategies that I identified, requesting kids to medium-switch was accomplished without any reference to ‘English’ or ‘Speaking English’, hence the classification of these strategies as implicit. Overall, I discovered four different implicit medium request strategies. The first implicit strategy observed was referred to as the ‘*hinting*’ medium request strategy. This strategy consists of providing only a hint that there is something wrong with the kids’ conduct (extracts 37-39). The second implicit strategy was referred to as the ‘*open-class repair initiator*’ strategy. This strategy consists of signaling that there is some problem with the kids’ conduct but leaving the issue of what the desired conduct is open (extract 40). The third implicit strategy observed was that of ‘*summoning*’. This involves implicitly initiating repair of the kids’ use of Greek by calling the kids’ attention (extract 39). Finally, the ‘*providing a candidate solution*’ strategy, consists of implicitly calling for the adoption of English by offering the English equivalent of the kids’ utterances (extract 40).

It has to be noted though that the distinction between different types of strategies and their classification as implicit or explicit does not mean that adults always employ only one type of strategy during their linguistic interventions in the areas. Rather, as I have demonstrated in section 7.2.3, a recurrent phenomenon in the corpus in question is that when a strategy fails then it is repaired by replacing it with a different request strategy, i.e. different strategies may be employed within the same intervention episode. More specifically, as we have seen, when the expected outcome of an implicit strategy fails to come off, then it is replaced by the explicit strategy of

'formulating the medium' (extracts 41-43). Further, an implicit strategy that has failed may also be replaced by another implicit strategy that is more specific (extracts 44-45). In other words, in all cases, there is a movement from less to more specific requests for the use of English. Therefore it must be concluded that the different strategies employed are hierarchical, namely medium request strategies seem to be ordered in terms of their relative strength to specify the desired linguistic behavior. At one end of the scale, '*summoning*' and '*open-class repair initiators*' indicate only that the adult has some problem with the kids' conduct without further specifying what the desired behaviour is. The adults' "are you remembering" and "what am I gonna say" '*hinting*' strategies are more specific in that they make reference to the history of previous interaction, to something that the kids have already been told, specifying in this way how the kids can work out what the desired behaviour is. Finally, the '*formulating the medium*' strategy is much more specific in that the desired linguistic behaviour is explicitly stated.

Also very importantly, as cases of 'other-initiated medium repair', no matter whether they are accomplished explicitly or implicitly, the adults' practices of requesting the use of English in the kids' play areas are significant, since in this way adult school members reveal what their stance towards the use of Greek in the CPAs is. They reveal that the kids' orientation to a Greek monolingual (or Greek-English bilingual) medium is seen by Reception adults as a problem, i.e. as an instance of deviant conduct. In turn, their orientation to the Greek monolingual (or Greek-English bilingual) medium as an instance of deviant conduct, as this is evident in their own practices of requesting the use of English, by implication shows what the medium they are attending to is, i.e. English monolingual. It becomes evident then that the adults' different medium request practices are not random. Rather, they are informed by a particular interactional norm, i.e. by an English monolingual norm. That is, their practices reveal their attendance to an English monolingual medium that they were also shown to orient to in Chapter 5 (section 5.3).

With regard to the kids' own reactions (Research Question 3), as we have seen, the kids responded to the adults' requests in four different ways. Firstly, the kids 'comply' with adult school members' implicit and explicit medium requests

(extracts 46-48). More specifically, as shown, the kids' respond to the adults' direct requests by adopting English as the medium of interaction, complying in this way with the request for the use of English. In the context of implicit requests however, the kids engaged first in an '*English please*' response, namely the kids engaged in acting themselves as the English norm enforcers which in turn led to the adoption of English by their co-participants in their area. In other words, the kids' compliance with the adults' implicit strategies was indirect since it was accomplished through the mediation of a member of the peer group who engaged in explicitly stating what the desired linguistic behaviour is. Further, as shown the kids 'compliance' with the adults' requests tends to be short-lived, with the kids returning after a few turns to their own Greek norm. Secondly, as I demonstrated, 'English please' may also emerge as a response in the context of explicit medium requests. In those cases however, the kids' 'English please' is *ritualistic* in the sense that it involves speaking English without however using English for the purposes of play interaction (see extract 49). Thirdly, as demonstrated, explicit medium requests may also be responded to by '*interrupting the ongoing play activity*' and adopting English only in order to talk to adults (extracts 50-51). As I have already argued, this response involves a redefinition of the situation as child-adult interaction and consequent orientation to what the kids consider to be the norm for this type of interaction, i.e. English monolingual (see also Chapter 5, section 5.3 for the adoption of an English monolingual medium during child-adult talk). Further, by interrupting their own ongoing play activity and switching into English only for the purposes of talking to adults, the kids manage to protect their peer group play interaction from the imposition of English attempted by adult school members. Fourthly, we have seen that the kids may completely '*ignore*' the adults' explicit requests for the use of English by paying no attention to the adult's intervention and request and sticking to their own Greek norm (extracts 52-53). It becomes evident then that no matter whether the adults' medium requests lead to the temporary adoption of the English medium or whether they lead to the continuation of using Greek, in the end Reception kids go back to what seems to be their preferred medium. Also very importantly, these reactions on the part of the kids suggest that children orient to the adults' attempts to impose English as an interruption to their own ongoing

production of their own Greek monolingual norm. Namely, their reactions show that kids orient to the adults' medium requests as a disruption to their own Greek play interaction. In turn, this orientation to the adults' requests as a disruption reflexively reveals that attending to a Greek monolingual medium for the purposes of their peer group interaction is seen by the kids as normative conduct. In other words, the kids' responses here provide further evidence for the kids' adoption of a Greek monolingual medium in the CPAs (already demonstrated in Chapter 5, section 5.2).

Chapter 8: Discussion: Kids' and Adults' 'Practiced Language Policies' in Reception

8.0 Introduction

In the previous Chapters (Chapter 5-7), by observing the various “medium-related activities” (Gafaranga 2001) that participants engage in, I have shown that there are three patterns of language choice that characterize talk in the Reception play areas. Talk can be conducted in a Greek monolingual medium, in a bilingual medium (which may be ‘Greek-based’ or ‘English-based’), or in an English monolingual medium. I have been referring to these language choice activities as practices since they occur frequently in the data and they therefore represent what is usually done in the Reception CPAs. In the discussion that follows, drawing on the MCA approach to language choice (Gafaranga 2001, 2005) and Auer’s (1998) notion of language preference, I argue that the Reception participants’ language choice practices are not random but informed by specific interactional norms. As already mentioned (see Chapter 4), the notion of ‘norm’ is used here in the Ethnomethodological sense. It is used to refer to the ‘scheme of interpretation’ (Garfinkel 1967) that informs participants’ conduct in and during interaction. Or to use Spolsky’s own words, the notion of norm is used here to refer to “the idea that members of the community have of appropriate behaviour” (Spolsky and Shohamy 2000: 29).

In this discussion Chapter, I make two statements. Firstly, I argue that the language choice practices described in the previous Chapters (5-7) are organised around two different interactional norms, i.e.: a) the norm of attending to the ‘competence-related language preference’ of the co-participants and b) the norm of attending to a language preference that is ‘institutionally-assigned’ (see also Chapter 4 for a definition). Secondly, I argue that although the second norm is shared by all participants, the first norm is only followed by the kids and as a consequence child-child interaction in the CPAs is approached by children and adult participants from different perspectives. It is on the basis of this observation that I argue that children and adult participants in Reception seem to some extent to operate under different

‘schemes of interpretation’ (Garfinkel 1967), i.e. to follow different *practiced language policies*.

8.1 Attending to the ‘Competence-Related Language Preference’ of the Co-Participants

As we have seen in Chapters 5 and 6, during child-child interaction in the play areas there are three options available to participants:

- a) A Greek monolingual medium;
- b) A bilingual medium which may be Greek-based or English-based;
- c) An English monolingual medium.

As a perusal of the extracts in Chapter 5 shows, these language choice practices followed by the kids are not random but organised around a specific interactional norm. That is, as perusal of the extracts in Chapter 5 demonstrates, all the examples where the Greek monolingual medium is adopted (see extracts 2-7) involve participants of a Greek linguistic background who can be categorised as being competent in Greek (see Chapter 2 (section 2.3.4.1) and Appendix 5 for the linguistic background of the RK participants). Conversely, examples where the English monolingual medium is adopted (see extracts 8-10) involve participants of a non-Greek linguistic background who can be described as not being competent in Greek. It becomes apparent then that the kids’ language choice practices, i.e. their adoption of a Greek monolingual or English monolingual medium, are not random but organized around the co-participants’ ‘competence-related language preference’. Further, note that examples where the Greek-based bilingual medium is adopted (see extracts 13-17) involve Greek origin participants while examples where the English-based bilingual medium is adopted (see extract 18) involve non-Greek origin participants. That is, although in both cases where the bilingual medium is adopted, children seem to be ‘doing being’ bilingual in English and Greek, the direction that

the bilingual medium takes (Greek-based or English-based) seems to depend on the ‘competence-related language preference’ of the participants; hence the adoption of a Greek-based bilingual medium with participants who are of a Greek linguistic background and prefer Greek and the adoption of an English-based bilingual medium with participants who are of a non-Greek linguistic background and do not prefer Greek.

It becomes evident then that all the language choice practices followed by the kids during their peer group interaction in the CPAs are informed by the same interactional norm, i.e. that of *attending to the ‘competence-related language preference’ of the co-participants*. In line with this norm, when among themselves kids fit each other to a language-based categorization device⁷², i.e. they map each other to the category of [+/- Greek] ‘competence-related language preference’. Accordingly, they adopt a Greek monolingual (or Greek-based bilingual) medium when their co-players have been categorized as [+Greek] and an English monolingual (or English-based bilingual) medium when their co-players have been categorized as [-Greek]. Further, the co-selectivity between language choice and the category of ‘competence-related language preference’ works for the kids as the ‘scheme of interpretation’ they draw on in order to make sense of each other’s acts; hence their interpretation and orientation to the use of Greek as normative and to the use of English as deviant when their co-players have been categorized as [+Greek] (see extracts 4-7) and their orientation to the use of Greek as deviant and to the use of English as normative when their co-players have been categorized as [-Greek] (see extract 10).

However this norm of attending to the ‘competence-related language preference’ of the co-participants can neither account for the various language choice practices that Reception participants were shown to engage in during child-adult interaction in the play areas nor for the fact that irrespectively of the participants’ ‘competence-related language preference’ participants orient in those cases to an

⁷² Gafaranga’s argument that in and during interaction, bilingual participants fit each other to a language-based categorisation device has already been discussed in Chapter 4, section 4.6.3.

English monolingual medium. As I argue below, it is a different interactional norm that is in operation in those cases of child-adult interaction.

8.2 Attending to an '*Institutionally-Assigned Language Preference*'

In Chapters 5-7, in and during child-adult interaction (and in the reproduction of this type of interaction) in the play areas, Reception participants were shown to engage in the following activities:

- a) kids systematically used English with adults while the latter did not call for a repair (see for example extract 11, Chapter 5);
- b) whenever the use of languages other than English (i.e. Greek) occurred, participants engaged in acts of repairing it (see for example extract 12, Chapter 5);
- c) kids used English to reproduce interactional routines involving educators (see for example extracts 26-29, Chapter 6);
- d) adults intervened in the kids' play areas to request the kids to switch the medium from Greek into English, i.e. adults engaged in acts of initiating repair of the kids' use of Greek (see for example extracts 30-40, Chapter 7).

I would like to argue here that contrary to the norm observed during child-child interaction, the aforementioned practices observed during child-adult interaction in the CPAs are organised around a different interactional norm. This second norm involves *attending to a language preference that is 'institutionally-assigned'*. As already mentioned in Chapter 4, the notion of '*institutionally-assigned language preference*' is introduced here to refer to the preference observed in the institutional context at hand for the use of a particular language in and during the enactment of the institutional identity of 'teacher' and 'pupil'. In other words, the notion of '*institutionally-assigned language preference*' is used here to refer to the fact that in the institutional context in question, the enactment of the institutional identity of teacher and pupil is indissolubly linked with the use of a particular language.

Evidence for this second norm of attending to a language preference that is ‘institutionally-assigned’ can be found in those occasions where Reception kids engage in reproducing child-adult talk in the CPAs (see Chapter 6, section 6.4) and more specifically in those cases where they engage in re-enacting a specific classroom routine (for example the register routine). For the purposes of this re-enactment, one or more of the peer group members engage(s) in ‘doing being’ the ‘teacher’ and the rest of them in ‘doing being’ the ‘pupils’. The fact that children very often engage in playing games that involve a re-enactment of previously experienced classroom routines and of the institutional identities (of ‘teacher’ and ‘pupil’) that are linked with these routines has also been demonstrated both by previous classroom discourse (Bunyi 2005, Björk-Willén and Cromdal 2009) and play interaction researchers (Butler 2008). As these previous studies show, to enact the role of the ‘teacher’, kids perform teacher-like acts, i.e. acts that are bound to the category ‘teacher’ (see for example Butler 2008, Bunyi 2005). Similarly, in my data as extracts 27-28 show to start and play the ‘register game’ Reception kids perform acts that are bound to the category ‘teacher’ while to keep the game going, the rest of the children perform acts bound to the category ‘pupil’. For example, in extract 27, one of the kids playing in the drawing area (Roksani) engages in calling out the participants’ names. These register-like acts are bound to the category ‘teacher’ since typically it is the teacher who performs the act of taking the register and the one who calls out the pupils’ names (see also extract 28, Chapter 6). By engaging in these acts, the child is clearly ‘doing being’ the teacher. Further, two of the other participants in this group (Europi and Hrusa) are ‘doing being’ the pupils as evidenced by the fact that they respond to their co-participant’s register-like acts and are referring to her as ‘Miss Karavanta’, the teacher of this particular class. As the transcript shows, all of these acts are accomplished in English. In other words, what these cases of reproducing adult-child talk in the CPAs demonstrate is that the enactment of institutional identities is indissolubly linked with the use of English.

Further evidence for the norm of attending to an ‘institutionally-assigned’ language preference can be found in the adults’ requests for the use of English (already discussed in Chapter 7). As shown in Chapter 7, a recurrent interactional

feature that characterizes child-adult talk in the play areas is that adults in Reception constantly intervene in the kids' play areas to request the kids to 'medium-switch' from Greek into English. In other words, adults regularly engage in what Gafaranga (2010) calls "medium requests", i.e. in acts of initiating repair of the kids' use of Greek. Gafaranga argues that in and through the medium requests observed in his Rwandan corpus, participants orient to specific language-based categories (Gafaranga 2010: 265). As we have seen in Chapter 7 (section 7.1.1.), he further claims that in and through the medium requests he observed in his data, language shift "is talked into being" (Gafaranga 2010: 266). Namely, he maintains that the participants' requests point to an underlying conversational order which in turn indexes the wider macro-sociological order (whereby language shift from Kinyarwanda-French bilingualism to monolingualism is taking place) (ibid). To some extent, Gafaranga's findings are also echoed in my own medium request data.

More specifically, as perusal of the extracts discussed in Chapter 7 shows, it is only adult participants that accomplish medium requests in the target classroom. This particular aspect of the conversational order of medium requests observed in my data is interesting in the sense that it reflects the unequal distribution of power among Reception participants with regard to who can request a particular medium to be adopted. In this particular case, this unequal distribution of power comes from the institutional context at hand and the institutional role typically performed by adults in this setting, i.e. the institutional role of 'teacher'. Previous classroom discourse researchers have talked about "the power asymmetry of the classroom", which is a result of the teacher's natural authority in the classroom (Edwards and Mercer 1987: 158). In this case as well, this specific packaging observed in the medium requests in my data can be accounted for on the basis of the authority that adults have by virtue of their institutional role as 'teachers' within this context. Further, as we have seen (see Chapter 4) according to previous MCA studies of classroom talk, the category 'teacher' is bound with certain activities such as controlling the floor, asking questions, issuing instructions and evaluating (Richards 2006: 59). I would like to suggest that medium requests is one of those teacher-bound activities. More specifically, in requesting the kids to switch the medium (in the extracts discussed in Chapter 7), adult participants are 'doing being' the teacher who precisely as the

classroom teacher has the authority and the power (to attempt at least) to influence the medium that is going to be adopted. Further note that in ‘doing being’ the teacher, adults in Reception both use English (in forming their requests) and initiate repair of the kids’ use of Greek. Clearly, this shows that in ‘doing being’ the teacher, adults orient to an English monolingual medium.

Conversely, the fact that adults in Reception (see extracts discussed in Chapter 7) always request the adoption of a particular medium indicates that they are orienting to institutional aspects of the participants’ identities. Namely, the request for the adoption of the English monolingual medium has to do with the fact that in this particular institutional context an English monolingual policy has been adopted (see Chapter 2). As we have seen, Gafaranga (2001, 2005) and Torras and Gafaranga (2002) argue that language preference is a categorisation device while Gafaranga (2001) further claims that, in language choice, participants orient to specific language-based categories, i.e. they categorise each other in terms of language preference, as being monolingual, bilingual and in which language (Gafaranga 2001: 1916). Moreover, as Gafaranga has later on specified, “Language-based categories may be decided locally in a specific conversation, but they may also be part of members’ stock of knowledge” (Gafaranga 2010: 265). In the case of the Reception community at BES, members know that in the institutional context in question an English monolingual policy has been adopted according to which English needs to be used all the time (see Chapter 2). The medium requests then with the specific packaging (i.e. the requests are always about the use of English) observed in the extracts discussed in Chapter 7 can be seen as one of the ways that adult members orient to specific language-based categories, i.e. as one of the ways that adults orient to language-based categories that are ‘institutionally-assigned’. That is, as I have also argued elsewhere (Papageorgiou and Gafaranga 2011), in requesting the kids to medium-switch from Greek into English, the adult participants are in a way reminding the kids that they need to take into account the institutional context at hand and to therefore start using English. In other words, in requesting the use of English, adults are asking the kids to orient to the institutional aspects of their identity and to therefore stop ‘doing being’ bilingual and to start ‘doing being’ monolingual in English, i.e. they are asking the kids to start ‘doing being’ Reception

pupils by using English (ibid). In that respect, the observed medium requests index the English monolingual policy of the school and it is based on that observation that I have elsewhere claimed that in and through their medium requests, adults in Reception talk the educational institution in question and its English monolingual policy into being (Papageorgiou and Gafaranga 2011).

Finally, evidence for the participants' orientation to a preference that is 'institutionally-assigned' can be found in those instances of adult-child interaction (see for example extract 12, Chapter 5) whereby adults engage in teacher-like activities such as exposed corrections ("boats the boats aren't they?"), frames ("all right thank you") and instructions ("hang up the aprons"). Quite interestingly, in cases like these whereby participants orient to the institutional aspects of their identity, the use of languages other than English becomes a problem that needs to be repaired, i.e. participants in those cases orient to an English monolingual medium (see extract 12, Chapter 5).

It becomes evident then that there is a second norm that underlies the Reception participants' activities during child-adult interaction that consists of *attending to a language preference that is 'institutionally-assigned'*. In line with this norm, typically during child-adult interaction, participants engage in 'doing being' the "standardized relational pair" (Sacks 1972, 1974) of 'teacher/pupil' and accordingly adopt an English monolingual medium as the medium of their interaction. Further, participants use their implicit knowledge of the co-selectivity that exists between language choice and the category of *'institutionally-assigned language preference'* as the norm against which they interpret each other's language choice acts; hence the participants' interpretation and orientation to the use of English as normative (see extract 12, Chapter 5) and to the use of Greek as deviant (see extract 12, Chapter 5 but also all the medium request extracts discussed in Chapter 7) in and during the enactment of their institutional identities.

8.3 Attending to Conflicting Norms

Apart from cases where there seems to be a consensus among participants about which norm of language choice is in operation, there are also cases of conflicting norms, i.e. cases whereby there is lack of agreement among kids and adults in Reception with regard to whether the norm of ‘competence-related language preference’ or the norm of ‘institutionally-assigned language preference’ is in operation. This clash of norms can be observed in the medium request extracts discussed in Chapter 7. More specifically, as the adults’ medium requests in the CPAs and the kids’ responses to these requests demonstrate, this clash of norms concerns the issue of language choice during child-child interaction. That is, as the adults’ medium requests in the CPAs and the kids’ responses to these requests show while from the adults’ perspective the norm of ‘institutionally-assigned language preference’ is still relevant when it comes to language choice during child-child interaction, from the kids’ perspective, it is the norm of ‘competence-related language preference’ that is relevant.

More specifically, as the extracts discussed in Chapter 7 show, by attending to the ‘competence-related language preference’ norm, kids of Greek linguistic background use Greek during their peer group interaction, i.e. they use their preferred language (see for example extracts 30-40, Chapter 7). By orienting to the kids’ conduct as inappropriate, following the kids’ use of Greek, an adult school member intervenes in the kids’ play areas and attempts in and through a medium request to get the kids to adopt English as the medium. As I have already argued above, these medium requests reveal the adults’ attendance to a language preference that is ‘institutionally-assigned’. That is, the adults clearly see the second norm observed in the data as also being relevant in the cases above, i.e. in and during child-child interaction. However, as the various reactions on the part of the kids indicate (already discussed in Chapter 7, section 7.3), children do not see the ‘institutionally-assigned’ norm as being relevant for their peer group interaction. More specifically, as shown in Chapter 7, kids respond to the adults’ medium requests in four different ways, i.e. a) they comply with the adults’ requests but only

temporarily with most kids returning to the use of Greek after a few turns; b) they engage in a ritualistic ‘English please’ response whereby they speak English without however actually using English for the purposes of their peer group interaction; c) they suspend the on-going play activity and adopt English only in order to talk to adults, protecting in this way their peer group activity from the imposition of English attempted by adult school members and d) they ignore completely the adults’ medium requests. Overall then, as the children’s responses to the adults’ requests reveal no matter whether the adults’ medium requests lead to the temporary adoption of the English medium or whether they lead to the continuation of using Greek, in and during their peer group interaction, Reception kids go on using their preferred medium. Also very importantly, these reactions on the part of the kids suggest that (Greek-linguistic-background) children orient to the adults’ attempts to impose English as an interruption to their own ongoing production of their own Greek monolingual norm. Namely, their reactions show that kids orient to the adults’ medium requests as a disruption to their own Greek play interaction. In turn, this orientation to the adults’ requests as a disruption reflexively reveals that attending to a Greek monolingual medium for the purposes of peer group interaction with peers of Greek linguistic background is seen by the kids as normative conduct. In other words, the kids’ responses here provide further evidence for the norm they follow in and during their peer group interaction in the CPAs, i.e. for the norm that consists of attending to the ‘competence-related language preference’ of their co-participants (see section 8.1 above).

In summary, as evidenced by the adults’ medium requests in the CPAs (see extracts 30-40 in Chapter 7) and the kids’ responses to these requests, the issue of language choice during child-child interaction in the play areas is approached by kids and adults in Reception from different perspectives. On the one hand, the adults’ medium requests suggest that from the adults’ perspective the institutional context and the identities tied to it need to be taken into consideration *at all times*. By implication, they see orientation to the ‘institutionally-assigned’ norm as also being relevant in and during children’s peer group interaction. That is, from the adult perspective, at all times, i.e. both during child-adult talk and child-child talk in the CPAs, participants need to attend to a language preference that is ‘*institutionally-*

assigned'. On the other hand, the kids' uptake of the adults' medium requests indicates that from the children's perspective this 'institutionally-assigned' norm is no longer relevant when it comes to peer group interaction in the play areas. Instead as the kids' responses demonstrate, from the kids' perspective, it is attendance to the 'competence-related' norm that is relevant in those cases of child-child interaction.

8.4 Conclusion

In this discussion Chapter, drawing on the MCA approach to language choice (Gafaranga 2001, 2005) and Auer's (1998) notion of language preference, I argued that the various language choice practices that Reception participants were shown to engage in the previous Chapters (Chapters 5-7) are not random but organized around two different interactional norms. The first of these norms is observed during child-child interaction in the CPAs and consists of *attending to a language preference that is competence-related*. In line with this norm, when among themselves, children categorize each other as being of [+Greek] 'competence-related language preference' or of [-Greek] 'competence-related language preference' and accordingly adopt a Greek monolingual or English monolingual medium. Further, the same norm is observed when kids are 'doing being' bilingual by adopting a bilingual medium during their peer group interaction. In those cases, they adopt a Greek-based bilingual medium when their co-participants have been categorised as being of [+Greek] preference and an English-based bilingual medium when their co-participants have been categorised as being of [-Greek] preference. The second norm observed in the data concerns adult-child interaction in the CPAs and consists of orienting to a language preference that is indissolubly linked with the performance of the participants' institutional identities, i.e. it consists of *attending to a language preference that is 'institutionally-assigned'*. In line with this norm, typically *during child-adult interaction in the CPAs*, Reception participants make membership to the "standardised relational pair" (Sacks 1972, 1974) 'teacher/pupil' and accordingly adopt English as the medium of their interaction. Further, as I have argued,

participants use the co-selectivity between language choice and the category of 'institutionally-assigned language preference' as a 'scheme of interpretation' (Garfinkel 1967), i.e. as a grid with reference to which they make sense of each other's language choice acts during child-adult talk in the play areas. Since both kids' and adults' language choice practices are informed by this 'institutionally-assigned' norm during child-adult interaction, one can speak of a norm that is shared by all Reception participants. Contrary however to this second norm that is shared, as evidenced by the adults' medium requests (see Chapter 7), the first norm of 'competence-related language preference' is not shared between kids and adults. This results in cases whereby Reception participants orient to conflicting norms. More specifically, as I have already argued, as the adults' medium requests and the kids' responses to these requests demonstrate, although adults in Reception consider the 'institutionally-assigned' norm to be also relevant during child-child interaction, from the kids' perspective it is not. Rather, during this type of interaction, kids orient to the first norm observed in the data. More specifically, as evidenced by their medium requests, adults expect kids to orient to the 'institutionally-assigned' norm of language choice. That is, they expect kids to be attending *at all times* to the institutional aspect of their identity and to accordingly adopt English as the medium of their peer group interaction. On the other hand, as evidenced by the kids' responses to the adults' medium requests, from the kids' perspective, the 'institutionally-assigned' English monolingual norm is no longer relevant when it comes to peer group interaction. Instead, from the kids' perspective what is relevant is their co-participants' 'competence-related language preference'. I would like to further suggest here that this clash of perspectives from which the issue of language choice during child-child interaction is approached is also linked to the Reception participants' differential orientation to the CPAs. More specifically, as I have already argued, in requesting the use of English, the adults are reminding the children to take into consideration the 'context' of the classroom and consequently the 'institutionally-assigned' preference for the use of English. Namely, by orienting to the play areas as an extension of the Reception classroom, i.e. as an extension of the English monolingual institutional context, and by ascribing the kids to the category 'pupil', adult school members expect and are therefore asking kids to start using

English. Likewise, upon the adults' medium requests, and because during peer group interaction, children orient to the CPAs as their own space, they do not adopt English (or they do so only temporarily) because doing so goes against their own norm, i.e. it goes against their own categorisation of themselves and of their Greek background peers as preferring Greek.

Finally, insofar as child-child interaction is approached from two different perspectives, i.e. insofar as kids' and adults' language choice practices are informed by two different 'schemes of interpretation' (Garfinkel 1967), one could speak of two different 'practiced language policies' being followed in the target Reception classroom. That is, the adults' policy that consists of *attending at all times to the 'institutionally-assigned language preference'* and the kids' own policy that consists of *attending to a language preference that is 'competence-related'*. In turn those two policies and the clash of norms observed is revealing with regard to the solution that Reception participants have adopted in the face of the conflicting demands imposed on them by the English monolingual policy of the school and the pedagogical approach to learning followed. It is clear that, on the one hand, in the face of the dilemma of how to promote English and respect at the same time learners' autonomy, the adults have prioritised English at the expense of learner autonomy. On the other hand, as evidenced by the alternative 'practiced language policy' followed by the kids, children have prioritised learner autonomy and free interaction over the school's English monolingual policy.

Chapter 9: Review of the Research and Its Contributions

9.0 Introduction

In this final chapter, I first provide a summary of the research and review the key findings of the thesis. Next, I talk about its contributions including implications that can be drawn about the school's policies and practices. Finally, I suggest directions for further research.

9.1 Summary of the Research and Key Findings

The motivation for this thesis emerged during my preliminary fieldwork in an international school (BES) in Athens, Greece. More specifically, the motivation for the research emerged during preliminary fieldwork at BES (January 2008) and after classroom observations and extensive informal discussions with BES member of staff and administrators about the pedagogy, curriculum and language programme followed in this particular school. During these discussions, Reception educators talked about the conflicting demands imposed on them by their school's policies. More specifically, the school has adopted, as its language policy, English as the 'official' medium of interaction, including in the Reception classroom that constituted the target of the research. That is, through its language policy, the school aims to promote the use of English throughout school. At the same time, BES has adopted a child-centred, play-based pedagogical approach to learning that aims to promote learner autonomy and 'free interaction' in designated play areas in the classroom that are used by educators as a teaching tool. As a result of these policies a conflictual situation has emerged, one whereby educators are expected to impose the use of English in the kids' play areas without however undermining children's autonomy and/or disrupting their 'free interaction'. During my preliminary fieldwork, the educators expressed serious concerns about how this conflicting situation can be approached. The aim of this thesis has been to contribute to this issue of concern from the Applied CA perspective of "description-informed action"

(Richards 2005). In this perspective, through analysts' descriptions, practitioners are made aware of their practices and are left to make their own decisions regarding the continuation or modification of them (Heap 1990, Richards 2005). Thus the purpose of my research has been to provide a detailed description of how the school's conflicting policy demands are actually lived in the children's and adult school members' everyday language choice practices in one of the school's Reception classrooms, i.e. in the RK Reception classroom.

To address this aim, two different types of data were collected: a) audio-recordings of naturally occurring play area interaction taking place in the Reception CPAs and b) field-notes taken during semi-participant observation of the participants' interaction in the play areas. Further, for the purposes of gaining a fuller understanding of the language and educational policy of the school and thus to be able to provide a detailed description of the context of my study, I conducted bibliographic and on line research as well as semi-structured interviews with BES's administrators and educators. For the purposes of this thesis though, only the audio-recordings of naturally occurring interactions in the CPAs have been analysed.

To analyze this corpus of naturally occurring interaction in the play areas of BES's Reception, I have taken child-child and adult-child interaction in the CPAs to be an instance of informal classroom talk. Further for the analysis of the data, being inspired by Spolsky's (2004) alternative language policy framework a view of language policy as something that resides and can be revealed in interlocutors' actual language practices (hence the notion of 'practiced language policy') has been adopted. Finally, with the aim of identifying any 'practiced language policies' that may underly the language choice behaviour of BES's Reception classroom participants in and during their play area interaction, the study drew on the CA approach to language choice (Auer 1984, Gafaranga 2000, 2001, 2005, 2007a, 2007b, 2009).

I have initially explored (Chapter 5) how the conflicting demands of the school's policies are actually lived in the kids' language choice practices in the play areas of their classroom (research question 1). Following Gafaranga's notion of "medium" (2007a) my analysis of the kids' language choice behaviour has focused on an investigation of the "linguistic code" (Gafaranga and Torras 2001: 196) that

Reception kids actually orient to in and during their interaction in the CPAs. Drawing on Ethnomethodology and the Conversation Analytic approach to language choice (Gafaranga 2007a, 2009) I addressed this issue by looking at how kids' orient to each other's language choice acts during their interaction in the play areas. The findings of this investigation have revealed the following possibilities:

a) kids oriented to their interlocutors' language alternation acts as normative conduct paying no attention to the movement between English and Greek, namely the kids were in those cases shown to orient to a 'bilingual medium' (which could be either Greek-based or English-based);

b) they oriented to the use of one of their two languages as an instance of repairable deviance and consequently engaged in "medium repair" activities (Gafaranga 2000); in other words, the kids were shown to adopt either a Greek monolingual or an English monolingual medium.

Overall, based on the kids' own differential orientations to their own language choice acts, I have shown that Reception children attend to three different media:

- a) A Greek monolingual medium;
- b) An English monolingual medium;
- c) A bilingual medium which may be Greek-based or English-based.

I have then examined (Chapter 6) another possibility observed during child-child play area interaction, namely that of the kids' orientation to their co-participants' language choice acts as an instance of functional deviance. More specifically, drawing on Goffman's notion of 'footing' (Goffman 1981), I have shown that children may also orient to the use of English as accomplishing a shift in 'footing' (ibid), i.e. as being functionally motivated. More specifically, I have demonstrated how when faced with a problem of misconduct in the context of peer group interaction, kids use English in an attempt to change their "participation framework" (Goffman 1981), i.e. in an attempt to turn the participation status of adults from bystanders to ratified participants and implicitly invite their intervention. Further, I

have shown how switching into English may be used by kids as a resource in order to introduce changes in the 'production format' of an utterance, i.e. in order to animate fictional identities and institutional (real life) identities. A key point made here is that in each of those cases where the kids initiate shifts in footing in and through the use of English a different mechanism is involved. As I have pointed out, in animating imaginative characters it is language contrast that is involved, while in changing the participation status of adults, it is directionality that matters. Similarly to the case of changing the participation status of adults, in the case of animating institutional identities it is directionality that matters. As I have argued, in this case, the kids draw on the association between language choice and specific institutional identities/activities., i.e. they draw on the co-selectivity between specific institutional identities/activities (taking the register, complaining to the teacher) and the use of English. As I have argued, the kids' language choice behaviour in this last case is important since it reveals the kids' knowledge and awareness of the linguistic norm (English) that is bound with these institutional identities and routines as well as their ability to draw on this knowledge in order to reproduce institutional activities for the purposes of their peer interaction in the play areas. Finally, based on the kids' systematic orientation to any switching into English as being functionally motivated, I have argued that in this way, children reveal not only their stance towards the use of English but also towards the use of Greek. Namely, reflexively English can be seen as functionally motivated only by reference to what the kids perceive to be normative, namely the use of Greek. It is on the basis of the kids' orientation to the use of Greek as normative as this becomes evident in their functional language choices, that I have claimed that these functional language choices can be seen as constituting further evidence for the kids' orientation to a Greek monolingual norm during peer group interaction in the CPAs (already discussed in Chapter 5, section 5.2).

I have then addressed the issue of how RK school personnel respond to children's actions resulting from the conflicting situation observed in Reception (research question 2) and have gone on to describe a recurrent interactional feature that characterizes child-adult talk in the CPAs (Chapter 7). That is the fact that adults in Reception constantly request kids playing in the areas to 'medium-switch' from

Greek to English. Drawing on Gafaranga (2010), I referred to the observed practices as ‘medium requests’ and have examined the various strategies that adult school members use in accomplishing these requests. The analysis of the adults’ medium request practices revealed two different types of strategies, namely explicit and implicit. I first talked about the explicit medium request strategy of ‘*formulating the medium*’ and demonstrated that in all of the formats that this strategy may take, adults make explicit reference to the medium that they would like the kids to adopt. Further, I identified four implicit strategies, namely: a) the ‘*hinting*’ medium request strategy, b) the ‘*open-class repair initiator*’ strategy, c) the ‘*summoning*’ strategy and d) the ‘*providing a candidate solution*’ strategy. These strategies were collectively referred to as implicit since adults were shown to request kids to medium-switch without any reference to the desired linguistic behavior, i.e. without any reference to ‘English’ or ‘Speaking English’. In addition, I have demonstrated that different types of strategies may be employed within the same intervention episode. Namely, I have shown that when a given strategy fails, it is repaired through a different medium request strategy. Further, I argued that the different strategies employed in these repairs are not random but hierarchical. As I have demonstrated, when a given medium request strategy fails, it is replaced by a more specific medium request strategy. In other words, there is a movement from less to more specific requests for the use of English. On the basis of this observation, I claimed that the different medium request strategies both explicit and implicit are ordered around their relative strength to specify what the desired linguistic behaviour is. At one end of the scale, ‘*summoning*’ and ‘*open-class repair initiators*’ indicate only that the adult has some problem with the kids’ conduct without further specifying what the desired behaviour is. The adult school members’ “are you remembering” and “what am I gonna say” ‘*hinting*’ strategies are more specific in that they make reference to the history of previous interaction, to something that the kids have already been told, specifying in this way how the kids can work out what the desired behaviour is. Finally, the ‘*formulating the medium*’ strategy is much more specific in that the desired linguistic behaviour is explicitly stated.

Next, I have gone on to examine how Reception children themselves respond to the adult school members’ various medium request practices (research question 3).

The analysis of the kids' conduct revealed four different responses on the part of the kids, namely:

- a) '*Compliance*' with the adults' medium requests. As I have argued however, compliance on the part of the kids tends to be short lived with the kids returning after a few turns to their own Greek norm.
- b) A '*Ritualistic English please*' response to the adults' medium requests. In this case, kids were shown to engage in speaking English without however actually using English for the purposes of their peer group interaction in the play areas.
- c) '*Interrupting the ongoing play activity*' and adopting English only in order to talk to adults. This is a response whereby the kids suspend their own play activities and use English only to talk to adults. Namely, in this type of response, the kids redefine the situation as child-adult interaction and consequently orient to what they consider the norm to be for this type of interaction (English). Further, as I have argued, by interrupting their own ongoing play activity and using English only in order to talk to adults, the kids manage to protect their peer group interaction in the CPAs from the imposition of English attempted by adult school members.
- d) '*Ignore*' the adults' medium requests and go on playing in Greek.

As I have argued these responses on the part of the kids suggest that children orient to adults' various strategies of requesting the use of English as an interruption of their own ongoing Greek interaction in the CPAs. In turn, this orientation to the adults' attempts to impose English as a disruption reflexively reveals that attending to a Greek monolingual medium for the purposes of their peer group interaction in the play areas is seen by the kids as normative conduct. In other words, collectively the kids' responses to the adults' medium requests provide further evidence for their orientation to a Greek monolingual medium during peer group interaction in the CPAs (already demonstrated in Chapter 5, section 5.2).

Additionally, informed by previous work on language play and language learning (Cook 1997, 2000, Bongartz and Schneider 2003, Cekaite and Aronsson 2005, Broner and Tarone 2001), interactional data (in chapters 5-7) were also

discussed from a language play perspective. However, with the focus being on language choice and practiced language policies, language play sequences have not been explored in any depth in this thesis; rather they were only briefly discussed. Overall, kids were shown to engage in two different types of language play activities, i.e. form-based play activities and semantic language play activities which in turn led to the creation of imaginative worlds of reference. In line with previous language play research (Broner and Tarone 2001, Cekaite and Aronsson 2005, Tarone 2001), I have argued that such language play practices contribute to second language learning in that they promote ‘noticing’ of L2 forms (in the case of form-based play) and in that they afford children with opportunities of practising and acquiring different registers in the L2 (in the case of semantic language play).

Finally, I have discussed the various “medium-related” (Gafaranga 2001) practices that participants were shown to regularly engage in Chapters 5-7 with a view that these practices may constitute language policy making in their own right (Chapter 8). More specifically, drawing on the MCA approach to language choice (Gafaranga 2001, 2005) and Auer’s (1998) notion of language preference, I argued that the Reception participants’ language choice activities are not random but informed by two different interactional norms. The first of these norms observed during child-child interaction involves *attending to the competence-related language preference of the co-participants*. Namely, I have claimed that the kids’ language choice practices, i.e. their adoption of a Greek monolingual, English monolingual or bilingual medium, are organised around a specific norm that involves *attending to the ‘competence-related language preference’ of their co-players*. In line with this norm, when among themselves kids categorise each other as being of [+Greek] ‘competence-related language preference’ and accordingly adopt a Greek monolingual medium or they categorise each other as being of [-Greek] ‘competence-related language preference’ and accordingly adopt an English monolingual medium. In addition, by orienting to the ‘competence-related language preference’ of their co-players, when kids engage in ‘doing being’ bilingual, they adopt a Greek-based bilingual medium with co-players who have been mapped to the category of [+Greek] preference while they adopt an English-based bilingual medium with co-players who have been mapped to the category [-Greek]. However,

as I have argued, this competence-related norm cannot account for the ‘medium-related’ practices that Reception participants engage during child-adult interaction in the CPAs. In fact I have argued that it is a different norm that is in operation in this case. This second norm observed in the data involves *attending to a language preference that is ‘institutionally-assigned’*. In line with this second norm, typically during child-adult interaction in the CPAs, Reception participants make membership to the “standardised relational pair” (Sacks 1972, 1974) ‘teacher/pupil’ and accordingly adopt English as the medium of their interaction. Although this second norm is shared among kids and adults in Reception, the first norm is not shared and as a result, cases whereby participants orient to conflicting norms are observed. More specifically, as the medium requests observed in my data reveal, the issue of language choice during child-child interaction is approached by children and adult participants from different perspectives. That is, as the adults’ medium request show, from the adult perspective, the norm of ‘institutionally-assigned language preference’ is also relevant when it comes to child-child interaction. However, as the kids’ responses to these requests show, from children’s own perspective, it is the ‘competence-related language preference’ norm that is relevant during their peer group interaction. Finally, insofar as adults and children in Reception operate in those cases under different ‘schemes of interpretation’ (Garfinkel 1967), I have argued that there are two different ‘practiced language policies’ being followed in the target RK Reception classroom, i.e. the adults’ policy of attending *at all times to a language preference that is ‘institutionally-assigned’* and the kids’ own policy of *attending during peer group interaction to a language preference that is competence-related*.

To recall, the aim of this thesis has been to investigate how the school’s conflicting policy demands are actually lived in the Reception participants’ language choice practices in the CPAs of their classroom. The results of this investigation have shown that children and adults in Reception have responded to the school’s conflicting policy demands in different ways, i.e. by orienting to two different ‘practiced language policies’: a) the adults’ policy of attending *at all times* to a language preference that is ‘institutionally-assigned’ and b) the children’s own policy of attending during peer group interaction to a language preference that is

‘competence-related’. In turn, their ‘practiced language policies’, as these become evident in the various language choice practices that they regularly engage in, are revealing with regard to the solution adopted by children and adults in Reception. On the one hand, the adults’ English monolingual ‘practiced language policy’ shows that, in the face of the conflicting demands of how to promote the use of English (language policy) without however disrupting children’s autonomy and free interaction (pedagogical approach to learning), adult school members have prioritised the use of English at the expense of children’s autonomy. That is, adult school members have prioritised the ‘declared’ (Shohamy 2006) English monolingual policy of the school at the expense of its child-centred pedagogical approach to learning. On the other hand, as the kids’ ‘practiced language policy’ shows, language choice during peer group interaction in the play areas does not depend or follow the school’s “declared” (ibid) English monolingual language policy. Rather for the kids, language choice in the play areas is bound to their co-participants’ competence-related language preference. That is, in the face of the conflicting demands of the school’s policies, the kids have developed their own alternative ‘practiced language policy’ according to which language choice in the play areas depends, not on the school’s “declared” language policy (Shohamy 2006), but on the interlocutor’s ‘linguistic identity’ (Gafaranga 2001). This redefinition of the language policy allows the children to attend to the school’s pedagogical approach (learner autonomy and free interaction).

9.2 Research Contributions

This thesis was intended as an empirically-based investigation of how BES’s conflicting policy demands are actually lived in the Reception participants’ language choice practices in the play areas of their classroom. By adopting the applied CA perspective of ‘description-informed action’ (Richards 2005) its major contribution is that by providing a detailed description of “what actually happens” (Seedhouse 2005: 258) in Reception as a result of the school’s policies, the study has the potential of raising BES administrators’ and educators’ awareness about the possible advantages, possibilities and limitations of their policies and practices. In turn, this awareness can

lead them to reach their own decisions about the continuation or modification of their policies and practices. More specifically, my investigation of the actual language choice practices followed by adult school members and children in the CPAs of their classroom has shown that contrary to the adult school members' monolingual policy, as competent bilingual social actors, the kids have developed and follow their own 'practiced language policy' that involves attending to the 'competence-related' language preference (Auer 1984, 1995) of their co-players. In other words, Reception children seem to be doing what all competent bilinguals would do, i.e. they assign themselves and their co-participants to language-based categories and accordingly orient to the medium that is bound with each of these categories. For the school's policies and practices in Reception that could mean that BES will have to revise either its language policy or its pedagogical approach to learning and that adult school members will have to reconsider the value of their 'medium request' practices in the play areas. That is, on the one hand, if the school aims at monolingualism in English then its pedagogical approach to learning will have to be revised, since as my study shows, it also results in Greek monolingual and bilingual practices in the CPAs on the part of the kids. On the other hand, if the school primarily aims at 'free interaction' and learner autonomy, then it will have to revise its English monolingual language policy and adult school members will have to reconsider the relevance and value of their linguistic interventions in the kids' CPAs.

It is clear then that the major contribution of the research is its potential to lead to more informed language policy making and language practices at BES's Reception. Working towards this direction, during my interviews with administrators and educators at BES, I provided them with transcripts of the audio-recorded interactions in the CPAs (see Appendix 1). Further, with the help and support of BES's administrators, I am currently planning to present the key findings of my research to BES's community. In addition, a more detailed report on the main research findings will be sent to the school and to Reception educators.

Although as I pointed out earlier the major contribution of the research is its potential to raise BES's administrators and educators' awareness about the possible advantages and limitations of their policies and practices in Reception and thus lead

to more informed policies and practices at BES, the study also contributes, albeit indirectly, to language-in-education policy research in three ways.

Firstly, this thesis has focused on play area interaction which, by following previous studies (Björk-Willén and Cromdal 2009, Cromdal 2003, 2005, Ericksson 2002, Melander and Sahlström 2009), has been treated as a specific type of informal classroom talk. I then have gone on to examine how the school's policies are actually lived during this type of informal classroom interaction. Previous language-in-education policy research has primarily focused on teacher-fronted classroom interaction (for example see Lin 1996, Martin 2005) while there are hardly any studies on how certain language-in-education policies are actually lived during other less traditional types of classroom interaction. In this respect, the study provides a valuable contribution to the existing dearth of research on how language-in-education policies are lived during types of classroom talk that go beyond the traditional IRF structure. Insofar as recent trends in bilingual and second language pedagogy support a play-based (and task-based) pupil-centred approach to learning, language-in-education policy research needs to go beyond the investigation of 'what really happens' during the traditional teacher fronted whole-classroom instruction, and expand its scope to include also the investigation of how certain policies translate in other less formalized classroom exchanges. The study in question constitutes a step towards this direction.

Secondly, methodologically, viewing 'practiced language policies' as 'interactional norms' and adopting CA methodologies applied to language choice to discover these norms (Papageorgiou 2009b, Bonacina 2010), proved to be useful for the identification of the classroom participants' 'practiced language policies' in Reception. In this respect, the study confirms and provides further evidence for the fact that a broad CA approach that includes both a sequential and categorization analysis (Bonacina 2010) of language choice can be useful in identifying the 'practiced language policies'. Further, the thesis in question builds on this CA approach to practiced language policies, by demonstrating that an additional medium-related practice which can be useful in the identification of 'practiced language policies' is that of 'medium request' (Gafaranga 2010). Both in my own previous work (Papageorgiou 2009b) and that of Bonacina (2010), there is evidence

that the practiced language policy of a bilingual classroom can be revealed in ‘medium-related’ practices (Gafaranga 2001) such as ‘medium repair’ and ‘medium suspension’ (Gafaranga 2000, 2007a). In this thesis, I have further demonstrated that ‘practiced language policies’ may also be revealed in ‘medium request’ (Gafaranga 2010) practices, i.e. I have shown that by observing the adult school members’ ‘medium request’ practices, their ‘practiced language policy’ comes to the fore.

Thirdly, to the extent that the findings of my investigation at BES’s Reception show that children and adults have developed and orient to different ‘practiced language policies’, talking about the ‘practiced language policy’ of a single ‘speech community’, i.e. about the practiced language policy of the Reception classroom community, cannot account for what actually occurs in my data. As shown in chapter 4, in suggesting an alternative language policy model, Spolsky proposed that language policy can operate within a ‘speech community’ of whatever size (Spolsky 2004: 40). According to Labov “the speech community is not defined by any marked agreement in the use of language elements, so much as by participation in a set of shared norms” (Labov 1972: 120). Insofar as Reception children and adults were shown to orient to different practiced language policies, the notion of ‘speech community’ (at least in the Labovian sense) cannot account for ‘what actually happens’ in my data. I would therefore like to suggest that it would be more relevant to talk about the ‘practiced language policy’ followed by a specific ‘community of practice’ rather than by a ‘speech community’. According to Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, a ‘community of practice’ is an “aggregate of people who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavour. Ways of doing things, ways of talking, ...in short *practices*-emerge in the course of this mutual endeavour” (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992: 464; my emphasis). In other words, Reception children as a ‘community of practice’ have come together with the purpose of playing in the CPAs and have engaged in specific language choice practices (see chapter 5 and 6) which as shown are guided by their own locally developed interactional norm, their own ‘practiced language policy’. In other words, children having *play* as their shared endeavour in the CPAs, they have developed and follow their own interactional norm, their own ‘practiced language policy’. Likewise, adult school members as a ‘community of practice’ with their own teaching and learning

agendas and concerns regularly engaged in specific interaction practices in the CPAs (medium requests, see chapter 7) which as I demonstrated are guided by a specific interactional norm, by a specific ‘practiced language policy’ that is different from that of the kids. The study at hand then contributes to language policy and language-in-education policy research by suggesting that it would be better to investigate ‘practiced language policies’ (language choice norms) in the context in which language choice norms actually emerge, that is in the context of ‘communities of practice’.

9.3 Directions for Further Work

As pointed out earlier, it is hoped that the present study will lead to more informed language policies and practices followed at BES by raising BES administrators’ and educators’ awareness about ‘what actually happens’ (Seedhouse 2005: 258) at the level of classroom interaction at BES’s Reception.

Working towards this direction, future work could investigate how data and material from the present study could be used for designing and delivering teacher training courses that will sensitize both Reception educators and other potential early years practitioners about the language choice norms and competences of young bilingual learners and that will promote a ‘discourse’ about appropriate policies and practices in bilingual early years educational settings.

In addition, future work could focus on how the CA approach adopted here could inform an intervention in the language-in-education policy and the pedagogical approach to learning followed in this particular school.

Last but not least, since for the purposes of this study I have only analysed interactional (naturally occurring) data, it would also be worth analyzing interview data as well to reveal the perceived language policies at BES’s Reception, namely to investigate what in Spolsky (2004)’s model is referred to as ‘language beliefs’ (Spolsky 2004:14). An examination of what Reception classroom participants themselves “think should be done” (ibid) could also lead to more informed policies and practices at BES’s Reception.

References

- Adams S., Alexander E., Drummond M.J. and Moyles J. 2004. *Inside the Foundation Stage: Recreating the Reception Year*. London: Association of Teachers and Lecturers.
- Alfonzetti 1998. "The Conversational Dimension of Code-Switching between Italian and Dialect Sicily" in *Code-Switching in Conversation*. Ed. Auer P. London: Routledge: 180-211.
- Antaki C. and Widdicombe S. 1998. *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage.
- Arthur J. 1996. Code Switching and Collusion: Classroom Interaction in Botswana Primary Schools. *Linguistics and Education* 8: 17-33.
- Atkinson J. M. and Heritage J. 2006. "Jefferson's Transcript Notation" in *The Discourse Reader*. eds. Jaworski A. and Coupland N. (second edition). Oxon: Routledge:158-165.
- Auer P. 1984. *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Auer P. 1988. "A Conversation Analytic Approach to Code-Switching and Transfer" in *Code-Switching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. eds. Heller M. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 166-187.
- Auer P. 1995. "The Pragmatics of Code-Switching: a Sequential Approach" in *One Speaker, Two Languages*. eds. Milroy L. and Muysken P. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 115-135.
- Auer P. 1998. *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London. Routledge.
- Auer P. 1999. From Codeswitching via Language Mixing to Fused Lects: Toward a Dynamic Typology of Bilingual Speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3/4: 309-332.
- Auer P. 2000. Why Should We and How Can We Determine the 'Base Language' of a Bilingual Conversation? *Estudios Sociolingüística* 1: 129-144.
- BAAL (British Association for Applied Linguistics). 1994 (2006). *Recommendations on Good Practice in Applied Linguistics*. WWW Document at http://www.baal.org.uk/about_goodpractice_full.pdf. Accessed 06 June 2007.
- Baldauf R. 2006. Rearticulating the Case for Micro Language Planning in a Language Ecology Context. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 7/2&3: 147-170.
- Ball St. J. 1990. *Politics and Policy Making in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Ball St.J. 1993. What Is Policy? Texts, Trajectories and Toolboxes. *Discourse* 13/2: 10-17
- Bakhtin M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Belle-Isle R. 1986. Learning for a New Humanism. *International Schools Journal* 11: 27-30.
- Björk-Willén P. and Cromdal J. 2009. When Education Seeps into 'Free Play': How Preschool Children Accomplish Multilingual Education. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41: 1493-1518.
- Blom J. P and Gumperz J. 1972. "Social Meaning in Linguistic Structures: Code-

- Switching in Norway” in *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. eds. Gumperz J. and Hymes D. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston: 407-434.
- Bloom L. 1993. “Transcription and Coding for Child Language Research: The Parts Are More than the Whole” in *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research* eds. Edwards J.A. and Lampert M. D. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.:149-166.
- Blum-Kulka Sh. 1982. Learning to Say What You Mean in a Second Language: A Study of the Speech Act Performance of Hebrew Second Language Learners. *Applied Linguistics* 3: 29-59.
- Blum-Kulka Sh. 1987. Indirectness and Politeness in Requests: Same or Different? *Journal of Pragmatics* 11: 131-146
- Blum-Kulka Sh., Brenda D. and Gerson D. 1985. “The Language of Requesting in Israeli Society” in *Language and Social Situation*. eds. Forgas J. New York: Springer: 113-141.
- Blum-Kulka Sh., House J. and Kasper G. 1989. *Cross Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex
- Bonacina F. 2005. ‘Language’ versus ‘Medium’ in the Study of Bilingual Classroom Interaction. Unpublished MSc Thesis. The University of Edinburgh.
- Bonacina F. 2010. *A Conversation Analytic Approach to Practiced Language Policies: The Example of an Induction Classroom for Newly Arrived Immigrant Children in France*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. The University of Edinburgh.
- Bonacina F. and Gafaranga J. 2010. ‘Medium of Instruction’ vs ‘Medium of Classroom Interaction’: Language Choice in a French Complementary School Classroom in Scotland. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, online preprint.
- Bongartz Chr. and Schneider M.L. 2003. Linguistic Development in Social Contexts: A Study of Two Brothers Learning German. *The Modern Language Journal* 87i: 13-37.
- Bourdieu 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Broner A.M. and Tarone E.E. 2001. Is It Fun? Language Play in a Fifth-Grade Spanish Immersion Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 85: 363-379
- Bruce T. 1991. *Time to Play in Early Childhood Education*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Bunyi G.W. 2005. “Classroom Language Practices in Kenya” in *Decolonization, Globalization: Language-In-Education Policy and Practice* eds. Lin A.M.Y. and Martin P. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: 131-152.
- Butler C.W. 2008. *Talk and Social Interaction in the Playground*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Butler C. and Weatherall A. 2006. “No, We’re Not Playing Families”: Membership Categorization in Children’s Play. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 39/4: 441-470.
- Cahill P. 2010. Children’s Participation in their Primary Care Consultations” in *Analysing Interactions in Childhood: Insights from Conversation Analysis*. eds. Gardner H. and Forrester M. London: John Wiley:128-145.
- Canagarajah S. 2006. “Ethnographic Methods in Language Policy” in *An*

- Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Ed. Ricento Th. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing: 153-169.
- Carder M. 2007a. *Bilingualism in International Schools: a Model for Enriching Language Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Carder M. 2007b. "Organization of English Teaching in International Schools" in *International Handbook of English Language Education*. eds. Cummins J. and Davison Chr. New York, MA: Springer: 379-389.
- Cekaite A. and Aronsson K. 2005. Language Play, a Collaborative Resource in Children's L2 Learning. *Applied Linguistics* 26/2: 169-191
- Chouliaraki L. and Fairclough N. 1999. *Discourse in Late Modernity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Claymen S. and Heritage J. 2002. *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook G. 1997. Language Play, Language Learning. *ELT Journal* 51/3: 224-231.
- Cook G. 2000. *Language Play, Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cook V. J. 1992. Evidence for Multicompetence. *Language Learning* 42/4: 557-591.
- Cooper R. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: CUP
- Cromdal J. 2000. Code-Switching for All Practical Purposes: Bilingual Organization of Children's Play. Linkoping Studies in Arts and Sciences 223. PhD Thesis .Linkopings Universitet 2000.
- Cromdal J. 2001a. Can I be with? Negotiating Play Entry in a Bilingual School. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 515-543.
- Cromdal J. 2001b. Overlap in Bilingual Play: Some Implications of Code-Switching for Overlap Resolution. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 34/4: 421-451.
- Cromdal J. 2003. The Creation and Administration of Social Relations in Bilingual Group Work. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 24: 56-75.
- Cromdal J. 2004. Building Bilingual Oppositions: Code-Switching in Children's Disputes. *Language in Society* 33: 33-58.
- Cromdal J. 2005. Bilingual Order in Collaborative Word Processing. On Creating an English Text in Swedish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37: 329-353.
- Cromdal J. and Aronsson K. 2000. Footing in Bilingual Play. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4/3: 435-457.
- Cummins J. 2007. "Foreword" to Carder's M. *Bilingualism in International Schools: A Model for Enriching Language Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd: viii-xi.
- Danby S. and Baker C. 1998. "What's the Problem? 'Restoring Social Order in the Preschool Classroom'" in *Children and Social Competence: Arenas of Action*. eds Hutchby I. and Moran-Ellis J. London: The Falmer Press: 157-186.
- Dashwood A. 2005. Alternatives to Questioning: Teacher Role in Classroom in Discussion. *Asian EFL Journal* 7/4: 144-165.
- Davis K.A. 1999. "Dynamics of Indigenous Language Maintenance" in *Sociopolitical Perspectives on Language Policy and Planning in the USA* eds. Huebner T. and Davis K.A. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 67-97.
- Davidson J. 1984. "Subsequent Versions of Invitations, Offers, Requests, and

- Proposals Dealing with Potential or Actual Rejection” in *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* eds. Atkinson J.M. and Heritage J. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 102-128.
- Deveney B. 2000. *An Investigation into the Influences on Parental Choice of an International School in Thailand. MA Thesis.* University of Bath.
- Drew P. 1997. ‘Open’ Class Repair Initiators in Response to Sequential Sources of Troubles in Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 69-101.
- Drew P. 2005. “Foreword: Applied Linguistics and Conversation Analysis” in *Applying Conversation Analysis* eds. Richards K. and Seedhouse P. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan: xiv-xx.
- Duranti A. 1997. *Linguistic Anthropology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eckert P. and McConnell-Ginet. 1992. Think Practically and Look Locally: Language and Gender as a Community-Based Practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21: 469-490.
- Economidou-Kogetsidis M. 2010. Corss-Cultural and Situational Variation in Requesting Behaviour: Perceptions of Social Situations and Strategic Usage of Request Patterns. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 2262-2281.
- Edwards D. and Mercer N. 1987. *Common Knowledge: The Development of Understanding in the Classroom.* London: Methuen.
- Eglin P. and Hester S. 1992. Category, Predicate and Task: The Pragmatics of Practical Action. *Semiotica* 88: 243-268.
- Ellis P. 2006. What Does It Mean to Be Internationally-Minded in a Non-International School? Paper Presented at the *IBO Conference 2006*, Athens, Greece: 12-14 October 2006.
- Ellwood C. 1999. IGCE and the IB Middle Years Programme; How Compatible Are They? *International Schools Journal XIX/1*: 35-44.
- Eriksson K. 2002. Booktalk Dilemmas: Teachers’ Organization of Pupils’ Reading. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 46: 391-408.
- Ervin-Tripp S. 1976. Is Sybil there? The Structure of Some American English Directives. *Language in Society* 5: 25-66.
- Faltzi R. 2007. *The Patterning of Language Alternation in Bilingual Classrooms: Evidence from a Greek Supplementary School.* Unpublished MSc Thesis. The University of Edinburgh.
- Færch Cl. and Kasper G. 1984. Pragmatic Knowledge: Rules and Procedures. *Applied Linguistics* 5: 214-225.
- Ferguson C.A. 1968. “Language Development” in *Language Problems of Developing Nations* eds. Fishman J.A., Ferguson Ch. And Das Gupta J. New York: John Wiley and Sons: 27-35.
- Ferguson G. 2003. “Classroom Code-Switching in Post Colonial Contexts: Functions, Attitudes and Policies” in *Africa and Applied Linguistics* eds Makoni S. and Meinhof U.H. AILA Review Vol. 16: 38-51. Amsterdam. John Benjamins: 38-51.
- Fishman J. 1968. “Language Problems and Types of Political and Sociocultural Integration: A Conceptual Postscript” in *Language Problems of Developing Nations* eds. Fishman J.A., Ferguson Ch. And Das Gupta J. New York: John Wiley and Sons: 491-498.

- Fishman J.A. 1974. "Language Modernization and Planning in Comparison with Other Types of National Modernization and Planning" in *Advances in Language Planning* ed. Fishman J.A. The Hague: Mouton: 79-102.
- Fishman J. 1979. Bilingual Education, Language Planning and English. *English World-Wide 1/1: 11-24*
- Fishman J.A., Ferguson Ch. And Das Gupta J. 1968. *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Foucault M. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault M. 1991. "Governmentality" in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Eds. Burchell G., Gordon C. and Miller P. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf: 87-104
- Fox E. 1985. International Schools and the International Baccalaureate. *Harvard Educational Review 55: 121-126*.
- Freeman R. 2004. *Building on Community Bilingualism*. Philadelphia, PA: Calson.
- Gafaranga J. 1999. Language Choice as a significant Aspect of Talk organization: the Orderliness of Language Alternation. *Text 19: 201-225*.
- Gafaranga J. 2000. Medium Repair versus Other Language Repair: Telling the Medium of a Bilingual Conversation. *The International Journal of Bilingualism 4/3: 327-350*.
- Gafaranga J. 2001. Linguistic Identities in Talk in Interaction: Order in Bilingual Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics 33: 1901-1925*.
- Gafaranga J. 2005. Demythologising Language Alternation Studies: Conversation Structure versus Social Structure in Bilingual Interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics 37: 281-300*.
- Gafaranga J. 2007a. *Talk in Two Languages*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gafaranga, J. 2007b. "Code-Switching as a Conversational Strategy" in *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication* eds. Auer P. and Wei L. New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 279-313.
- Gafaranga J. 2009. "The Conversation Analytic Model of Code-Switching" in *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-Switching* eds. Bullock B. and Toribio A.J.:Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 114-127.
- Gafaranga J. 2010. Medium Request: Talking Language Shift into Being. *Language in Society 39: 241-270*.
- Gafaranga J. and Torras M.C. 1998. Do Speakers Speak a Language? Evidence from Two Bilingual Settings. *Working Paper Series 94*, Centre for Language in Social Life, Lancaster University.
- Gafaranga J. and Torras M.C. 2001. Language versus Medium in the Study of Bilingual Conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism 5: 195-219*.
- Gafaranga J. and Torras M.C. 2002. Interactional Otherness: towards a Redefinition of Codeswitching. *International Journal of Bilingualism 6: 1-22*.
- Gallagher E. 2008. *Equal Rights to the Curriculum: Many Languages, One Message*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Gardner H. 2005. "A Comparison of a Mother and a Therapist Working on Child Speech" in *Applying Conversation Analysis* eds. Richards K. and Seedhouse P. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan: 56-72.
- Garfinkel H. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Garfinkel H. and Sacks H. 1970. "On Formal Structures of Practical Actions", in

- Theoretical Sociology: Perspectives and Developments*. eds. Mckinney J. C. and Tiryakian E. A. New York: Meredith Corporation: 337-366.
- Gellar C. A. 1993. How International Are We? *International Schools Journal* 26: 5-7.
- Georgakopoulou A. 1997. *Narrative Performances: A Study of Modern Greek Storytelling*. Amsterdam: Benjamin.
- Goffman E. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays in Face-to-Face Behaviour*. New York: Doubleday.
- Goffman E. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Goffman E. 1979. Footing. *Semiotica* 25: 1-29. (Reprinted in Erving Goffman, 1981, *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press: 124-159).
- Goodwin Ch. And Heritage J. 1990. Conversation Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 283-307
- Gould J. 1999. *Globalisation, Culture and School Choice: a Discussion of the Issues in an International School Context*. Unpublished (EdD) Assignment. University of Bath.
- Guldal T. M. 1997. *Three Children, Two Languages: the Role of Code Selection in Organizing Conversation*. Phd thesis. NTNT Trondheim, Norway.
- Gumperz J.J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Habermas J. 1979. *Communication and the Evolution of Society*. London: Heinemann.
- Habermas J. 1985. *The Theory of Communicative Action* (volume 2). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Halmari H. and Smith W. 1994. Code-Switching and Register Shift: Evidence from Finnish-English Child Bilingual Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21: 427-445.
- Hammersley M. 1976. "The Mobilisation of Pupil Attention" in *The Process of Schooling: A Sociological Reader*. Eds. Hammersley M. and Woods P. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul: 104-115.
- Hammersley M. and Atkinson P. 2007. *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. 3rd Edition. London: Routledge.
- Haugen E. 1966a. *Language Conflict and Language Planning: the Case of Modern Norwegian*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Haugen E. 1966b. "Linguistics and Language Planning" in *Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference, 1964* ed. Bright W. The Hague: Mouton and Co: 50-71
- Haugen E. 1983. "The Implementation of Corpus Planning: Theory and Practice" in *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives* eds. Cobarrubias J. and Fishman J. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 269-289
- Hauser E. 2010. "Other-Correction of Language Form Following a Repair Sequence" in *Pragmatics and Language Learning Volume 12* eds. Kasper G., Nguyen H. Th., Yoshimi D.R. and Yoshioka J.K. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i: National Foreign Language Resource Center: 277-296.

- Hayden M. 2006. *Introduction to International Education: International Schools and their Communities*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Hayden M. and Thompson J. 1995a. International Schools and International Education: a Relationship Reviewed. *Oxford Review of Education* 21/3: 327-345.
- Hayden M. and Thompson J. 1995b. Perceptions of International Education: a Preliminary Study. *International Review of Education* 41/5: 389-404.
- Hayden M. and Wong S. D. 1997. The International Baccalaureate: International Education and Cultural Preservation. *Educational Studies* 23/3: 349-361.
- Haywood T. 2002. "An International Dimension to Management and Leadership Skills for International Education" in *International Education in Practice: Dimensions for National and International Schools* eds. Hayden M., Thompson J. and Walker G. London: Kogan Page Limited: 170-184.
- He A.W. 2004. Identity Construction in Chinese Heritage Language Classes. *Pragmatics* 14 (2/3): 199-216
- Heap J. L. 1990. Applied Ethnomethodology: Looking for the Local Rationality of Reading Activities. *Human Studies* 13: 39-72.
- Heritage J. 1984. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Heritage J. 1988. "Explanations as Accounts: a Conversation Analytic Perspective" in *Analyzing Everyday Explanation: a Casebook of Methods* ed. Antaki Ch. London: Sage Publications Ltd: 127-144.
- Heritage J. 1999. Conversation Analysis at Century's End: Practices of Talk-in-Interaction, their Distributions and their Outcomes. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 32/1&2: 69-76.
- Heritage J. and Maynard D. 2006. *Practicing Medicine: Talk and Action in Primary Care Encounters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hester S. and Eglin P. 1997. "Membership Categorisation Analysis: An Introduction" in *Culture in Action: Studies in Membership Categorisation Analysis*. Washington, DC: University Press of America: 1-24
- Hill I. 2000. Internationally-Minded Schools. *International Schools Journal* XX/1: 24-37.
- Hill I. 2002. "The History of International Education: an International Baccalaureate Perspective" in *International Education in Practice: Dimensions for National and International Schools* eds. Hayden M., Thompson J. and Walker G. London: Kogan Page Limited: 18-29.
- Hill I. 2006a. Student Types, School Types and Their Combined Influence on the Development of Intercultural Understanding. *Journal of Research in International Education* 5/1: 5-33.
- Hill I. 2006b. Early Stirrings in International Education Part X: School Heads and Governments Rescue the IB Project. *International Schools Journal* XXV/2: 68-75.
- Hornberger N. 2002. Multilingual Language Policies and the Continua of Biliteracy: an Ecological Approach. *Language Policy* 1: 27-51.
- Hornberger N. 2005. Opening and Filling Up Implementational and Ideological Spaces in Heritage Language Education. *The Modern Language Journal* 89/4: 605-609
- Hornberger N. 2006. "Frameworks and Models in Language Policy and

- Planning” in *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Ed. Ricento Th. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing: 24-41.
- Hornberger N. and Johnson D. 2007. Slicing the Onion Ethnographically: Layers and Spaces in Multilingual Language Education Policy and Practice. *TESOL Quarterly* 41/3: 509-532
- Horsley A. 2003. Short Day/Long day-a Model for Bilingual Elementary Schools. *The International Schools Journal Compendium: Volume 1: ESL: Educating Non-Native Speakers of English in an English-Medium International School*. ed. Murphy E. Woodbridge: John Catt Educational Ltd: 222-225.
- House J. and Kasper G. 1981. “Politeness Markers in English and German” in *Conversational Routine* Ed. Coulmas Fl. The Hague: Mouton: 157-185.
- Housley W. and Fitzgerald R. 2002. The Reconsidered Model of Membership Categorisation Analysis. *Qualitative Research* 2: 59-83
- Hutchby I. and Wooffitt R. 1998. *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jefferson G. 1987. “On Exposed and Embedded Correction in Conversation” in *Talk and Social Organisation* eds. Button Gr. and Lee R.E. J.Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: 86-100.
- Jernudd B.H. and Das Gupta J. 1971. “Towards a Theory of Language Planning” in *Can Language Be Planned?: Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations* eds. Rubin J. and Jernudd B.H. Hawaii: The University Press of Hawaii: 195-215
- Johnson R.K. 1985. *Report of the ELTU Study of the Oral Medium of Instruction in Anglo Chinese Secondary School Classroom*, Hong Kong: Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong,
- Johnson D.C. 2009. Ethnography of Language Policy. *Language Policy* 8: 139-159
- Johnson D.C. 2010. Implementational and Ideological Spaces in Bilingual Education Language Policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 13/1: 61-79
- Jones R. and Thornborrow J. 2004. Floors, Talk and the Organization of Classroom Activities. *Language in Society* 33: 399-423.
- Jonietz P.I. and Harris N. D.C. 1991. *World Year Book of Education 1991: International Schools and International Education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Kasper G. 1985. Repair in Foreign Language Teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 7/2: 200-215.
- Krashen St. 1981. *Second Language Acquisition and Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kloss H. 1966. Types of Multilingual Communities: A Discussion of Ten Variables. *Sociological Inquiry* 36: 135-145
- Kloss H. 1968. “Notes Concerning a Language-Nation Typology” in *Language Problems of Developing Nations* eds. Fishman J.A., Ferguson Ch. and Das Gupta J. New York: John Wiley and Sons: 69-85.
- Kloss H. 1969. *Research Possibilities of Group Bilingualism: A Report*. Quebec: International Centre for Research on Bilingualism.
- Labov W. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press.

- Lambert W.E. 1980. The Two Faces of Bilingualism. In Focus No.3. Rosslyn, Va.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education
- Lantolf J.P. 1997. "The Function of Language Play in the Acquisition of L2 Spanish" in *Contemporary Perspectives on the Acquisition of Spanish, Volume 2: Production, Processing, and Comprehension* eds. Glass W.R. and Pérez-Leroux A.T. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press: 3-24.
- Larsen-Freeman D. 1997. Chaos/Complexity Science and Second Language Acquisition. *Applied Linguistics* 18/2: 141-165
- Lawton, D. 1989. *Education, Culture and the National Curriculum*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Leach R. 1969. "What is an International School?" in *International Schools and their Role in the Field of International Education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd.: 1-15.
- Liddicoat A.J. 2007. *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Liebscher Gr. and Dailey-O'-Cain J. 2005. Learner Code-Switching in the Content-Based Foreign Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 89/2:234-247.
- Lin A.M.Y. 1990. *Teaching in Two Tongues: Language Alternation in Foreign Language Classrooms* (Research Report No. 3) City Polytechnic of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.
- 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.
- Lin A.M.Y. 2005. "Critical, Transdisciplinary Perspectives on Language-In-Education Policy and Practice in Postcolonial Contexts: The Case of Hong Kong" in *Decolonisation, Globalisation: Language-in-Education Policy and Practice* eds. Lin A.M.Y. and Martin P. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd: 38-54
- Lin A.M.Y. 2008. "Code-Switching in the Classroom: Research Paradigms and Approaches" in *Encyclopedia of Language and Education (second edition) volume 10: Research Methods in Language and Education* eds. King K.A. and Hornberger N. New York: Springer: 273-286
- Lin A.M.Y. and Martin P. 2005. "From a Critical Deconstruction Paradigm to a Critical Construction Paradigm: An Introduction to Decolonisation, Globalisation and Language-In-Education Policy and Practice" in *Decolonisation, Globalisation: Language-in-Education Policy and Practice* eds. Lin A.M.Y. and Martin P. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd: 1-19
- Luke A., McHoul A.W. and Mey J.L. 1990. "On the Limits of Language Planning: Class, State and Power" in *Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific* eds. Baldauf R.B. and Luke A. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd: 25-44
- Lytra V. 2003. *Constructing Play Frames and Social Identities: the Case of a Linguistically and Culturally Mixed Peer Group in an Athenian Primary School*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. King's College London.
- MacKenzie P., Hayden M.C. and Thompson J.J. 2001. The Third Constituency: Parents in International Schools. *International Schools Journal* XX/2: 57- 64.
- MacKenzie P., Hayden M.C. and Thompson J.J. 2003. Parental Priorities in the

- Selection of International Schools. *Oxford Review of Education* 29/3: 229-314.
- Makri-Tsilipakou M. 1994. Interruption Revisited: Affiliative versus Non-Affiliative Intervention. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21: 401-426.
- Markee N. 2005. "The Organization of Off-Task Talk in Second Language Classrooms" in *Applying Conversation Analysis* eds. Richards K. and Seedhouse P. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan: 197-213.
- Marti L. 2006. Indirectness and Politeness in Turkish-German Bilinguals and Turkish Monolingual Requests. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 1836-1869.
- Martin P. 1999. Close Encounters of a Bilingual Kind: Interactional Practices in the Primary Classroom in Brunei. *International Journal of Educational Development* 19: 127-140.
- Martin P. 2003. Interactions and Inter-relationships around Text: Practices and Positioning in a Multilingual Classroom in Brunei. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 6 (3 & 4): 185-201.
- Martin P. 2005. "'Safe' Language Practices in Two Rural Schools in Malaysia: Tensions between Policy and Practice" in *Decolonisation, Globalisation: Language-in-Education Policy and Practice* eds. Lin A.M.Y. and Martin P. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: 74-97.
- Martin P., Creese A. and Bhatt A. 2003. Complementary Schools and Their Communities in Leicester. Final Report for the ESRC for Project No: R000223949. WWW Document at: <http://www.uel.ac.uk/education/staff/finalreport.pdf>. Accessed on 22/05/2010.
- Martin-Jones M. 1995. "Code-Switching in the Classroom: Two Decades of Research" in *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching* eds Milroy L. and Muysken P. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press: 90-111.
- Matthews M. 1989. The Scale of International Education. *International Schools Journal* 17: 7-17.
- May St. 2006. "Language Policy and Minority Rights" in *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Ed. Ricento Th. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing: 255-272.
- McCaig N. 1992. Birth of a Notion. *The Global Nomad Quarterly* 1/1: 1-2.
- McCarty T.L. 2004. "Dangerous Difference: A Critical-Historical Analysis of Language Education Policies in the United States" in *Medium of Instruction Policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Eds. Tollefson J.W. and Tsui A.B.M. Mahwah, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- McGillivray G. 2007. "England" in *Early Childhood Education and Care: Policy and Practice*. eds. Clark M.M. and Waller T. London: Sage Publications Ltd.: 19-50.
- McHoul A.W. 1990. The Organization of Repair in Classroom Talk. *Language in Society* 19/3: 349-377.
- Melander H. and Sahlström Fr. 2009. In Tow of the Blue Whale. Learning as Changing Participation in Social Interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41: 1519-1537.
- Milroy L. 1987. *Language and Social Network*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Milroy L., Li W. and Moffat S. 1991. Discourse Patterns and Fieldwork Strategies in Urban Settings: Some Methodological Problems for Researchers in Bilingual Communities. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 12/4:287-300.
- Moore H. 1996. Language Policies as Virtual Reality: Two Australian Examples. *TESOL Quarterly* 30/3: 473-497
- Mühlhäusler P. 1996. *Linguistic Ecology: Language Change and Linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific Region*. London: Routledge.
- Murphy E. 2003. Monolingual International Schools and the Young Non-English-Speaking Child. *Journal of Research in International Education* 2/1: 25-45.
- Nunan D. 2003. The Impact of English as a Global Language on Educational Policies and Practices in the Asia-Pacific Region. *TESOL Quarterly* 37/4: 589-613
- Ochs E. 1979. "Transcription as Theory" in *Developmental Pragmatics* eds. Ochs. E. and Schieffelin B.B. New York: Academic Press Inc.: 43-72.
- Papageorgiou I. 2008. Linguistic Heterogeneity in the Greek Educational System: A Sociolinguistic Approach to the Cross-Cultural Policy. Poster Presented at the *Sociolinguistic Symposium 17*, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 3-5 April, 2008.
- Papageorgiou I. 2009a. Towards an Alternative Framework for the Investigation of 'Practiced' Policies in Bilingual Classrooms. Conference Paper Presented at the *Linguistics and English Language Postgraduate Conference, The University of Edinburgh*, Edinburgh, Scotland, 20-23 May, 2009.
- Papageorgiou I. 2009b. A Framework for the Investigation of 'Practiced Language Policies' in Bilingual Classrooms. Conference Paper Presented at the *International Symposium on Bilingualism 7*, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 8-11 July, 2009.
- Papageorgiou I. and Gafaranga J. 2011. The Educators' 'Medium Request' Strategies in an English-Medium Kindergarten Classroom in Greece: Talking 'Practiced Language Policy' into Being. Paper Presented at the *International Symposium on Bilingualism 8*, Oslo, Norway, 15-18 June, 2011.
- Pavlidou T.S. 1991. Cooperation and Choice of Linguistic Means: Some Evidence from the Use of the Subjunctive in Modern Greek. *Journal of Pragmatics* 15:11-42.
- Peck S. 1980. "Language Play in Child Second Language Acquisition" in *Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House: 154-164.
- Pennycook A. 1989. The Concept of Method, Interested Knowledge, and the Politics of Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 23/4: 589-618
- Pennycook A. 1994. *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. Essex: Longman.
- Pennycook A. 2002. "Language Policy and Docile Bodies: Hong Kong and Governmentality" in *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*. Ed. Tollefson J.W. London: Lawrence Erlbaum: 91-110.
- Pennycook A. 2006. "Postmodernism in Language Policy" in *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Ed. Ricento Th. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing: 60-76.
- Peterson A.D. C. 2003. *Schools across Frontiers: the Story of the International Baccalaureate and the United World Colleges*. La Salle, IL: Open court.

- Phillips S. U. 1972. "Participant Structures and Communicative Competence: Warm Springs Children in Community and Classroom" in *Functions of Language in the Classroom* eds. Cazden C., John V. and Hymes D. New York: Teachers College Press: 370-394.
- Phillipson R. and Skutnabb-Kangas T. 1996. English Only Worldwide or Language Ecology? *TESOL* 30/3: 429-452.
- Pike 1967. *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behaviour*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Pomerantz A. and Bell N.D. 2007. Learning to Play, Playing to Learn: FL Learners as Multicompetent Language Users. *Applied Linguistics* 28/4: 556-578
- Pönisch A. 1987. *Special Needs and the International Baccalaureate: a Study of the Need for and Development of Alternative Courses to the International Baccalaureate*. MSc Thesis. University of Oxford.
- Psathas G. 1995. *Conversation Analysis: the Study of Talk-in-Interaction*. London: Sage Publications.
- Ramanathan V. 2005. Rethinking Language Planning and Policy from the Ground Up: Refashioning Institutional Realities and Human Lives. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 6/2: 89-101
- Rampton B. 1992. "Scope for Empowerment in Sociolinguistics?" in *Researching Language: Issues of Power and Method*. eds. Cameron D., Frazer E. and Harvey P. London: Routledge: 29-64.
- Rampton B. 1995. *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. Essex. Longman Group Limited.
- Raschka Ch., Sercombe P. and 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.
- Ricento Th. 2000. Historical and Theoretical Perspectives in Language Policy and Planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4/2: 196-213.
- Ricento Th. 2006a. "Theoretical Perspectives in Language Policy: An Overview" in *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Ed. Ricento Th. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing: 3-23.
- Ricento Th. 2006b. "Methodological Perspectives in Language Policy: An Overview" in *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Ed. Ricento Th. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing: 129-134.
- Ricento Th.K. and Hornberger N.H. 1996. Unpeeling the Onion: Language Planning and Policy and the ELT Professional. *TESOL Quarterly* 30/3: 401-427
- Richards K. 2005. "Introduction" in *Applying Conversation Analysis* eds. Richards K. and Seedhouse P. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan: 1-15.
- Richards K. 2006. 'Being the Teacher': Identity and Classroom Conversation. *Applied Linguistics* 27/1: 51-77.
- Rubin J. 1971. "Evaluation in Language Planning" in *Can Language Be Planned?: Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations* eds. Rubin J. and Jernudd B.H. Hawaii: The University Press of Hawaii: 217-252.
- Rubin J. and Jernudd B.H. 1971a. "Introduction: Language Planning as an Element in Modernization" in *Can Language Be Planned?: Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations* eds. Rubin J. and Jernudd B.H. xiii-xxiv.

- Rubin J. and Jernudd B.H. 1971b. *Can Language Be Planned?: Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations* Hawaii: The University Press of Hawaii:
- Sacks H. 1966. *The Search for Help: No One to Turn to*. PhD Thesis. University of California, Berkley.
- Sacks H. 1972. "An Initial Investigation of the Usability of Conversational Data for Doing Sociology" in *Studies in Social Interaction* ed. Sudnow D.N. New York: Free Press: 31-74
- Sacks H. 1974. "On the Analysability of Stories by Children" in *Ethnomethodology: Selected Readings* eds. Turner R. Harmondsworth: Penguin: 216-232.
- Sacks H. 1984. "Notes on Methodology" in *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* eds Atkinson J.M. and Heritage J.C. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 21-27.
- Sacks H. 1992/1995. *Lectures on Conversation: Volume 1*. Oxford: Blackwells.
- Sampson D.L. and Smith H.P. 1957. A Scale to Measure World-Minded Attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology* 45: 99-106
- Sanderson J. 1981. *International Schooling: the 'Mobile' Pupil and His Educational Needs*. MSc Thesis. University of Oxford.
- Sangpil Byon A. 2004. Sociopragmatic Analysis of Korean Requests: Pedagogical Settings. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36/9: 1673-1704.
- Schegloff E. 1987. "Recycled Turn Beginnings: a Precise Repair Mechanism in Conversation's Turn Taking Organization" in *Talk and Social Organisation* eds Button G. and Lee J. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: 70-85.
- Schegloff E. 1991. "Reflections on Talk and Social Structure" in *Talk and Social Structure* eds. Boden D. and Zimmerman D.H. Berkeley: University of California Press: 44-70.
- Schegloff E., Koshik I, Jacoby S. and Olsher D. 2002. Conversation Analysis and Applied Linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22: 3-31.
- Schegloff E. 2007a. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff E. 2007b. A Tutorial in Membership Categorisation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 462-482.
- Schegloff E. and Sacks H. 1973. Opening Up Closings. *Semiotica* 8: 289-327.
- Schegloff E., Jefferson G. and Sacks H. 1977. The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Language* 53/2: 361-382.
- Schenkein J. 1978. "Sketch of an Analytic Mentality for the Study of Conversational Interaction" in *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*. Ed. Schenkein J. New York: Academic Press: 1-6.
- Schutz A. 1964. *The Collected Papers II: Studies in Social Theory*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Searle J. 1975. "Indirect Speech Acts" in *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 3: Speech Acts*. Eds. Cole P. and Morgan J. New York: Academic Press: 59-82.
- Seedhouse P. 1999. The Relationship between Context and the Organization of Repair in the L2 Classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 37/1: 59-80.
- Seedhouse P. 2004. *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Seedhouse P. 2005. "Conversation Analysis as Research Methodology" in *Applying Conversation Analysis* eds. Richards K. and Seedhouse P. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan: 251-266.
- Sidnell J. 2010. *Conversation Analysis. An Introduction*. Singapore: Wiley Blackwell.
- Silverman D. 1998. *Harvey Sacks: Social Science and Conversation Analysis*. Oxford: Policy Press.
- Silverman D. 2000. *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage Publications.
- Shohamy E.G. 2006. *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Skelton M. 2002. "Defining 'International' in an International Curriculum" in *International Education in Practice: Dimensions for National and International Schools* eds. Hayden M., Thompson J. and Walker G. London: Kogan Page Limited: 39-54.
- Skilton-Sylvester E. 2003. "Legal Discourse and Decisions, Teacher Policymaking and the Multilingual Classroom: Constraining and Supporting Khmer/English Bilingual Education in the United States" in *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 6/3&4:168-184
- Skutnabb-Kangas T. 2008. "Human Rights and Language Policy in Education" in *Encyclopedia of Language and Education (second edition) Volume 1: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*. Eds. May A and Hornberger N. New York: Springer: 107-119.
- Skutnabb-Kangas T. and Phillipson R. 1994. *Linguistic Human Rights: Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Spolsky B. 1972. *The Language Education of Minority Children*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Spolsky B. 2004. *Language Policy*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky B. 2007. Towards a Theory of Language Policy. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 22/1: 1-14.
- Spolsky B. 2008. "Investigating Language Education Policy" in *Encyclopedia of Language and Education (second edition) Volume 1: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*. Eds. May A and Hornberger N. New York: Springer: 27-39.
- Spolsky B. and Shohamy E. 2000. "Language Practice, Language Ideology, and Language Policy" in *Language Policy and Pedagogy: Essays in Honor of Ronald Morton* eds. Lambert R. and Shohamy E. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company: 1-41
- Swain M. 1985. "Communicative Competence: Some Roles of Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output in Its Development" in *Input in Second Language Acquisition* eds. Gass S. and Madden C. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publishers: 235-256.
- Swain M. 2000. "The Output Hypothesis and beyond: Mediating Acquisition through Collaborative Dialogue" in *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. Ed. Lantolf. J.P. Oxford: Oxford University Press: pps
- Talmy S. 2009. "Resisting ESL Categories and Sequence in a Critically 'Motivated' Analysis of Classroom Interaction" in *Talk-in-Interaction: Multilingual*

- Perspectives* eds. Nguyen H. and Kasper G. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, National Foreign Language Centre: 181-213.
- Tamburrini J. 1982. "New Directions in Nursery Education" in *New Directions in Primary Education*. ed. Richards C. Lewes: The Falmer Press: 97-110.
- Tarone E. 2000. "Getting Serious about Language Play: Language Play, Interlanguage Variation and Second Language Acquisition" in *Social and Cognitive Factors in SLA: Selected Proceedings of the 1999 SL Research Forum* eds. Swierzbinska B., Moris Fr., Anderson M.E., Klee C.A. and Tarone E. Melville, MA: Cascadilla Press: 31-54.
- Ten Have P. 1999. *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide*. London: Sage.
- Terwilliger R.I. 1972. International Schools-Cultural Crossroads. *The Educational Forum* 36/3: 359-363
- Thompson J. 2001. "Towards a Model for International Education" in *International Education: Principles and Practice* eds. Hayden M. and Thompson J. London: Kogan Page: 276-290.
- Tien C.I. 2009. Conflict and Accommodation in Classroom Codeswitching in Taiwan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 12/2: 173-192.
- Tollefson J. 1986. Language Policy and the Radical Left in the Philippines: The New People's Army and Its Antecedents. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 10: 177-186.
- Tollefson J. 1991. *Planning Language, Planning Inequality: Language Policy in the Community*. London: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Tollefson J. 1995. "Introduction: Language Policy, Power and Inequality" in *Power and Inequality in Language Education* ed. Tollefson J.W. New York: Cambridge University Press: 1-8
- Tollefson J. 2002a. "Introduction: Critical Issues in Educational Language Policy" in *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*. Ed. Tollefson J.W. London: Lawrence Erlbaum: 3—15.
- Tollefson J. 2002b. "Language Rights and the Destruction of Yugoslavia" in *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*. Ed. Tollefson J.W. London: Lawrence Erlbaum: 179-199.
- Tollefson J. 2006. "Critical Theory in Language Policy" in *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Ed. Ricento Th. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing: 42-59.
- Tollefson J. 2008. "Language Planning in Education" in *Encyclopedia of Language and Education (second edition) Volume 1: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*. Eds. May A and Hornberger N. New York: Springer: 3-14.
- Torras M.C. and Gafaranga J. 2002. Social Identities and Language Alternation in Non-formal Institutional Bilingual Talk: Trilingual Service Encounters in Barcelona. *Language in Society* 31: 527-548.
- Useem R.H. 1976. Third Culture Kids. *Today's Education* 65/3: 103-105.
- Van Lier L. 1988. *The Classroom and the Language Learner*. New York: Longman.
- Wei L. 1994. *Three Generations, Two Languages, One Family: Language Choice and Language Shift in a Chinese Community in Britain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Wei L. 2002. 'What Do You Want Me to Say?' On the Conversation Analysis Approach to Bilingual Interaction. *Language in Society* 31: 159-180.
- Wei L. 2005. 'How Can You Tell?': Towards a Common Sense Explanation of Conversational Code-Switching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37: 375-389
- Wei L. and Martin P. 2009. Conflicts and Tensions in Classroom Codeswitching: an Introduction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 12/2: 117-122.
- Wei L. and Wu Ch.-J. 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: 193-211
- Wijewardene I.M. 1999. *What People Perceive International Schools in Sri Lanka Have to Offer Which Makes Them More Popular than Local Schools for Those Who Can Afford Them*. MA Thesis. University of Bath.
- Wiley T.G. 2002. "Accessing Language Rights in Education: A Brief History of the U.S. Context" in *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*. Ed. Tollefson J.W. London: Lawrence Erlbaum: 39-64
- Wiley T.G. and Lukes M. 1996. English-Only and Standard English Ideologies in the U.S. *TESOL Quarterly* 30/3: 511-535. (Policy and Ideology in LEP)
- Williams B. 2003. Setting up an Intensive English Unit: the First Two Years. *The International Schools Journal Compendium: Volume 1: ESL: Educating Non-Native Speakers of English in an English-Medium International School*. ed. Murphy E. Woodbridge: John Catt Educational Ltd: 213-216.
- Wilson Th. 1991. "Social Structure and the Sequential Organisation of Interaction" in *Talk and Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*, eds. Boden D. and Zimmerman D. H. Cambridge: Cambridge Polity Press: 22-43.
- Wong J. and Zhang Waring H. 2010. *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy: a Guide for ESL/EFL Teachers*. New York: Routledge.
- Wooffitt R. 2005. *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: A Comparative and Critical Introduction*. London: Sage Publications.
- Zimmerman D. H. 1998. "Discoursal Identities and Social Identities". In *Identities in Talk* eds. Antaki Ch. And Widdicombe S. London: Sage: 87-106.

Policy Documents

- BES 2007. *Annual Reviews*. Athens: BES.
- BES 2008a. *Information about BES*. WWW Document at <http://www.BES.gr/information>. Accessed 10/01/2008.
- BES 2008b. *Mission Statement*. WWW Document at <http://www.BES.gr/information> Accessed 10/01/2008.
- BES 2008c. *Reception: Information Booklet for Parents*. Athens: BES.
- Council of International Schools. 2011. *About CIS*. WWW Document at <http://www.cois.org/> Accessed 13/02/2011.
- Early Excellence (EE). 2008. *Early Excellence: Promoting Quality in the Early Years*. WWW Document at <http://www.earlyexcellence.com/index.html> Accessed 10/01/2008.

- European Council of International Schools. 1993. *The International Schools Directory 1993/94* (Petersfiled, ECIS).
- European Council of International Schools. 2011. *About ECIS*. WWW Document at <http://www.ecis.org/page.cfm?p=277> Accessed 13/02/2011/
- International Schools Association. 2011. *Organisation*. WWW Document at http://www.isaschools.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=blogcategory&id=31&Itemid=66 Accessed 13/02/2011.
- International School of Geneva. 2011. *About Ecolint*. WWW document at: <http://www.ecolint.ch/ecolint/ch/ench/index.cfm?page=/ecolint/home/campuses/boissiere> Accessed 13/02/2011.
- International School of London. 2011. *About International School of London- Introduction to International School of London*. WWW Document at <http://www.islondon.com/AboutIsl.asp> Accessed 13/02/2011.
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) 2000. *Curriculum Guidance for the Foundation Stage*. London: QCA.
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) 2003. *The Foundation Stage Profile*. London: QCA.
- School Curriculum and Assessment Authority (SCAA) 1996. *Nursery Education: Desirable Outcomes for Children's Learning*. London: Department for Education and Skills.

APPENDIX 1 : INTERVIEWS AT BES

Some of the topics I discussed with BES administrators and Reception educators were: a) what are their aims and expectations when it comes to Reception pupils' language choice in Reception, b) what is their approach to the use of languages other than English in the Reception CPAs c) Is offering bilingual assistance seen as part of the roles and responsibilities of Reception teaching assistants who are bilingual in English and Greek, d) what is BES's rationale for (re)grouping pupils in Reception. Additionally, in the interviews with Reception educators, I chose four excerpts from the audio recorded data (see below) and asked teachers and assistants to comment on what was going on. My aim here was to further elicit responses with regard to how they think the issue of 'English-only' and 'free-interaction' can be approached. Also these transcripts constituted an initial form of feedback to BES's community about what actually happens at the level of classroom interaction in Reception as a result of the school's conflicting policies.

Extract 1

Sand Play Area: Alexander, Marianthi, Katerina, Europi

1. Katerina: tha itane afto hameno edo ke tha to ihe kani
2. Europi: pu ine to prosopo miti?
3. (0.4)
4. Katerina: edo
5. Europi: pu ine to prosopo miti?
6. Katerina: edo
7. Europi: eh to xriazome
8. Katerina: ego to pira proti
9. Europi: omos ego to hriazome

10. (0.7)
11. Marianthi: edo tha ehi
12. Alexander: edo tha ftiaksume to kastro
13. (0.10)
14. Katerina :edo
15. (0.1)
16. Europi: pedia ftiahnume vuno?
17. {no reply} (0.2)
18. Europi: ftiahnume vuno?
19. Alexander: ohi
20. Europi: ne ftiahnume?
21. Marianthi: ne
22. Katerina: oti po ego oti po ego eh?
23. Alexander: to diko mu tha gini pio psilo vuno
24. Europi: Ah (.) ah prepi na to rikso (.) na to risiko?
25. Katerina: ne
26. (0.1)
27. Katerina: gia na ftiaksume vuno
28. Europi: na ftikasume vuno na ftiaksume vuno {in a singing voice}
29. Alexander: vrika mia vomva (na ti rikso)?
30. Katerina: na ftiaksume to vuno poli psilo

Extract 2

Construction Area: Stephano , John; Stelios and Odysseas

1. Stelios : ego kita edo ti ehis
2. Odysseas: **eh now Stick it stick it stick it**

3. Stelios: **stick it ah:**
4. (0.5)
5. Odysseas: **John look back here how big is the ladder**
6. (0.5)
7. Stelios: **no John look they are making the ladder**
8. Odysseas: **yes look how big is the ladder**
9. (0.5)
10. Stephano: **(Odysseas and me are doing the (xx) the (xx))**
11. (0.2)
12. Odysseas: **oh No wait I will make I will make it this**
13. (0.10)
14. Odysseas: **John (xx) no wait it s not ready**
15. Stelios : **eh John it s not ready**
16. Odysseas: **not ready the ladder**

Extract 3

Workshop Area: John, Steve, Odysseas, Stelios and Nantia, Miss Karavanta, Miss Charalampidou

1. John: **where are the tools I need tools**
2. Miss Miss Charalampidou: **You can wait eh John there s [lots of tools in the (xx)**
3. Stelios: [na
ftiaksume spaghetti ? na ftiaksume Odysseas?
4. Odysseas: ne (.) na ftiaksume (.) spaghetti
5. (0.3)
6. Miss Charalampidou: **Stelio? Stelio? can you speak English so that John can understand as well?**
7. (0.1)

8. Miss Charalampidou: **eh ok?**
9. (0.6)
10. Miss Anna: **here (.) here here here**
11. (0.5)
12. Miss Anna: **(please use English so that John can understand as well ok?)**
13. (0.15)
14. Odysseas: afta ta dio ta dio prasina
15. (0.5)
16. Odysseas: ohi ohi kokino ohi kokino
17. (.)
18. Odysseas: ohi kokino prasino
19. (.)
20. Stelios: ego eho kitrino
21. (0.5)
22. Odysseas: af to kokino to kokino kani spaghetti
23. Steve: to kokino kani spaghetti
24. Stelios: ke ke ke afto ke afto kani spaghetti
25. Odysseas: ne

Extract 4:

Drawing area: Europi, Stella, Nikos, Roksani, Miss Karavanta

1. Europi :ise pente ke mi ikosi
2. Roksani: o: hi ime pente
3. (0.2)
4. Nikos: ego ime pente ke miso
5. (0.3)
6. Miss Karavanta: **writing table look at me all of you (0.1) I am giving you a warning**
7. (0.2)

8. Miss Karavanta: **(keep your voices down) (xx) and more English please**
9. Europi: **more**
10. Stella: **Ok (.) (I don't want) this I want this (.) not this**

APPENDIX 2: TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

Transcription Conventions are mainly in accordance with Gail Jefferson's transcript system as reported by Atkinson and Heritage (2006).

Participants:

Participants' names have been invented in order to protect their anonymity. At the beginning of each extract, information about each participants' 'language preference' (Auer 1984) is provided.

Character format to indicate Language Contrast

Plain characters indicate Greek

Bold characters indicate English.

Italics indicate any other language being used

Transcription of original talk in Greek:

Greek was transcribed using characters from the Latin alphabet. (see conventions below)

----- Indicates that translation of Greek into English follows

Turn and inter-turn pauses numbered for ease of reference

? indicates rising intonation

(0.2) Indicates pause in seconds

(.) indicates micropause, i.e. pause shorter than one second

o::
of colons and repetition of colons indicates an extension of the preceding sound or syllable

[start	Indicates the point where two utterances overlap or simultaneously
-	indicates a cut-off of the preceding sound
<u>Underlined speech</u>	Indicates some form of stress
!	Indicates an animated tone
→	Left-hand arrow indicates Target Item
(xx)	indicates unintelligible talk
(words within parentheses) to	items enclosed within parentheses indicate an attempt to transcribe an incomprehensible utterance
{ curly brackets }	indicate investigator's comments on context, quality of speech and paralinguistic features

Romanization Conventions for Modern Greek

<u>Symbol</u>	<u>IPA</u>	<u>Symbol</u>	<u>IPA</u>
b	b	a	a
d	ð	e	e
f	f	i	i
g	ɣ ɣ̞ g	o	o
h	χ ɣ̞ χ	u	u
k	k c	ei	ei
l	l ɬ	ai	ai
m	m ɱ	au	au
n	n ŋ ɲ		
p	p		
r	r		
s	s		
t	t		
v	v		
z	z		
ks	ks		
th	θ		
ts	ts		
nt	d		

APPENDIX 3: LETTERS AND CONSENT FORMS GIVEN TO BES MEMBERS OF STAFF AND PARENTS

Dear Teachers,

My name is Ifigenia Papageorgiou and I am a postgraduate student in Linguistics at the University of Edinburgh (United Kingdom). In order to get my degree, I am required to submit a dissertation project. For this project, I would like to study the use of language by bilingual classroom participants.

For my research I would like to observe and audio-record some of the lessons in order to listen back to the interactions afterwards and examine the structure of the talk in more detail. I might also take notes while auditing the lesson.

This study fully complies with the guidelines for the protection of personal data and therefore full privacy and anonymity for participants is ensured. No names or other personal data will be used while all participants can withdraw from the study at any time. My research will have no risks for the participants and the lesson will be conducted as usual without me intervening or participating in it.

If you wish to participate in this research, please sign the attached consent form.

Thank you for your help.

Ifigenia Papageorgiou

CONSENT FORM

Title of Dissertation Project: Classroom Interaction in Bilingual Classrooms

I agree to participate in Ms Papageorgiou's project named above.

Name of Teacher:

Signature:

Date:

Dear Headmaster,

My name is Ifigenia Papageorgiou and I am a postgraduate student in Linguistics at the University of Edinburgh (United Kingdom). In order to get my degree (PhD), I am required to submit a dissertation project. For this project, I would like to study the use of language by bilingual classroom participants.

For my research I would like to sit in and audio-record some of the lessons in order to listen back to the interactions afterwards and examine the structure of the talk in more detail. I might also take notes while auditing the lesson.

My research will have no risks for the participants and the lesson will be conducted as usual without me intervening or participating in it. My proposed methods of data collection (ethnographic observation and audio-recording of classroom interaction in identified classroom(s)) conform 100% to the principles and requirements of the linguistics ethic guidelines, guaranteeing informed consent, full privacy for participants, and freedom of harm. Therefore the study will be anonymous, and no names or other personal data will be used. Moreover, all data collected will be used only for the purposes of research and all participants can withdraw from the study at any time.

If you give your consent for your school to participate in this research, please sign the attached consent form.

Yours sincerely,

Ifigenia Papageorgiou

CONSENT FORM

Title of Dissertation Project: Classroom Interaction in Bilingual Classrooms

I give my consent for Ms Papageorgiou to conduct her PhD research in our school.

Headmaster:

Signature:

Date:

Dear Head of Lower School,

My name is Ifigenia Papageorgiou and I am a postgraduate student in Linguistics at the University of Edinburgh (United Kingdom). In order to get my degree (PhD), I am required to submit a dissertation project. For this project, I would like to study the use of language by bilingual classroom participants.

For my research I would like to sit in and audio-record some of the lessons in order to listen back to the interactions afterwards and examine the structure of the talk in more detail. I might also take notes while auditing the lesson.

My research will have no risks for the participants and the lesson will be conducted as usual without me intervening or participating in it. My proposed methods of data collection (ethnographic observation and audio-recording of classroom interaction in identified classroom(s)) conform 100% to the principles and requirements of the linguistics ethic guidelines, guaranteeing informed consent, full privacy for participants, and freedom of harm. Therefore the study will be anonymous, and no names or other personal data will be used. Moreover, all data collected will be used only for the purposes of research and all participants can withdraw from the study at any time.

If you give your consent for me to conduct my research in your school, please sign the attached consent form.

Yours sincerely,

Ifigenia Papageorgiou

CONSENT FORM

Title of Dissertation Project: Classroom Interaction in Bilingual Classrooms

I give my consent for Ms Papageorgiou to conduct her PhD research in our school.

Head of Lower School:

Signature:

Date:

Head of Lower School

05.02.08

Dear Parents,

Please find attached a letter from a student Ms Ifigenia Papageorgiou. Ms Papageorgiou has asked if we can help her to gather some data for her PhD.

Ms Papageorgiou will collect her data by observing and recording the interactions of the children on audio tape. **The lessons will not be interrupted and all data collected will be anonymous.**

As a school and a centre of learning, we are happy to be involved in this sort of research.

If you have any queries or do not wish your child to be included in this, please let me know by Monday 11th February.

Yours sincerely,

Head of Lower School

Athens, 29/01/2008

Dear Parents,

My name is Ifigenia Papageorgiou and I am a postgraduate student in Linguistics at the University of Edinburgh (United Kingdom). In order to get my degree (PhD), I am required to submit a dissertation project. For this project, I would like to study the use of language by bilingual classroom participants.

For my research I would like to observe and audio-record some of the lessons in order to listen back to the interactions afterwards and examine the structure of talk in more detail. I might also take notes while auditing the lesson.

This study fully complies with the guidelines for the protection of personal data and therefore full privacy and anonymity for participants is ensured. No names or other personal data will be used while all participants can withdraw from the study at any time. My research will have no risks for the participants and the lesson will be conducted as usual without me intervening or participating in it.

If you have any queries or you do not wish your child to take part in this research please contact the Head of Lower School, by Monday 11 February.

Thank you very much for your help.

Yours sincerely,

Ifigenia Papageorgiou

PhD Candidate

Linguistics and English Language

University of Edinburgh

UK

Title of Dissertation Project: Classroom Interaction in Bilingual Classrooms

APPENDIX 4: TRANSCRIPTS OF CLASSROOM PLAY INTERACTION

Extract 1

Drawing Area: Europi, Hrusa, Kyriaki

1. Europi: ego tha kano ena koritsaki m ena kalathaki san tin kokinoskufitsa na mazevi luludakia
2. Kyriaki: omos ohi tin kokinoskoufitsa
3. Hrusa: den kseris na kanis tin kokinoskufitsa
4. Europi: ohi
5. Hrusa: kseris?
6. Europi: kanis den kseri mono (0.2) {coughing} mono i Kate kse {coughing}ri
7. Kyriaki: mono i Kate?
8. (0.1)
9. Europi: i Kate ine mia zografos pou erhete spiti mu
10. Hrusa: ego to ksero
11. Europi: ne
12. (0.3)
13. Kyriaki: emena
14. Europi: pios kseri pion pion ftiahno (.) ftiahno dio koritsakia pu: to megalitero kratai ena kalathaki ke mazevi luludakia (0.2) ke to mikrotero kratai to heri (0.2) tu megaliteru eh? (.) mantepste (.) pios kseri?
15. (0.2)
16. Europi: eh?
17. (0.1)
18. Europi: thelete na sas po me ti grama arhizi to koritsaki ?
19. Kyriaki: me ti?
20. Europi: edo tha ne afto
21. (0.4)
22. Europi: ne (me to n arhizei)

-
1. Europi: I am going to make a little girl with a basket she will be like
 2. the Little Red Riding Hood who is collecting flowers
 3. Kyriaki: but not the Little Red Riding Hood
 4. Hrusa: you don't know how to make the Little Red Riding Hood
 5. Europi: no
 6. Hrusa: do you know?
 7. Europi: nobody knows only only Kate knows
 8. Kyriaki: only Kate?
 9. (0.1)
 10. Europi: Kate is the artist that comes into my place
 11. Hrusa: I know that
 12. Europi: yes

13. (0.3)
14. Kyriaki: I
15. Europi: who knows who who I am going to draw I am drawing two little girls who the older one is holding a basket and is picking up flowers and the younger one is holding the hand of the oldest one? guess who knows?
16. (0.2)
17. Europi: eh?
18. (0.1)
19. Europi: Would you like me to tell you what s the first letter of the little girl's name?
20. Kyriaki: what is it?
21. Europi: this one is going to be here
22. (0.4)
23. Europi: yes(it begins with an n)

Extract 2

Workshop Area: Hrusa; Katerina

1. Katerina: na kano makaronia? meta apo sena mama?
 2. Hrusa: kane
 3. Katerina: edaksi
 4. Hrusa: ke afise me na ftiakso tin turta mu
-

1. Katerina: can I make spaghetti? After you mam?
2. Hrusa: ok do some
3. Katerina: ok
4. Hrusa: and let me make my cake

Extract 3

Water Play Area: Stelios, Steve, Europi, Marianthi

1. Europi: eh thes na su rikso?
2. (0.4)
3. Europi: pios alos theli na tu rikso nero (.) eh? (.) pios theli na pgi nero?
4. Stelios: ohi ego
5. Marianthi: ohi ego
6. Steve: ohi ego
7. (0.2)
8. Europi: thelis na su valo mesa sti kanata afti?
9. Stelios: ne
10. (0.11)

11. Europi: pios alos theli na tu gemiso tin kanata tu? (.) Marianthi edo

-
1. Europi: eh would you like some?
 2. (0.4)
 3. Europi: who else would like some water eh? (.) who would like to drink some water?
 4. Stelios: not me
 5. Marianthi: not me
 6. Steve: not me
 7. (0.2)
 8. Europi: would you like me to put some in this jar?
 9. Stelios: yes
 10. (0.11)
 11. Europi: who else would like me to fill his jar? Marianthi over here

Extract 4

Sand Play Area: Katerina; Europi

1. Europi: pu ine to prosopo miti? {refers to one of the patterns}
2. (0.4)
3. Katerina: edo
4. Europi: pu ine to prosopo miti?
5. Katerina: edo
6. (.)
7. Europi: eh to xriazome
8. (.)
9. Katerina: ego to pira protti
10. Europi: omos ego to hriazome {Europi takes her tool back}

-
1. Europi: where is the face nose? {refers to one of the patterns}
 2. (0.4)
 3. Katerina: It's here
 4. Europi: where is the face nose?
 5. Katerina: It's here
 6. (.)
 7. Europi: Eh I need it
 8. (.)
 9. Katerina: I had it first
 10. Europi: yes but I need it {Europi takes the pattern she needs}

Extract 5

Sand Play Area: Nikos, Miss Karavanta

1. Miss Karavanta: **tell me what you made**
2. Nikos: **a castle**
3. Miss Karavanta: **a castle?**
4. Nikos: **(a castle cake)**
5. Miss Karavanta: **eh what?**
6. Nikos: **(xx)**
7. Miss Karavanta: **a what cake?**
8. Nikos: **(castle cake)**

Extract 6

Sand Play Area: Stephano; Alexander

1. Alexander: **we are the great dragon**
2. (.)
3. Stephano: **yea and we fly ou**
4. Alexander: **ou**
5. Stephano: **no:**
6. Alexander: **ok**

Extract 7

Water Play Area: Alexander; Stephano

1. Alexander: **I am mixing I am mixing I am mixing I am mixing I am mixing I am mixing**
2. (.)
3. Alexander: **Stephano you destroy it here ok?**
4. Stephano: **no**
5. Alexander: **why?**
6. Stephano: **I am putting another (xx)**
7. Alexander: **eh destroy it (.) destroy it here?**
8. (0.10)
9. Stephano: **(xx)**

Extract 8

Construction Area: John ; Odysseas; Stephano

1. Odysseas: **John do you want to help me?**

2. John: **yes**
3. (0.4)
4. Odysseas: **(xx) to put it like this?**
5. John: **yes**
6. (0.5)
7. Odysseas: **(I will go) eh wait wait wait John**
8. John: **(xx)**
9. Odysseas: **(xx) wait**
10. (.)
11. Stephano: **(xx) I need to have (xx)**
12. (.)
13. Odysseas: **wait wait**
14. (0.1)
15. Stephano: **(come on)**
16. Odysseas: **no look over here we put one stick so let s put that**
17. (0.2)
18. Odysseas: **there (.) ok?**
19. (0.1)
20. Odysseas: **Ok John?**
21. (0.4)
22. John: **yes**
23. Odysseas: **put (.) put it**

Extract 9

Sand Play Area: Stephano; Alexander

1. Stephano: **(doing) a castle**
2. Alexander: **yes a castle doing**
3. (.)
4. Alexander: **look**
5. (0.1)
6. Alexander: **the sand toy**
7. Stephano: **no I don t want to touch the sand toy**
8. Alexander: **why? (0.3) you do like that**
9. Stephano: **(xx) no**

Extract 10

Sand Play Area: Stephano , Alexander, Christos

1. Alexander: **I am taking so much sand**
2. Christos: **yes yes (so much sand)**
3. Stephano: **yes take all that sand and we put here**

4. (0.2)
5. Christos: **yea**
6. (0.2)
7. Stephano: **and after this (.) and after the sand we put here and after (.) you know what to do? this (.) we put here**
8. (0.5)
9. Christos: **(a castle)**
10. Alexander: **yes**
11. Stephano: **(now the castle) all the sand (.) here (.) will put it here**
12. (0.4)
13. Stephano: **look what I fixed**
14. Alexander: **ok I (xx) close it we are (xx)**

Extract 11

Sand Play Area: Stephano, Alexander, Christos

1. Christos: **it s very big**
2. Alexander: **yes it s very big**
3. (0.1)
4. Stephano: **yes**
5. (.)
6. Christos: **very very big**
7. Stephano: **ye: very big (xx)(0.1) (we need it to make it more bigger) very very bigger more bigger**
8. (.)
9. Alexander: **yes more (.) bigger**
10. Stephano: **o o o bigger bigger bigger go bigger bigger bigger bigger go bigger**
11. (0.2)
12. Alexander: **this is bigger**
13. Stephano: **this is bigger a:**
14. Alexander: **ouou now throw it in the sand castle**
15. Christos: **yes**
16. Stephano: **now (.) now (.) now (.) now**
17. Christos: **it s bigger**
18. Stephano: **now (.) throw throw throw throw ye:**
19. Altogether: **iii:**
20. Alexander: **ye: {celebrating}**

Extract 12

Polydron Area: Dimitris, Stephano

1. Stephano: **look what we are doing for you**
2. (.)

3. Dimitris: **why where is mine**
4. Stephano: **this is yours (xx) and may do it like that**
5. Dimitris: **no I want to do it like that (xx) please (.) take this**
6. (.)
7. Stephano: **like that (.) is very nice**
8. Dimitris: **like that they don t but this need to be open for**
9. Stephano: **but first we have to break it all**
10. (0.4)
11. Dimitris: **we can t (.) break it all**
12. Stephano: **and after we do it**
13. Dimitris: **yes**
14. Stephano: **break it all we do like that**

Extract 13

Sand Play Area: Alexander , Mary, Odysseas , Miss Karavanta

1. Alexander: **look what we fixed a castle**
2. Miss Karavanta: **ouaou: (.) how did you do it?**
3. Odysseas: **(we put sand in)**
4. Miss Karavanta: **we put?**
5. Odysseas: **we put sand and we did it like that**
6. Miss Karavanta: **hmmm**
7. Alexander: **we are going to fix it again**
8. Miss Karavanta: **why don t you (get) another (.) bucket and do another one?**
9. Mary: **ok**

Extract 14

Sand Play Area: Sofoklis, Kyriaki ; Stelios, Elli , Ifigenia

1. Sofoklis: **look how many cakes we have do**
2. Ifigenia: **oh what are these? cakes?**
3. Students in chorus: **cakes**
4. Ifigenia: **ouaoua that s a really big one**
5. {Sofoklis laughs }

Extract 15

Polydron Area: Nikos, Miss Johns

1. Nikos: **look what we made** {shows the constructions they have made}
2. Miss Johns: **well done it s pretty fantastic**
3. Nikos: **all those we made it**
4. Miss Johns: **well done**

Extract 16

Polydron Area: Alexander, Ifigenia

1. Alexander: **can you stick (.) can you stick this?**
2. Ifigenia: **where? where do you want it?**
3. Alexander: **there (.) (I try it)**
4. (.)
5. Ifigenia: **okay**
6. Alexander: **it s not stick it**
7. (0.10)
8. Alexander: **no:**
9. (0.2)
10. Alexander: **no:**
11. Ifigenia: **it s impossible**
12. Alexander: **le let me do this me**
13. (0.1)
14. Alexander: **there you go**

Extract 17

Polydron Area: Dimitris, Yiorgos, Stephano, Ifigenia

1. Stephano: **Miss Ifigenia can you put one like this?**
2. (0.2)
3. Ifigenia: **ok you need squares**
4. (0.7)
5. Stephano: **I fix a big house**
6. (0.1)
7. Yiorgos: **I am doing that**
8. Dimitris: **can I tell you tell you? I fixed that**
9. Ifigenia: **ok** {laughing}
10. Stephano: **not this**
11. Ifigenia: **well you need to find another square if you don t like this**

Extract 18

Workshop Area: Alexander, Christos, Elli, Miss Karavanta, Miss Charalampidou

1. Alexander: **why we have chipstock in the play dough?**
2. Miss Karavanta: **why you have what?**
3. Alexander: **chipstock**
4. Elli: **I have cookies**
5. Miss Karavanta: **what do you have what?**
6. Alexander: **this**
7. Miss Karavanta: **chopsticks**
8. Alexander: **why we have chopsticks?**
9. Miss Karavanta: **chopsticks you can use them in pretending eating Chinese food**
10. (0.1)
11. Alexander: **Chinese**
12. Christos: **Miss Karavanta**
13. (.)
14. Christos: **Miss Karavanta**
15. Miss Karavanta: **stickchop stickchop** { laughing }
16. (.)
17. Christos: **Miss Karavanta I have this in my house**
18. Miss Karavanta: **you have got chopsticks in your house?**
19. Christos: **ye**
20. Alexander: **and me**
21. Miss Karavanta: **make little portions of food like that and see if you eat them [with the chopsticks**
22. Alexander: **[me too**
23. Miss Charalampidou: **I have got in my house too my sister eats with chopsticks**

Extract 19

Sand Play Area: Marianthi, Miss Karavanta

1. Marianthi: **after I want to go in the water**
2. Miss Karavanta: **you are in the sand right now**
3. Marianthi: **after I want to go the water**
4. Miss Karavanta: **you will get the chance but not today**

Extract 20

Water Play Area: Alexander, Ifigenia

{ Alexander is playing with a car }

1. Alexander: **you know one day (.)I see the cars**
2. Ifigenia: **aha**
3. Alexander: **I see the cars going in the (.) going in the sea**
4. Ifigenia: **cars in the sea?**

5. Alexander: **yes**
6. (.)
7. Ifigenia: **what kind of cars?**
8. (.)
9. Alexander: **o all the cars**

Extract 21

Workshop Area: Steve, Ifigenia, Miss Karavanta

1. Steve: **today I can play video games**
2. Ifigenia: **you can play video games?**
3. Steve: **yes my dad always lets me to play (.) whe (.) when today because can I tell you? because if tomorrow we don t have [school**
4. Miss Karavanta: [(xx)
5. Steve: **only two days only two days**
6. Miss Karavanta: **that s right**
7. (.)
8. Steve: **no three days**
9. Miss Karavanta: **your mammy and daddy are right**
10. (0.1)
11. Steve: **three days**
12. (.)
13. Miss Karavanta: **ok**
14. Steve: **because if because if (.) if we if we**
15. (0.1)
16. Miss Karavanta: **yea**
17. Steve: **if the other day we don t have school that means I can play video games**
18. Miss Karavanta: **that s the rule eh? that s a good rule I think**

Extract 22

Polydron Area: Alexander, Marianthi , Miss Karavanta

{It s tidy up time. The kids have to break all the constructions and put all the polydron pieces back in the box }

1. { Alexander starts throwing polydron pieces on the floor }
2. Marianthi: (Stamata) Alexander
3. (0.1)
4. Marianthi: (ela) na ta mazepsis
5. { Alexander goes on throwing polydron constructions away }
6. (0.5)
7. Marianthi: **look what is do Alexander**

8. Miss Karavanta: **eh Alexander (0.1) absolutely not (.) pick up every piece that is on the floor now (.) quickly (0.2) quickly (0.1) my goodness Alexander (0.2) every piece that is on the floor pick it up (.) very quickly (0.1) pick them up please (.) you need to break them and put them in here (.) hurry up Alexander hurry up**
9. { Alexander collects the pieces and puts them back in the box }

1. { Alexander starts throwing all the pieces on the floor }
2. Marianthi: (Stop it) Alexander
3. (0.1)
4. Marianthi: come and pick them up

Extract 23

Polydron Area: Stelios, Ifigenia

1. Stelios: **I want a square Efigenia**
2. Ifigenia: **what do you want?**
3. Stelios: **one more square closed**

Extract 24

Water Play Area: Alexander, Stelios, Steve, Ifigenia

1. Alexander: emis ehume pio poli pios to rikse?
 2. Stelios: I Efigenia
 3. (0.1)
 4. Alexander: vrexate kei ta paputsia mu
 5. Stelios: ke mena
 6. Steve: ego katholu ohi giati pira apo do
-
1. Alexander: we have more over here who did that?
 2. Stelios: Efigenia did it
 3. (0.1)
 4. Alexander: you made me all wet including my shoes
 5. Stelios: me too
 6. Steve: It wasn' t me I just took some from here

Extract 25

Water Play Area: Europi, Stella, Katerina, Roksani, Ifigenia

1. Europi: ei kiria Ifigenia boris na mu riksis (.) **glitter** edo mesa?
 2. Ifigenia: **ok**
 3. Stella: milai ke ellinika
 4. Ifigenia: **I ll try**
 5. Roksani: [milate ellinika?]
 6. Stella: [**do you speak Greek?**]
 7. Ifigenia: **I do yea**
 8. (0.1)
 9. Ifigenia: **what about you?**
 10. Stella: me Greek
 11. Europi: me Greek
 12. Stella: me Greek and English
 13. Katerina: me Greek and English
 14. Europi: me Greek and English
 15. Roksani: and Spanish
 16. Katerina: and Spanish
-

1. Europi: ei miss Ifigenia can you put some (.) **glitter** in my pot?
2. Ifigenia: **ok**
3. Stella: she also speaks Greek
4. Ifigenia: **I ll try**
5. Roksani: [do you speak Greek?]
6. Stella: [**do you speak Greek?**]
7. Ifigenia: **I do yea**
8. (0.1)
9. Ifigenia: **what about you?**
10. Stella: me Greek
11. Europi: me Greek
12. Stella: me Greek and English
13. Katerina: me Greek and English
14. Europi: me Greek and English
15. Roksani: and Spanish

APPENDIX 5: THE RK PARTICIPANTS' LINGUISTIC BACKGROUND

<u>(fake) Name</u>	<u>Linguistic Background</u>
Stella	Greek
Alexander	Greek
Steve	Greek-(British) English
Roksani	Greek
Europi	Greek
Katerina	Greek
Sofoklis	Greek (EAL)
Anna	Greek
Mary	Greek
Hrusa	Greek
Marianthi	Greek
Christos	Greek (EAL)
Konstantinos	Greek
Odysseas	Greek
Stelios	Greek (EAL)
Nantia	Greek
Yiorgos	Greek (EAL)
Elli	Greek (EAL)
Stephano	Italian (EAL)
Kyriaki	Greek
Nikos	Greek
John	(American) English
Dimitris	Greek (EAL)
Kevin	Greek-(American) English

Rachel	(American) English
Miss Karavanta	Greek-English
Miss Charalampidou	Greek-English