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Abstract

Traditionally, language policy (LP) has been conceptualised as a notion separate from that of practice. That is, language practices have usually been studied with a view to evaluate the extent to which a LP is (or is not) implemented (e.g. Martin, 2005; Johnson, 2009). Recently, however, Spolsky (2004, 2007, 2008a) has argued that policy and practice need not be seen as distinct and that, in fact, there is policy in language practices themselves (I use the term ‘practiced language policy’). Therefore, Spolsky’s claim represents a decisive development in the field of LP research. However, this proposal remains essentially programmatic since Spolsky does not indicate how practiced language policies can be investigated. The aim of this thesis is to address this methodological gap. The main claim of the thesis is that Conversation Analysis (CA) – a method specifically developed to describe conversational practices – can be used to investigate practiced language policies. In order to support this claim, a case study has been conducted on the language practices of an induction classroom for newly-arrived immigrant children in France.

In the thesis, a broad view of CA is adopted, incorporating both sequential and categorisation analysis (Membership Categorisation Analysis). More specifically, I have used the conversation analytic approach to code-switching (as developed over the last few years by researchers such as Auer, 1984; Li Wei, 2002; Gafaranga, 2009; Bonacina and Gafaranga, 2010) and investigated a corpus of audio-recorded classroom interactions I collected in the above mentioned setting. Observation of these interactions revealed a number of “norms of interaction” (Hymes, 1972) the classroom participants orient to in order to go about the routine business of talking in an orderly fashion. For example, it was observed that each of the languages available can potentially be adopted as the “medium of classroom interaction” (Bonacina and Gafaranga, 2010) depending on who is doing being the language teacher. When no one is doing being the language teacher, it was observed, a key determinant of language choice is participants’ language preference. Finally, in the absence of any shared preferred language, French was adopted. The practiced language policy of this induction classroom consists of the set of such interactional norms. It is because CA can be used to discover and describe such interactional norms that this thesis claims it can be used to investigate practiced language policies in this induction classroom and in other settings as well.

In summary, this thesis is primarily a contribution to the field of LP research. It starts from recent proposals in the field, especially by Spolsky (2004, 2007, 2008a), that there is policy in practices and shows how this programmatically formulated proposal can be implemented. More specifically the thesis shows that and how CA can be used to discover a practiced language policy. The research reported here has adopted a case study methodology, investigating language choice practices in a multilingual educational setting. It therefore contributes to the study of bilingual classroom talk, albeit indirectly. This is particularly the case as there has been very few, if any, studies of bilingual classroom talk which combine both sequential and categorisation analysis.
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1.1. Introduction

Since its emergence as a research field, language policy has generated many studies, models and publications and has been conceptualised in various ways. The recent inauguration of a new academic journal (Language Policy) and the publication of several books all entitled Language Policy (Baker, 2002; Ricento, 2006; Shohamy, 2006a; Spolsky, 2004) indicate that this research field is flourishing. Among these recent developments, Spolsky (2004) probably offers the most comprehensive conceptualisation of language policy. According to him, language policy can be viewed as comprising three elements: language management (i.e. “direct efforts to manipulate a language situation”, Spolsky, 2004: 8), language beliefs or ideology (i.e. “what people think should be done”, Spolsky, 2004: 14) and language practices (i.e. “what people actually do”, Spolsky, 2004: 14). Furthermore, he argues that there is a language policy at each of these three levels and, since “language practices, beliefs and management are not necessarily congruent, [each] may reveal a different language policy” (Spolsky, 2004: 217). In this respect, Spolsky’s significant contribution is his claim that there is a policy in practices, which I propose to call a ‘practiced language policy’ (see also Bonacina 2008). However, this new conceptualisation of language policy remains essentially programmatic since Spolsky does not indicate how practiced language policies can be investigated. It is this methodological gap that I aim to address in this thesis. Indeed, my primary aim is to propose an approach to the investigation of practiced language policies. And my main claim is that a practiced language policy can be investigated using Conversation Analysis, a method specifically developed to describe conversational practices.
1.2. Language policy defined

Scholars frequently discuss what language policy deals with. For instance, in his *Introduction to Language Policy*, Ricento (2006c) lists the topics that fall under the purview of language policy (e.g. language shift, linguistic human rights, education of linguistic minorities etc.). Similarly, in their renowned models of language policy and planning, Kloss (1969) and Cooper (1989) state that language policy deals with the status of languages (which Kloss calls ‘status planning’, 1969: 81-83), their form (which Kloss calls ‘corpus planning’, 1969: 81-83) and their acquisition (which Spolsky and others call ‘language education policy’ or ‘language-in-education policy’; Spolsky, 2008a: 27). However, scholars often fail to explain their understanding of the notion of language policy itself. As Ball (1993: 10) notes, “more often than not analysts fail to define conceptually what they mean by policy”. To give an example, the term ‘language policy’ has often been related to that of ‘language planning’; both terms have been used either interchangeably, hand in hand (such as in the hyphenated “language planning-policy”, Tollefson, 1991: 17), or with one being a superordinate term subsuming the other (e.g. language policy subsuming language planning as in Ricento, 2000: 209). At other times, the two have been seen as different (e.g. Tollefson, 1991: 16). Thus, ‘language policy’ has been used to mean various things.

Admittedly, a few researchers have defined language policy. This is the case, for instance, with Tollefson, who defines it as “the institutionalisation of language as a basis for distinctions among social groups” (1991: 17). However, this definition is clearly intertwined with Tollefson’s own epistemological views. Being a strong advocate of a critical approach to the study of language policy, he assumes that language policies are affected by power relationships in wider society. In this sense, there exist as many definitions of language policy as there are approaches to language policy research. In other words, the concepts of language policy are “observer dependent” (Spolsky, 2004: 41). This is probably one of the reasons why, as many researchers have noted (Spolsky, 2004: ix; Ricento, 2006c: 10, Johnson, 2009: 139), there is no consensus about the theory and nature of language policy.
In the absence of a consensus on the definition of language policy, I propose my own working definition building on Spolsky’s (2004, 2007, 2008a) LP model. He writes the following:

“The theory I am exploring will hold that each of these three components [i.e. language management, language beliefs and language practices] within (and, as we shall see, others outside) the domain produces forces that account for language choices by participants” (Spolsky, 2007: 4).

In this thesis, I understand language policy as being what regulates speakers’ language choice and alternation acts.

1.3. Focus of the study

Although there is no consensus on the definition of language policy, scholars have conceptualised language policy in (one or all of) three different ways (for a critical review of the research literature on language policy see Chapter Two). Ball (1993) provides an important insight in this regard. He argues that one way in which language policy has been conceptualised is language policy as text (Ball, 1993: 10). This conceptualisation refers to the understanding that what influences language choice is a text; to be understood as an authoritative statement, either verbal or written, of what should be done. Examples of policy as text are constitutional clauses, laws, verbal declarations and so forth. From this perspective, textual analysis presents itself as a useful method.

A second way in which language policy has been conceptualised is as discourse (Ball, 1993: 10). Here, the notion of ‘discourse’ is to be understood in line with Foucault (1971) as being more than just language and speech and to refer to a set of beliefs and ideologies. As Ball puts it, discourse is “what can be said, and thought, but also about who can speak, when, where and with what authority” (1993: 14). Conceptualising policy as discourse means that what influences language choice acts as a set of beliefs and ideologies about what should be done. Scholars studying language policy as discourse (e.g. Pennycook, 2002) adopt various methods, including Critical Discourse Analysis.

The third and most recent addition to the above two – an addition we owe to Spolsky (2004) – is policy as practice (here after referred to as ‘practiced language
policy’). Spolsky’s claim must be understood in its proper context. Traditionally, policy and practice have been seen as distinct and often mismatching. A policy is or is not put into practice and policy and practice may or may not match. Spolsky rejects this view, claiming that the two need not be seen as distinct. Instead he claims that there is policy in practices. While, as indicated above, it is relatively easy to see what methods can be – and indeed have been – used to investigate language policy as text and as discourse, Spolsky does not indicate how a practiced language policy can be investigated. However, some of his statements seem to point towards what that methodology should be. For instance, he writes that there is a policy in language practices insofar as they are “regular and predictable” (Spolsky, 2007: 3) and that we can derive from them “a set of descriptive and explanatory rules that would somehow capture the idea that members of the community have of appropriate behaviour” (Spolsky and Shohamy, 2000: 29). One of the most robust methodologies for investigating the organisation of language practices currently available is Conversation Analysis. Therefore, my main claim is that Conversation Analysis can be used to investigate practiced language polices. This thesis is a demonstration, based on a case study, of this claim.

1.4. The case study
While this research could have been based in any institutional or non-institutional context, a combination of factors led me to base it in a specific sociolinguistic setting, namely an induction classroom for newly-arrived immigrant children in France. First of all, through previous research (Bonacina, 2005), I had developed a familiarity with bilingual classroom research and I wanted to build on this experience. Secondly, I made the hypothesis that language policy issues would be more salient in a bi/multilingual context. Induction classrooms for newly-arrived immigrant children thus presented an ideal research site since they are linguistically heterogeneous contexts. Thirdly, as I was born and grew up in France, I thought my familiarity with French society and the French education system would help in data collection and interpretation. Lastly, I anticipated that, since France is well-known
for having an explicit French monolingual language policy (policy as text) and a long-lasting monolingual ideology (policy as discourse), it would be possible to investigate the practiced language policy in the specific sociolinguistic context against the backdrop of these other two.

The main research question that I pursue in this case study is: ‘what is the practiced language-in-education policy of the target induction classroom?’ I aim to address this question using Conversation Analysis – a method developed independently in order to investigate language use as social practice (e.g. Sacks, 1992a, 1992b; Schegloff, 2007a) – in order to demonstrate that it is the most suitable approach for the investigation of practiced language policies. More specifically, given that induction classrooms are multilingual educational contexts, I adopt a Conversation Analytic approach to bilingual talk, which has been developed over the last few years by researchers such as Auer (1984), Li Wei (2002), Gafaranga (2009) and Bonacina and Gafaranga (2010).

At this point, it is important to emphasise that the aim of this case study is not to provide a full account of the language-in-education policy in France’s induction classrooms or in the target classroom. Rather, the aim is to develop and illustrate the claim that Conversation Analysis is the most appropriate approach to the study of practiced language policies. As a result, the case study focuses on a specific aspect of the language-in-education policy of the target classroom, namely, the practiced language-in-education policy. In this sense, language choice and alternation acts are analysed not with a view to evaluating the implementation of language policy as text or as discourse (as is the case in most studies of language policy that focus on the mismatch between ‘policy’ and ‘practice’) but rather with a view to identifying the underlying practiced language policy.

1.5. Outline of thesis
This thesis is divided into nine chapters. In the next chapter, I review the phases of development of language policy research. This review highlights the need for a methodology to investigate practiced language policies and suggests Conversation
Analysis as a potential candidate approach. Chapter Three introduces the sociological, political and linguistic context of the case study; describing the French monolingual language policy in general and in education in particular; the educational programmes for newly-arrived children and more particularly the functioning of induction classrooms at primary level; and the specific induction classroom I studied. In Chapter Four, I present the theoretical framework I draw upon in the analysis of the language choice and alternation practices observed in the target classroom. In Chapter Five, I give an account of the methods I used to collect a corpus of classroom interaction.

After these background chapters, I present the practiced language-in-education policy of the induction classroom under study. In Chapter Six, I describe the different language choice and alternation practices observed in the corpus of classroom interaction. More specifically, I identify the different “medium(s)\(^1\) of classroom interaction” (Bonacina, 2005; Bonacina and Gafaranga, 2010) used in classroom talk, as well as the different types of language alternation practices.

In Chapter Seven, I move on to accounting for the practiced language-in-education policy of the target classroom. In this chapter, I focus on language choice practices and aim to identify the “deducible and implicit rules” (Spolsky and Shohamy, 2000: 2) oriented to by the classroom participants in their language choice acts. Drawing on a broad view of Conversation Analysis that incorporates both sequential and categorisation analysis (Membership Categorisation Analysis), I argue that the mediums of classroom interaction can be accounted for with reference to whoever is ‘doing being the language teacher’. I also show that when no-one is making membership to what I propose to call ‘teacher-hood’, the classroom participants orient to each other’s language preference when interpreting and engaging in their language choice acts.

In Chapter Eight, I focus on language alternation practices and aim to identify the “deducible and implicit rules” (Spolsky and Shohamy, 2000: 2) oriented to by the classroom participants in their language alternation acts. I focus especially on the most salient type of language alternation practices, namely, what I

\(^1\) For the plural of ‘medium’, I choose to use the English plural form ‘mediums’ rather than the accurate yet less frequent form ‘media’.
propose to call *licensed* language alternation practices. Drawing on Schegloff’s (2007a) framework of sequence organisation, I show three examples of interactional sequences in which language alternation is licensed – namely, word searches, meaning quests and multilingual label quests.

Finally, in Chapter Nine, I draw the thesis to a conclusion, summarising the key findings of the case study, the implications and limitations of the proposed Conversation Analytic approach to the study of practiced language policies, and suggesting avenues for future research.
2.1. Introduction

Language policy emerged as a research field in the 1960s and has since interested a wide range of researchers including sociolinguists, political scientists, educationalists and educational linguists. As I discussed in Chapter One (§1.2), language policy research has engaged with a wide range of issues and the notion itself has been defined in various ways. It has been associated with that of language planning in the expression ‘language policy and planning’ or the expression ‘language planning and policy’ (both abbreviated as LPP), and later on with the notion of language practice in the expression ‘language policy and practice’ (unfortunately also abbreviated as LPP). However, it is not the aim of this chapter to provide an overarching theory of language policy (LP)\(^2\). Rather, this chapter provides a critical reading of the LP research literature, building on the existing reviews found in Hornberger (2006), Hornberger and Johnson (2007), Johnson (2009, 2010), Ricento (2000, 2006a), Ricento and Hornberger (1996), and Tollefson (1991, 2002a, 2008). It reviews (more or less chronologically) the different research focuses\(^3\) that emerged in the development of LP research and its subfield, language-in-education policy (LIEP) research, along with the three conceptualisations of language policy (i.e. language policy as text, as discourse and as practice) and their respective approaches. Ultimately, the aim of this chapter is to reveal a methodological gap in the LP literature and to propose a relevant approach.

\(^2\) To overcome any confusion, I will talk in terms of language policy research and use the simpler abbreviation LP.

\(^3\) For the plural of ‘focus’, I choose to use the English plural form ‘focuses’ rather than the accurate yet less frequent form ‘foci’.
Four central focuses emerge in the research literature on LP, namely language planning models (§2.2), ideologies, power and inequality (§2.3), agency (§2.4), and language practices (§2.5). I review each of these focuses in separate sections, where I also present in more detail the reasons for these shifts of focus, the conceptualisation of language policy entailed, the research approaches adopted, and some representative work.

2.2. A focus on language planning models
The first studies of language policy emerged in the 1960s with a view to reporting, and eventually guiding, the planning of languages co-present in post-colonial countries. Indeed, the use of the umbrella notion of ‘language policy and planning’ (LPP) attests to the close association between language policy and language planning. In fact, scholars focused on language planning processes, conceptualising language policy as text; that is, as a (verbal or written) statement that informs language planning processes.

2.2.1. Language planning in the “new developing nations”
The first LP studies were primarily concerned with language planning issues arising in post-colonial countries, or what Fishman called the “new developing nations” (1968: 491). Scholars focused on the macro-processes of language planning, developing a number of language planning models with a view to providing cost-effective methods and strategies to plan languages. In this regard, language planning was understood to be “the authoritative allocation of resources to language” (Fishman, 1979a: 11) and “the organised pursuit of solutions to language problems, typically at the national level” (Fishman, 1974a: 79). And language policy usually referred to a (verbal or written) statement that informed language planning processes. Language planning activities involved “corpus planning”, “status planning” (Kloss, 1969: 81-83) and “acquisition planning” (Cooper, 1989: 33) or what Spolsky (2008a: 27) and others call “language education policy”. Corpus planning refers to the development of a language variety and the
determination of the linguistic characteristics of this language variety. It includes questions concerning the adequate pronunciation, syntactic structures and morphological forms, as well as strategies to expand the existing vocabulary (Trudgill, 2003: 29). Status planning refers to the selection of functions for particular language varieties. One important status planning issue is the selection of an official language for an institution or a state (Trudgill, 2003: 128-9). Language education policy refers to who should learn what language varieties (Spolsky, 2008a: 27). As Cooper notes, “the planning of language instruction accounts for the lion’s share of acquisition planning” (1989: 160). Status and corpus planning are usually envisaged together, insofar as a language variety may not have the structures to deal with its allocated functions. As Fishman notes, “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” (1979a: 12). Language education policy is also closely linked with status and corpus planning (Spolsky, 2008a: 27). For instance, a language that has been given an official status (status planning) will most likely be used as a medium of instruction in schools (language in education) and will thus need to have appropriate terminologies (corpus planning).

In the literature itself, this first approach to LP research is usually referred to as “the traditional approach” (e.g. Ricento, 2006c: 12; Tollefson, 2002b: 5, 2008: 3). It is also sometimes called the “neoclassical approach” (e.g. Tollefson, 1991: 35; Hornberger and Johnson, 2007: 510), the “classical approach” (e.g. Ricento, 2000: 206) or the “positivist approach” (e.g. Ricento and Hornberger, 1996: 405).

**2.2.2. A traditional approach to LP and LIEP research**

A traditional approach to LP and LIEP research was influenced by the ideology of ‘one-language-one-nation’. According to this, monolingualism guarantees unity and monolingualism in a western language guarantees modernisation. From this perspective, the goal of language planning was one of unifying, modernising, and subsequently, westernising emerging nation-states. This ideology was linked to the belief that language diversity is a problem – that is, a threat to the unity of nations.
and an obstacle to modernisation that states have to solve through planning (Mühläusler, 1996: 311; Ricento, 2000: 198; Ricento and Hornberger, 1996: 405). This belief is salient, for instance, in a key volume of studies conducted in the traditional approach entitled *Language Problems of Developing Nations* (Fishman, Ferguson and Das Guptas, 1968). It is also found in Neustupný’s (1970) paper, in which careful correspondences between a language problem and a stage of language planning are provided. In short, language policy and planning was first conceptualised as a problem-solving activity (Cooper, 1989: 34; Ricento, 2000: 206); ‘language policy’ was the proposed solution to a language problem and ‘language planning’ the process involved to implement that solution.

In this sense, language planning was approached in the same way as any other kind of planning, or as Fishman puts it, as any “other-than-language planning” (1974a: 81). Researchers were influenced by economic planning – and particularly by modernisation and development theory (Rostow, 1960). Tollefson (2008: 4) argues that three key assumptions of modernisation and development theory are found in the traditional approach to LP research. These are the assumptions that language policy and planning benefits ethnolinguistic minorities, that language planning should be carried out by technical experts and that the nation-state should be the focus of the research. Indeed, most of the early LP scholars assumed that language policy and planning was a neutral process, scientifically designed by experts for the modernisation – and therefore the benefit – of ethno-linguistic minorities, and that it ought to be studied at the macro-level.

### 2.2.3. Macro-level studies

In the traditional approach to LP and LIPE, language policy and planning was understood essentially to be a top-down process and was thus studied at the macro-level. Researchers provided empirical and descriptive accounts of language policy and planning processes in various emerging nation-states (for representative examples see the volumes edited by Fishman, Ferguson and Das Guptas, 1968; Rubin and Jernudd, 1971). They also designed various typologies of language and language planning models (e.g. Kloss, 1966, 1968; Fishman, 1968). For instance,
Fishman (1968) proposed a typology of nations, identifying language planning problems and solutions for each nation type. When discussing the “new developing nations” (1968: 491) such as those in Sub-Saharan Africa, he suggests that they should use regional and local languages only for transitional and short-term purposes, until they acquire a “foreign tongue” for a successful transition into modernity (Fishman, 1968: 492). However, he states that the “old developing nations” (1968: 493) such as the ones found in North Africa and South-East Asia, should adopt a westernised language for transitional purposes and use subsequently a modernised and simplified local or regional language (1968: 494).

Although most of the studies conducted within a traditional approach dealt with issues of national language planning, researchers soon started to investigate LIET issues, since, as Tollefson pertinently notes, “corpus-planning issues such as language standardisation and script reform necessarily involve educational institutions” (2008: 4). A collection of studies edited by Spolsky (1972) on the language education of minority children illustrates this growing interest in LIET research. Another example is Fishman’s interest in bilingual education programmes, which, he argues, are one of the major instances of language planning (1979a: 11).

### 2.2.4. The work of Rubin, Haugen, Ferguson and Fishman

Within the traditional approach to LP and LIET research, some scholars devised models of language policy and planning; the most influential being Rubin (e.g. 1971), Haugen (e.g. 1966a, 1966b, 1983), Ferguson (e.g. 1968), and Fishman (e.g. 1968, 1979a, 1974a and 1974b).

Haugen (1966a, 1966b) offers a four-fold model of language planning, divided into the following sections: ‘selection of norm’, ‘codification of norm’, ‘implementation of function’ and ‘elaboration of function’. In a later publication, Haugen (1983) proposes a revised version of this model, taking into account Rubin’s (1971) notion of “evaluation” in language planning and Kloss’s (1969) distinction of status and corpus planning.

Also noteworthy is Fishman’s (1979a) model, which takes the form of a flow-chart that summarises the contributions of his predecessors. Fishman identifies
six common stages to status planning and corpus planning processes. To take the example of status planning, the first stage is “decision making” (1979a: 13), carrying out the negotiations on a “model of the good language” (1979a: 19). The second is “codification” (1979a: 14), the third, “elaboration” (1979a: 14) and the fourth, “implementation”, which Fishman describes as “the authoritative allocation of resources” (1979a: 15). The fifth stage is that of “evaluation” (1979a: 17) and the sixth is that of “iteration” (1979a: 18), which corresponds to a return to the decision-making process, while taking into consideration findings from the evaluation. Language policy and planning processes are thus understood here to be cyclical.

These two models of language planning have formed the basis for many studies and for further elaboration. As I have already described, Cooper (1989: 33), for instance, adds the notion of “acquisition planning” to the notions of status and corpus planning. Other examples of development are Hornberger’s (1994, 2006) and Ricento and Hornberger’s (1996) integrative framework of LPP processes where Haugen’s (1983) fourfold matrix model is combined with Cooper’s (1989: 33) notion of ‘acquisition planning’.

2.3. A focus on ideology and discourses of power and inequality

Confronted with the mismatch between LP models and their implementations, as well as with the failure of new nations to ‘modernise’, LP scholars shifted their research focus from devising models to unravelling ideologies and discourses at play in language policy and planning processes. During the 1990s, the traditional approach to LP research was superseded by what is commonly referred to as the ‘critical approach’ to LP. In this section, I present this second stage in the development of LP research, reviewing the limits of the traditional approach (§2.3.1), presenting the critical approach to LP and the conceptualisation of language policy involved (§2.3.2), as well as the two strands of studies conducted within this perspective, namely macro-discourse studies (§2.3.3) and micro-discourse studies (§2.3.4).
2.3.1. Limits of the traditional approach

From the 1980s onwards, LP researchers moved away from the initial focus on language planning as they came to realise that developing nations had failed to modernise despite elaborate language planning models and strategies. In fact, LP researchers increasingly claimed that language planning was in great part responsible for preventing developing nations from modernising. For example, Tollefson criticises traditional LP scholars’ “optimistic belief” (2008: 4) that language policy and planning enhances the economic and political mobility of ethno-linguistic minorities by giving them access to a dominant language. On the contrary, he argues that language planning processes have allocated more resources to dominant languages in order to retain economic and political power in the hands of dominant countries (e.g. Tollefson, 1991). In brief, Tollefson (e.g. 1991 and 2008) along with other scholars (e.g. Ricento and Hornberger, 1996: 405) criticised the view held within the traditional approach to LP that language policy and planning was an apolitical and ideologically neutral process. These writers showed that language policy and planning processes were indeed highly political and ideological.

A second criticism made of early LP studies was that researchers assumed that a simple and straightforward relationship existed between the processes of language policy and planning and their outcomes, overlooking the complex socio-political systems and colonial history of the nation-states under study (Tollefson, 2008: 4; Ricento, 2000: 201). Furthermore, Pennycook (2002) argued that discourses play a key role in shaping the form and use of language varieties.

Lastly, the ideology of one-language-one-nation that underpinned language planning in the traditional approach became increasingly irrelevant as the increase in migration meant that nation-states could no longer be envisaged as linguistically and ethnically homogenous. Furthermore, the very act of planning language became questionable. Rubin and Jernudd had already raised the question within a traditional approach to LP in an edited volume aptly entitled Can Language Be Planned? (1971). Then, LP scholars gradually moved away from an understanding of
language as a defined and bounded code to conceptualise it as having “multiple and numerous discourses, functions, and statuses” (Ricento, 2006b: 4). As a result, early language planning attempts to establish diglossia between majority and minority languages were criticised for being based on a fictive demarcation between majority and minority languages (e.g. May, 2006: 257). Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that the contribution of LP studies conducted within a traditional approach was (and is still) very much acknowledged. In this respect, Tollefson writes that “the major achievement of early LPP research was an understanding of the relationship between language structure and language function on the one hand, and various forms of social organisation (ethnic groups, nation-states) on the other” (2008: 5).

In short, the focus of LP studies shifted from devising typologies and models of language planning to investigating the influences of ideology and power in language policy and planning processes and the role of these processes in perpetuating social inequality. This shift was initiated mainly by Tollefson (1986, 1991), Luke, McHoul and Mey (1990) and Wolfson and Manes (1985). It gave rise to what is known both as the “critical perspective” on LP research (e.g. Hornberger and Johnson, 2007: 509; Ricento, 2000: 202; Ricento and Hornberger, 1996: 406; Tollefson, 2002b: 3) and “critical language policy” (e.g. Tollefson, 2006b: 44; Johnson, 2009: 140; Johnson, 2010: 62).

### 2.3.2. A critical approach to LP and LIEP research

As Tollefson explains (2002b: 4-5; 2006b: 42-44), an approach to LP and LIEP is said to be ‘critical’ for three reasons: firstly, because it challenges traditional approaches to LP research; secondly, because it is aimed at social change (and especially, at reducing social inequality); and thirdly, because it is influenced by critical social theory (e.g. Bourdieu, 1991; Foucault, 1972; Habermas, 1979, 1985 etc.). Scholars adopting a critical perspective to LP research include Tollefson (e.g. 1991, 2002c), Pennycook (e.g. 1989), Ricento (e.g. 1995, 2006a), Sonntag (1995), Street (1984) and Wiley (e.g. 1996, 2002). LP research conducted within this approach focuses on the connections between language policy and notions of power, ideology and inequality. These three focuses are developed hereafter.
One focus of critical LP research is to investigate the role that language policy could be said to play in maintaining unequal power relationships between majority and minority language groups (e.g. Tollefson, 1991: 11). Power, which Tollefson defines as “the ability to control events in order to achieve one’s aims” (2006b: 46), is seen as underlying all language policies. Language policy is thus conceptualised as a “mechanism for locating language within social structure so that language determines who has access to political power and economic resources” (Tollefson, 1991: 17).

A second focus of critical LP research is the investigation of the ideologies that underlie language policies. As Ricento and Hornberger explain, critical LP research is grounded in the assumption that “all language policies are ideological, although the ideology may not be apparent or acknowledged by practitioners or theorists” (1996: 406). Here, the notion of ‘ideology’ is understood from the perspective of critical social theory and refers to “implicit or unstated (‘common sense’) notions about the nature of language and communication that position individuals and groups within a social order” (Tollefson, 2008: 5). Recently, Johnson has acknowledged that “critical language policy scholarship has helped illuminate ideologies enmeshed in language policies” (2010: 62).

A third focus of critical LP research is the role that language policy plays in structuring and sustaining unequal social and economic relationships (Tollefson, 1991: 8). Tollefson (1991: 2) argues that “the mechanism of language policy arbitrarily gives importance to language in the organisation of human societies” and that policy-makers usually support the interests of dominant groups (2006b: 42). Therefore, another aim of critical LP research consists of unravelling the multiple ways in which language policies are connected to social inequalities in order to develop more democratic language policies and subsequently contribute towards social justice (e.g. Freeman, 1998; Hornberger, 1998). In this sense, most scholars working within a critical perspective on LP are influenced by the language rights movement (see especially Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson, 1994), which claims that speakers of minority and indigenous languages should be given the institutional protection and support that already help speakers of majority languages. Critical LP
scholars argue that language policies usually flout the language rights of ethnolinguistic minority groups in order to maintain the language – and by implication the power – of the dominant group. As a result, they propose a “human-rights-oriented language policy” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2008: 107). Hornberger aptly describes this new focus as being a result of a shift from an ideology of “language-as-problem” (e.g. Rubin, 1971) – which underlined the traditional approach to LP – to an ideology of “language-as-right” (2002: 32).

Critical LP researchers have conducted a vast number of studies on language-in-education policies. Representative examples are Corson (e.g. 1999), Donahue (2002), and Sook and Norton (2002); the latter two are part of a volume aptly entitled Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues (Tollefson, 2002a). These studies address questions such as: “how do language policies in schools create inequalities among learners? How do policies marginalise some students while granting privilege to others? How do language policies in education help to create, sustain, or reduce political conflict among different ethnolinguistic groups?” (Tollefson, 2002b: 3 and 13-4). Most of them aim to unravel the ideologies that underlie language-in-education policies (e.g. Lippi-Green, 1997; Moore, 1996; Wiley, 1996). Such ideologies include the standard language ideology (i.e. the belief that the use of non-standard varieties in education prevents the acquisition of a standard variety) and the monolingual approach to education (i.e. the belief that the use of a language other than the target language prevents language or subject-matter learning) (for a full discussion see Tollefson, 2008: 6-9). Wiley (1996), for example, successfully unravels the ways in which English-only and standard-English ideologies influenced language-in-education policies in the US. Language rights issues have also been addressed in critical LIEP studies (e.g. Phillipson, 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2008; Wiley, 2002). For instance, Skutnabb-Kangas argues that examples of the violation of linguistic human rights are usually found in educational contexts in which children are being denied the right to mother-tongue medium education (2008: 109). Clearly then, critical LP and LIEP scholars have conceptualised language policy as discourse. In this vein, they have conducted macro- and micro-discourse studies of LP and LIEP.
2.3.3. **Macro-discourse studies: the work of Tollefson**

Within a critical perspective to LP and LIEP, most scholars conduct critical discourse analysis at the macro-level of a state or an institution. An important body of critical LP research that focuses on what is usually referred to as ‘macro-discourses’ has been carried out by Tollefson, using what he calls the ‘historical-structural approach’ (1991, 2002b, 2002c, 2006a, and 2008). Two key tenets of the historical-structural approach to LP are that wider historical and societal forces are at play in language policies and that language policies are created at the level of the state, which uses them to maintain the power of dominant language groups (Tollefson, 1991: 10). Therefore, Tollefson focuses exclusively on the discourses at the macro-level of the state, international organisations and multinational corporations. For example, in his LIEP study in Slovenia, he (2002c) examines how a shift of ideology from linguistic pluralism to Serbian centralism encouraged Slovenia to seek independence from Serbia in order to preserve its ethnolinguistic capital. The historical-structural approach has largely influenced critical LP research and has been taken up by other critical scholars such as May (2006), McCarty (2004), and Street (1993). May’s (2006) study is a good example as he stresses the need to explore the “historical antecedents” (2006: 268) that shaped language policies, as well as our categorisation of languages into the minority/majority dichotomy.

2.3.4. **Micro-discourse studies: the work of Pennycook**

While Tollefson has approached LP research by focusing on the study of discourses at the macro-level of the state, Pennycook has explored the study of discourses at the micro-level of a local context. Among other things, he has published detailed analyses of micro-discursive practices in Hong Kong (e.g. 2002). Influenced by postmodern theory, Pennycook has proposed investigating LP as processes of governance. He explains Foucault’s (1991) notion of ‘governmentality’ as the ways in which “power operates at the micro-level of diverse practices, rather than in the macro-regulations of the state” (Pennycook, 2006: 64; see also 2002: 92).
Importantly, by investigating “how governance is achieved through language” (2006: 64), Pennycook shifts attention from the macro-level of the state to the micro-level of actual practices of governance. Indeed, he states that his main focus is “on the multiplicity of ways in which practices of governance may be realised” (2006: 65).

In brief, critical LP researchers have moved away from devising typologies and models of language policy, instead turning towards investigating the ideologies and discourses of power and inequality at play in language policies. To use Ball’s (1993) words, critical LP researchers have conceptualised language policy as discourse; that is, as being a set of beliefs and ideologies that influence language choice and alternation acts (see also §1.3 for a definition of language policy as discourse). In this regard, they have mainly conducted critical discourse analyses at either a macro-level (e.g. Tollefson 1991, 2002c) or a micro-level (e.g. Pennycook, 2002, 2006).

2.4. A focus on agency

Increasingly, strong reservations have been expressed towards critical LP researchers for adopting the hegemonic view that ideologies and discourses regulate the form and use of language varieties. From this criticism emerged a new focus on ‘agency’ in LP research. In this third phase of development, researchers still conceptualise language policy as text and discourse. However, they focus on speakers’ agency in challenging these texts and discourses. In what follows, I consider the limits of a critical approach to LP research (§2.4.1), the new focus on agency (§2.4.2), and the resulting anthropological and sociological approach to LP and LIEP research (§2.4.3), before closing with a discussion of the important work of Ricento, Hornberger and Johnson (§2.4.4).
2.4.1. Limits of the critical approach

In the research literature on LP, two criticisms are regularly raised against LP studies that focus on ideologies and discourses of power and inequality (e.g. Johnson, 2009, 2010; Hornberger and Johnson, 2007; Ricento and Hornberger, 1996 for full reviews of the limits of critical LP studies). The first criticism is that critical LP researchers overemphasise the importance of the state or other supranational organisations in LP processes while, in fact, state actors and other heads of supranational organisations are rarely involved in language policy (Ricento and Hornberger, 1996: 413). The second criticism targets researchers’ deterministic view of language policy and the fact that they overlook the power of human agency (e.g. Hornberger and Johnson, 2007: 510). For instance, Bowe and Ball (1992) refer to this view of LP as the “state control model”. Similarly, Ricento and Hornberger note that, in studies where LP is conceptualised as ideology and discourse, it looks as if “individuals are not free to choose the language(s) that they will be educated in or be able to use in specific domains, as all choices are constrained by systems that reinforce and reproduce the existing social order” (1996: 407). Johnson (2009) summarises this criticism in these terms:

“Critical language policy approaches have enriched our conceptualisation of language policy but by focusing primarily on the power invested in policy, they obfuscate agency and perpetuate the reification of policy as necessarily monolithic, intentional, and fascistic. Besides the acknowledgment that CLP [Critical Language Policy] should promote more democratic policies, there is not much room in these frameworks for local practices which challenge dominant discourses, engender alternative discourses and radical practices, and potentially effect social change” (2009: 155).

Interestingly, Tollefson had foreseen this criticism, stating that his historical-structural model could not explain individuality in language policy and planning processes – as it was not designed for that specific purpose (1991: 35-6). In trying to address this gap, some LP researchers have focused on speakers’ agency in language policy and planning processes.

2.4.2. Agency and language policy

To counteract an earlier focus on ideologies and discourses of power and inequality in language policy and planning processes, LP researchers began to focus on
agency, which was understood as “the role(s) of individuals and collectivities in the processes of language use, attitudes, and ultimately policies” (Ricento, 2000: 208). The main line of argument is that, during the implementation process of a language policy (also referred to as ‘appropriation process’), speakers have the choice to follow, change or challenge top-down policies.

This focus on agency in LP research is often attributed to a shift from materialistic to post-materialistic positions. McGroaty describes this as a loss of confidence in governmental institutions, a loss of willingness to accept elite authority, and a growing disposition to engage in political processes (2002: 21). However, it should be pointed out that speakers’ agency in LP processes had already been acknowledged by Fishman (1979a), who wrote:

“Having learned about the sociology of language in general and about language planning in particular teachers should be readier than heretofore to join with each other and with other community members to more effectively engage in language planning both in the status-planning and in the corpus-planning realms. Teachers in private and ethnic community schools […] can hope thereby to become more useful leaders on behalf of their languages, schools, communities and on behalf of the revision of bilingual education as a whole” (Fishman, 1979a: 22, my emphasis).

This extract clearly indicates that Fishman already viewed teachers as actors in the policy process (or planning in this case) at the local level of a school. It also shows that teachers’ agency was viewed as being used in favour of “their languages”. In fact, the notion of agency has very much been linked with the concepts of ‘language shift’ and ‘language revitalisation’ (e.g. Fishman, 2006). Often, agency is seen as a way to resist language policies that threaten indigenous or minority languages. In this regard, Hornberger (2002) proposes the notions of “implementational spaces” and “ideological spaces” to refer to the interstices, in policy texts and discourses, where agency can be exerted for the support of indigenous and minority languages. These notions have subsequently been used in studies focusing on agency and LP (e.g. Freeman, 2004; Hornberger, 2005; Hornberger and Johnson, 2007; Johnson, 2010). Furthermore, the notion of agency is also linked to the ideology that linguistic diversity is an asset (e.g. Mühläusler, 1996: 311). In short, LP researchers argue that speakers use their agency in language policy and planning processes to protect or revitalise their languages,
which are perceived as valuable resources. LP research has thus shifted from an ideology of language-as-problem underlying traditional approaches to an ideology of language-as-right underlying critical approaches; and, lastly, to an ideology of language-as-resource (Hornberger, 2002: 32).

Studies that focus on agency are mostly found in LIEP research (e.g. Ramanathan, 2005 and Stritikus, 2002). Scholars argue that classroom participants are not “afterthought[s] who implement what ‘experts in the government’ have already decided” (Ricento and Hornberger, 1996: 417) or “unwitting reproduce[s] of social reality” (Ricento and Hornberger, 1996: 418). On the contrary, they are policy-makers, insofar as they are agents in the implementation of (or resistance to) school language policies (e.g. Ricento and Hornberger, 1996: 417; Skilton-Sylvester, 2003: 170). As Johnson (2010) puts it: “educators make choices – they are not helplessly caught in the ebb and flow of language policies, no matter how strong policy ‘discourses’ might be” (2010: 76). Their agency can be seen in the way(s) they try to maintain endangered local languages. Although the idea that teachers can reverse language shift and maintain endangered languages seems somehow paradoxical – insofar as educational institutions have traditionally been used to impose monolingualism in dominant languages (see Spolsky, 2008b for a detailed discussion) – LIEP researchers claim that schools are a key site in which indigenous languages may be saved (e.g. Hornberger, 2008).

2.4.3. An anthropological and sociological approach to LP and LIEP research

This new focus on agency has led LP scholars to adopt an anthropological and sociological approach to language policy. Within this approach, LP scholars have conducted ethnographic studies in local contexts – and especially institutional contexts such as schools – to investigate “varying local interpretations, implementations and perhaps resistance” (Hornberger and Johnson, 2007: 510); in other words, to investigate agency. Proponents of this approach include Canagarajah (2006), Johnson (2009), Ramanathan (2005) and Stritikus and Wiese (2006). Significant LIEP studies conducted within this perspective are Ramanathan
Skilton-Sylvester’s (2003) study of primary-school teachers in the United States is a good example. She shows examples of teacher-policymakers who support and value the use of Khmer in their classroom, despite surrounding English monolingual ideologies and policies. In this regard, she argues that “much of language teaching can also be seen as language policymaking” (2003: 174). Her study also testifies to the influence of the language maintenance paradigm and the ideology of language-as-resource, which are typical of an anthropological and sociological approach to LP research. Indeed, she argues that, although the classes under study did not include instruction in the heritage language (i.e. Khmer), teachers were able to support additive bilingualism in classrooms by valuing children’s first languages (2003: 173). Also noteworthy is that Skilton-Sylvester’s stated aim is to explore the relationship between teachers’ ideologies and policies at the micro-level with ideologies and policies held at the macro-level of the school and society (2003: 170). In this vein, many LP and LIEP studies conducted within a sociological and anthropological perspective attempt to articulate agency within macro-level discourses in order to avoid the pitfall of considering exclusively one aspect of language policy, that is, either the state’s power to impose language policies or the educators’ power to (re)interpret these policies. As Johnson puts it, “the sociological and anthropological work on educational policy attempts to strike a balance between critical analyses of policy power and educator agency” (2009: 143). A convincing illustration of this balance is Ball’s attempts to study LIEP by looking at agency in relation to “the big picture” (1993: 14), that is, “within a moving discursive frame which articulates and constrains the possibilities and probabilities of interpretation and enactment” (1993: 15). Similarly, taken together, the work of Ricento, Hornberger and Johnson proposes a method in the realm of the anthropological and sociological approach to investigate connections between macro and micro discourses at play in language policy.
2.4.4. The work of Ricento, Hornberger and Johnson

Following Ricento’s (2000: 208) call for a conceptual framework that would link the macro and micro levels of LP, Ricento, Hornberger and Johnson have proposed the ‘ethnography of language policy’ in a series of single- and co-authored publications (see especially Hornberger and Johnson, 2007; Johnson, 2009, 2010; Ricento and Hornberger, 1996). The ‘ethnography of language policy’ aims to investigate language policy interpretation and appropriation, by linking macro and micro analysis and combining critical discourse analysis with an ethnography of a local context or institution (Johnson, 2009: 140). As a result, for the most part, these studies use interviews and surveys. For instance, in his study of bilingual education language policy in the school district of Philadelphia (US), Johnson (2010) investigates how a group of educators uses a space left in the current LP for bilingual developmental education to create their own local language policy. To do so, he conducts a critical discourse analysis of policy texts at the local, federal and national levels (2010: 64), and of the educators’ discourses that he collected during interviews (2010: 72-3).

In this sense, Johnson defines the purview of the ethnography of language policy as including “both critical analyses of local, state, and national policy texts and discourses as well as data collection on how such policy texts and discourses are interpreted and appropriated by agents in a local context” (2009: 142, my emphasis). This quotation indicates that, in this approach, language policy is still conceptualised as text and discourse. As he puts it, language policy is “an interconnected process generated and negotiated through policy texts and discourse” (Johnson, 2009: 156, my emphasis). In brief, Ricento, Hornberger and Johnson view texts, discourses and agency as being an interconnected part of a whole, which they refer to as the “LPP [language policy and planning] onion” (Ricento and Hornberger, 1996: 402). They argue that implicit and overt discourses should be investigated at each layer of the ‘LPP onion’ insofar as “each context – federal, state, district, school, classroom etc. – carries its own set of dominant and alternative discourses about language education and language policy” (Johnson, 2009: 154).
2.5. **A focus on language practices**

So far, I have shown that LP scholars focused first on the macro-processes of language policy and planning (the traditional approach). They then turned to consider the ideologies and discourses at play, both at the macro- and the micro-level of a local context (the critical approach). Thirdly they began to explore speakers’ agency (the anthropological and sociological approach). I now turn to the fourth and most recent focus in LP research, namely *actual language practices*. In what follows, I present a shift of focus – from discursive practices to language practices (§2.5.1.). Next, I discuss the inter-disciplinary perspective within which this shift takes place (§2.5.2.). After that, I examine the emergence of two strands of LP research that focus on language practices and show how they entail different conceptualisations of LP (§2.5.3 and §2.5.4.). Lastly, I emphasise the lack of a research method in the second strand of research and propose a relevant approach (§2.5.5).

### 2.5.1. A shift of focus to language practices

The precursors to a shift of focus towards language practices are observable in those LP studies in which researchers testify to an interest towards actual language use, without yet studying language practices. This is the case, for instance, in Skilton-Sylvester’s (2003) study discussed above (see section §2.4.3). Here, the author demonstrates an interest in the study of language choice practices in a classroom context in the United States. More specifically, she claims to be interested in whether Cambodian pupils use Khmer in their English medium classrooms; and, if Cambodian is used, how and why (2003: 174). However, in her paper, she does not give any examples of actual classroom talk. Instead, she discusses teachers’ *discourses* about L1 use in the classroom. Similarly, in his study of language-in-education policies in the Catalan language area, Vila i Moreno (2008) acknowledges the need to study classroom language practices in order to evaluate the impact of recent language policies. However, he considers the study of actual classroom talk to be beyond the purview of his field. Rather than conducting his
own research of language use in classrooms in the Catalan language area, he simply refers to existing studies (Vila i Moreno, 2008: 42).

Interestingly, other LP researchers have crossed this line and started to include the study of actual language practices (e.g. Martin, 2005). Indeed, a new focus on language practices emerged in LP, and especially LIEP, research. This new focus has resulted in a convergence between the field of LP research and that of code-switching research. Although this is not the place to review the literature on code-switching research (for a review see Chapter Four), it should be noted that studies of language choice and alternation phenomena have also taken into account the LP of the context under investigation. For example, Lin (1996) has produced a study of classroom interaction, collected in an English-medium classroom in Hong Kong. She shows that the classroom participants’ language choice strategies are a pragmatic response to the English-only policy of the school. In short, researchers interested in language policy issues and language choice issues now meet at the intersection of policy and practice in studies that claim to investigate ‘language policy and practice’ (LPP) (e.g. Lin and Martin, 2005; Muthwii, 2002; Nunan, 2003). Consequently, the traditional notion of ‘language policy and planning’ (LPP) is now superseded by the notion of ‘language policy and practice’ (LPP). Martin aptly summarises this shift in these words:

“‘Top-down’ approaches, focusing on policy and planning decisions, have been brought together with ‘bottom-up’ accounts of what is actually happening at the classroom level.” (2005: 74).

This new focus on language practices is taken up in two different ways, which are detailed in the later sections of this chapter (§2.5.3 and §2.5.4.). For the moment, I will turn to the inter-disciplinary perspective on LP and LIEP research, in which this new focus has emerged.

---

4 As I indicated at the start of this chapter, because of the ambivalence of the abbreviation LPP (which could refer to either ‘language policy and planning’ or ‘language policy and practice’), I use the more neutral and general term ‘language policy’ research (LP).
2.5.2. An inter-disciplinary approach to LP and LIEP research

Increasingly, LP scholars have conducted inter-disciplinary research. Indeed, in order to address more than one of the focuses discussed above in a single study, scholars have had to combine various theoretical and methodological approaches, such as textual analysis, critical discourse analysis and ethnographic approaches. This is a consequence of LP researchers’ efforts to situate LP research in the broader field of sociolinguistics and to make it more and more permeable to other research fields in the social sciences and humanities (see Ricento, 2006a: x).

In fact, an inter-disciplinary perspective on LP research can be found as early as the seminal work of Ball (e.g. 1990, 1993). In conceptualising LP as both text and discourse, Ball declares that “what we need in policy analysis is a toolbox of diverse concepts and theories” (1993: 10). He illustrates this kind of “composite theory approach” (1993: 15) in his study of the politics of educational reform in the UK (Ball, 1990). Later, focusing on texts, discourse and agency, Ricento defines LP research as “a multidisciplinary and an interdisciplinary activity” (2006b: 9). In turn, LP scholars focusing on texts, discourse, agency and language practices all conduct inter-disciplinary research. For instance, Lin argues that researchers need to adopt “transdisciplinary perspectives on language-in-education policy and practice” (2005: 39). She highlights the case of LIEP studies conducted in Hong Kong and notes that, depending on researchers’ conceptualisation of ‘policy’, various approaches have been used, such as critical discourse analysis (e.g. Pennycook, 2002) and critical ethnographies (e.g. Lin, 1996). In order to overcome the potential compartmentalisation and fragmentation of LP and LIEP research, Lin suggests “travel[ling] between different disciplinary perspectives” (Lin, 2005: 51) and being “both pragmatic and flexible in research paradigms and approaches” (Lin, 2008: 284).

Indeed, more inter-disciplinary studies are being conducted, especially studies of language-in-education policy and practice. A good example is the collection of papers in an issue of the *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* edited by Li Wei and Martin (2009a). Every study in this volume draws on a number of epistemological and theoretical approaches, including
ethnography of communication, critical social theory and interactional sociolinguistics (Li Wei and Martin, 2009b: 118). Within an inter-disciplinary approach to LP research, the question arises as to what specific approach can be best used to investigate language practices in LP and LIEP studies. In what follows, I show how the study of language practices in LP research has been tackled in two different ways.

2.5.3. Strand 1: Language policy vis-à-vis language practices

In the first strand of research, language practices are investigated *vis-à-vis* language policy, which is still conceptualised as text and/or discourse. More specifically, LP scholars investigate actual language practices against the backdrop of language policies in order to evaluate whether policies are implemented or challenged. Language practices are considered, therefore, as a site in which tensions between policy and speakers’ agency are best observed.

A significant example of this first strand of language policy and practice research is Martin’s (2005) study of two classrooms in two rural schools in Malaysia. As Martin puts it, this study “purposely gives emphasis to the actual language practices in the schools, as many studies that purport to consider policy and practice together actually give pre-eminence to the former and neglect the latter” (2005: 93). He conducts a “discourse-analytic study” (2005: 93) of classroom language practices to see how the classroom participants put policy into practice (2005: 94). In this respect, language choice practices are interpreted *vis-à-vis* the schools’ language policies. Findings demonstrate the existence of tensions between policy and practice insofar as the classroom participants disengage with the school language policy by using a language other than the prescribed language of instruction. The notion of a tension existing between policy and practice has since become a common thread in LIEP studies conducted within this first strand of research. As Canagarajah notes, “the field of LPP [language policy and practice] is now moving towards a more localised orientation that takes these tensions, ambiguities, and paradoxes seriously” (2005: 195).
Heller’s work (see for instance 1996, 2001, 2007) is also representative of this body of research, which analyses classroom language practices with regards to the language policy stated by a school. In her ethnographic study of L’École Champlain, a French medium high-school in Ontario (Canada), Heller has thoroughly investigated how pupils’ language choice practices reflect the way different groups within the school – that is, the English and French bilinguals, the monolingual Quebecois and the Francophone immigrant students mainly from Africa – position themselves socially. This very complex and rich situation enables Heller to reflect on the multiple tensions existing between the English-speaking majority group and the French-speaking minority group, as well as between the Canadian French-speaking minority group and the immigrant French-speaking minority group. In taking the position that “language is so often explicitly a terrain of social struggle” (2001: 117), Heller interprets language choice acts in the school with regards to the school language policy. In this sense, since the school explicitly adopts a French monolingual language policy, Heller interprets the use of English (and any languages other than French) as being a deviance from the policy and, therefore, as an act of ‘rebellion’ against the monolingual identity that the school is trying to impose on its pupils. This is a clear example of the first strand of research according to which practices are interpreted vis-à-vis a top-down policy.

Other significant examples of LIEP studies that have been conducted within this first strand of language policy and practice research can be found in the special issue of the International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism mentioned above, entitled ‘Conflicts and tensions in classroom codeswitching’ (Li Wei and Martin, 2009a). Particularly noteworthy contributions are Rashka et al. (2009), Tien (2009) and Li Wei and Wu (2009). The last explores tensions between policy and practice in Chinese complementary school classrooms in the UK. Their main argument is that bilingual children switch creatively between English and Chinese in order to challenge, on the one hand, the teacher’s authority and, on the other hand, the school’s monolingual policy. A key finding is that “Chinese pupils used their language skills to simultaneously follow and flout the rules and norms of behaviour in the school” (2009: 208). This indicates that language practices are
indeed investigated with reference to the “rules and norms of behaviour of the school” – in other words, the school language policy. Similarly, Rashka et al. (2009) and Tien (2009) examine conflicts and tensions between the multilingual practices in Taiwanese EFL classrooms and the pressures of English-only ideologies. In these studies, language practices are also investigated in relation to language policies, which are mainly conceptualised here as discourses, that is, as monolingual ideologies of language teaching and learning. In brief, whether LP scholars conceptualise language policy as either text or discourse or both, language practices are systematically interpreted with regard to a language policy determined outside interaction. This is the main difference between this first strand of research and the second strand of research, in which LP is argued to exist within language practices.

2.5.4. Strand 2: language policy in practices. The work of Spolsky

In the second strand of research, it is suggested that language practices can be analysed with reference to a language policy, not only at the level of texts or discourses, but also at the level of practices themselves. A third conceptualisation of language policy is thus entailed; one whereby language policy is conceptualised as being within practices. This conceptualisation has been proposed by Spolsky (2004, 2007, 2008a).

In his first step towards a theory of LP, Spolsky (2007) follows Fishman’s (1972) domain analysis, arguing that each of the identified domains of a specific community – such as school, home and church – “has its own policy, with some features controlled internally and others under the influence or control of external forces” (2007: 2). Furthermore, he contends that the LP within a specific domain has three main components: (1) language management (i.e. “the formulation and proclamation of an explicit plan or policy, usually but not necessarily written in a formal document, about language use”, Spolsky, 2004: 11); (2) language beliefs or ideology (i.e. “what people think should be done”, Spolsky, 2004: 14); and (3) language practices (i.e. “what people actually do”, Spolsky, 2004: 14) (see also
Spolsky, 2007 and 2008a). Crucially, he writes that there is a policy at the level of each of these three components and that the LP observed at each of these three levels may differ (2004: 217):

“It [i.e. a language policy] may be discovered in the linguistic behaviour (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 authorised body” (Spolsky, 2004: 217).

To a large extent, the first two components of Spolsky’s (2004) model of LP echo the first two conceptualisations of LP discussed so far (language policy as text and as discourse). However, Spolsky’s statement that there is a language policy in language practices represents a decisive development in the field. In the first strand of research, LP has been conceptualised as a notion separate from that of practice. However, in the second strand, Spolsky argues that policy and practice need not be seen as distinct. In fact, he claims that there is policy in language practices themselves. In a key statement, he explains that practices “constitute a policy to the extent that they are regular and predictable” (2007: 3).

The idea that language practices are regular and predictable can be traced in some of Spolsky’s earlier publications. Indeed, Spolsky and Shohamy have observed that “practice forms a recognisable and analysable set of patterns” (2000: 29, my emphasis). They have also stated that “practice refers to the deducible, implicit rules that seem to underlie the language use of a defined community” (Spolsky and Shohamy, 2000: 2, my emphasis; see also Spolsky, 2004: 9). For them, the term ‘practice’ does not only refer to language use but also to a policy underlying language use. This is later confirmed by Spolsky, who writes that “language policy may refer to all the language practices, beliefs and management decisions of a community or polity” (2004: 9). In order to refer to Spolsky’s conceptualisation of practice as policy, I propose the term practiced language policy. The study of a practiced language policy thus involves the identification of these “deducible, implicit rules” underlying language use. As Spolsky and Shohamy put it:

“It assumes that we could derive from a study of language use in the community a set of descriptive and explanatory rules that would somehow capture the idea that
members of the community have of appropriate behaviour” (Spolsky and Shohamy, 2000: 29).

In addition, Spolsky argues that the policy at the level of language use – and not at the level of management or beliefs – is the “real language policy”: “the real language policy of a community is more likely to be found in its practices that [sic] its management” (Spolsky, 2004: 222; see also Spolsky, 2007: 3). It is also the most influential, as the following passage explains:

“The theory I am exploring will hold that each of these three components [i.e. management, beliefs and practices] within (and, as we shall see, others outside) the domain produces forces that account for language choices by participants. *Strongest of all is language practice*” (Spolsky, 2007: 4, my emphasis).

At this point, it is necessary to reiterate the difference between the first strand of research on language policy and practice (see for instance Heller, 1996, 2001, 2007; Martin, 2005; or Li Wei and Martin 2009a) and the second strand of research proposed by Spolsky (e.g. 2004, 2007) and developed in this thesis. Namely, the former invites the analyst to interpret language choice practices with regards to a policy situated *outside* interaction (for example a policy stated by a head of school or written in a constitution) while the latter invites the analyst to interpret language choice practices with regards to a policy situated *within* interaction. However, as I pointed out in Chapter One, Spolsky’s conceptualisation of a practiced language policy remains essentially programmatic since he does not indicate how practiced language policies can be investigated. The aim of this thesis is thus to address this methodological gap, and the main claim is that Conversation Analysis can be used to investigate practiced language policies.

### 2.5.5. A proposed Conversation Analytic approach

To start with, it should be noted that Conversation Analysis (CA) has been proposed for the investigation of other aspects of LP research, most notably by Jernudd (1991), who has suggested using CA in language planning. For him, the aim of language planning is to solve language problems. In this respect, he claims that “a theory of language problems must reveal how language problems occur in communicative acts” (1991: 31). Since CA and language planning share a common
interest in trouble and repair in conversation, he suggests using CA as a starting point for the planning of languages (1991: 32). In what follows, I explain why CA presents itself as a possible approach to the investigation of practiced language policies.

Although Spolsky did not indicate how to study practiced language policies, some of his statements seem to echo key CA principles (discussed in detail in Chapter Four, section §4.3; for introductory texts on CA see also Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998; Liddicoat, 2007; Psathas, 1995; ten Have, 2007). First, Spolsky writes that, to investigate a language policy at the level of language use, one should “look at what people do and not at what they think should be done or what someone else wants them to do” (2004: 218). This central focus on actual language interaction is shared by Conversation Analysts, who study “the everyday nature of talk” (Liddicoat, 2007: 2) in naturally occurring interaction.

Secondly, as I described earlier, Spolsky argues that there is a policy at the level of language practices insofar as they are “regular and predictable” (2007: 3). He explains that language practices form “sets of patterns” (Spolsky and Shohamy, 2000: 29). The assumption that language acts are regular is also shared by CA practitioners, whose principal aim is to study the “order/organisation/orderliness of social action” (Psathas, 1995: 2) and especially of talk activities. Likewise, Spolsky’s acknowledgment of “patterns” of language acts echoes Conversation Analysts’ interest in describing “interactional practices”, that is, “recurrent activities that have their own structures” (Young, 2008: 61).

Thirdly, Spolsky states that what he calls “language practice” is the strongest force accounting for language choices by participants (2007: 4). He uses the term “practice” to refer to “the deducible, implicit rules that seem to underlie the language use of a defined community” (Spolsky and Shohamy, 2000: 2). This understanding of practice echoes CA’s understanding of “interactional norms” (Hymes, 1972). From an Ethnomethodological/Conversation Analytic perspective, interactional norms are understood as “a point of reference or action template for interpretation” (Seedhouse, 2004: 10). They are what speakers use to know whether
a practice is appropriate in a given context. In other words, norms are used by speakers as “schemes” (Garfinkel, 1967) to interpret each other's language acts. In this respect, it should be stressed that Spolsky’s understanding of ‘practice’ corresponds to CA’s understanding of ‘norms’ and that CA’s understanding of ‘practice’ corresponds to Spolsky’s understanding of ‘patterns of language use’.

Fourthly, Spolsky and Shohamy state that in order to discover these “deducible and implicit rules” one needs to study their “nonobservance” (2000: 29). They write that these 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). The study of the nonobservance of rules evokes Conversation Analysts’ “deviant cases analyses” (Heritage, 1984a, 1988), a method that studies “any case that seems to depart from a previously formulated rule or pattern” (ten Have, 1999: 136).

All in all, there are enough pointers in Spolsky’s (2004, 2007; Spolsky and Shohamy, 2000) LP model to CA as an appropriate method to study what I call a practiced language policy. It is on these grounds that I claim that CA is an efficient approach to the investigation of practiced language policies.

2.6. Summary

In this chapter, I have reviewed the four different focuses of LP research since its development as a research field in the 1960s; namely, language planning models, language ideologies and discourses, agency, and language practices. I have also shown that these four focuses entail three different ways of conceptualising language policy. Language policy has been, and still is today, conceptualised as (1) text (i.e. an authoritative statement, either verbal or written, of what should be done), (2) discourse (i.e. a set of beliefs and ideologies of what should be done) or (3) practice (i.e. a set of norms about what is usually done) – or as a combination of the three. That is, texts, discourses or practices (or a combination of the three) are understood to be what influences language choice and alternation acts. As Spolsky puts it, they produce “forces that account for language choices by participants”
Furthermore, I have highlighted the fact that, while LP researchers have adopted various approaches to investigate policy as text and policy as discourse, no approach has yet been suggested to investigate policy in practices. I have thus proposed a Conversation Analytic approach to the study of practiced language policies. The remaining chapters of this thesis report a case study I have conducted by way of investigating this claim.
3.1. Introduction
In the previous chapter, I have identified a methodological gap in the LP research literature and have claimed that Conversation Analysis can be used to study practiced language policies. I have also said how, in order to support this claim, I conducted a case study of an induction classroom for newly-arrived immigrant children in France, investigating its practiced language policy. As already explained above (see Chapter One, §1.4), I have chosen to base the case study in a multilingual classroom context in order to build on my previous research experience in a similar context (Bonacina, 2005). I also made the hypothesis that language policy issues would be more salient in an environment in which more than one language was available. Furthermore, I chose to conduct the case study in France – where I was born and raised – as I thought my familiarity with French society and the French education system would facilitate data collection and interpretation. In this chapter, I present France’s monolingual language management and ideology, moving from the macro-level of the state to the micro-level of the target induction classroom. In the first place, I present France’s monolingual language policy (LP) (§3.2). I then examine France’s monolingual language-in-education policy (LIEP) in the specific domain of French state schools (§3.3). Next, I introduce France’s educational provisions for newly-arrived immigrant children, detailing the policy of induction classrooms at primary level (§3.4). Lastly, I move to the micro-level of the target induction classroom, describing the primary school in which it is located (which I refer to as La Plaine) and the profiles of its participants (§3.5).
3.2. **France’s monolingual language policy**

As Spolsky puts it, “France is the paradigmatic case for strong ideology and management” (2004: 63). In what follows, I describe these two aspects of France’s monolingual policy, namely, “language management” and “language ideologies”.

3.2.1. **The management of the French language**

The variety of French promoted and protected in France’s language policy is, historically, the dialect of Ile de France (Francien), which has undergone processes of standardisation (for a full review of the standardisation of French see, for instance, Ager, 1996: 29-39). France’s monolingual LP has been (and still is) stated and protected by numerous language management processes. For example, many laws have been passed to establish and maintain French as the official language of France. By way of illustration, three can be mentioned (for a full review of France’s language management see Ager, 1996: 40-45 and Spolsky, 2004: 66-67. See also Salhi, 2002 for a review of France’s language management outside France). Firstly, the *Ordonnance de Villers-Cotterêts*, signed by François I in 1539, stated that French had to be used in legal documents and in French courts. Secondly, the 1794 decree following the French Revolution imposed the use of French throughout French territory. Thirdly and more recently, in 1992, the French Parliament changed the 1958 Constitution to give French the constitutional status of the official language of the Republic: “[t]he language of the Republic shall be French” (Constitution de la République Française, 1958: Article 2, my translation). In addition, many institutions have been created to regulate and protect the French language, including the well known *Académie Française* and the lesser known *Conseil Supérieur de la Langue Française* and *Délégation Générale à la Langue Française*.

---

5 ‘The edicts of Villers-Cotterêts’.
6 “La langue de la République est le français” (Conseil Constitutionnel, original version).
7 ‘The French Academy’.
8 ‘The High Council of the French Language’.
9 ‘The General Delegation to the French Language’.
This monolingual language management has rarely been challenged. One example is the debate over what is commonly referred to as the ‘Toubon Law’ (Loi n°94-665) (for a full discussion, see Ager, 1996: 156-168). Proposed and passed in 1994, the Toubon Law made the use of French compulsory in four domains – consumer protection, employment, education, and audio-visual communication – and initially forbade the use of foreign words. However, the Constitutional Council stopped the Senate ratifying it on the basis that it did not conform to Article eleven of the ‘Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen’, which states:

“The free communication of ideas and opinions is one of the most precious rights of Man. Any citizen may therefore speak, write and publish freely, except when this is tantamount to the abuse of this liberty in the cases determined by Law” (Déclaration des Droits de l’Homme et du Citoyen, my translation, my emphasis).

Thus far, the notion that any citizen can “speak, write and publish freely” had been understood as a freedom of content and not of linguistic means (Encrevé, 2005). Therefore, in addition to causing the amendment of the Toubon Law, the decision of the Constitutional Council raised a new awareness of constitutional linguistic rights, which has been drawn upon in later initiatives to support the use of languages other than French (see section §3.2.3 and §3.2.4).

3.2.2. The French linguistic ideology

France’s monolingual language management is based on two ideological principles: national unity and Equality for All. The first one refers to the belief that the French language unifies the French nation; that is, that one language makes one nation (‘one-nation-one-language’). This belief was a driving force in the construction of France as a nation-state. Indeed, the propagation of French as the one and only language of the nation was thought to bring cohesion. For instance, after the French Revolution, Deputy Bertrand Barère and Abbot Grégoire promoted the ideas that a republican nation was intrinsically monolingual and that ignoring the state language

---

10 Named after the Minister of Culture and Francophone Affairs of the time, Jacques Toubon.
11 “La libre communication des pensées et des opinions est un des droits les plus précieux de l’homme: tout citoyen peut donc parler, écrire, imprimer librement, sauf à répondre de l’abus de cette liberté dans les cas déterminés par la loi” (Déclaration des Droits de l’Homme et du Citoyen, original version).
was betraying one’s country (Encrevé, 2005). Similarly, as early as the seventeenth century, French was the policy-prescribed language of all state institutions, which served the unification and centralisation of France. In this respect, it has often been argued persuasively that the French language has been used as a national emblem, alongside the French flag and the national anthem (e.g. Ager, 1999: 192; Spolsky, 2004: 65). The belief that the unity of France lies in linguistic homogeneity is often referred to as ‘the French linguistic ideology’ (Encrevé, 2005) and still informs today’s language management in France; with the exception that the notion of ‘social cohesion’ has now largely replaced that of ‘national unity’ (Ager, 1996: 204).

The second ideology underlying the language management of French is the republican principle of ‘Equality for All’, according to which all citizens are equal and should therefore be treated the same. Equality of opportunity is thought to be best provided in a linguistically uniform state (Spolsky, 2004: 65). In this sense, French citizens have the right to use French and, as Ager puts it, “immigrants have rights (to use French, rather than their own language)” (1996: 206). Clearly influenced by communitarian philosophy, this ideology results in the belief that “difference is […] a disadvantage to the individual” (Wright, 2004: 185). Given that the principle of ‘Equality for All’ emerged during the French Revolution, it has often been thought that France’s monolingual language policy stemmed from the Revolution. However, it is worth mentioning here that, immediately after the Revolution, the French republic proclaimed a multilingual policy, in which policy documents had to be translated into the various regional languages of France. As Encrevé sums up, “during the democratic times of the Revolution, all the languages of France were languages of the Republic” (2005, my translation). It was a few years later, when the Jacobins took power in a time referred to as ‘la Terreur’ (1793-1794), that the state enforced a French monolingual policy.

---

12 In French, ‘l’Idéologie Linguistique Française’.
13 In French, ‘l’Egalité pour tous’.
14 “Durant les temps démocratiques de la Révolution, toutes les langues de France étaient langues de la République” (Encrevé, 2005, original version).
15 Literally, ‘the Terror’.
3.2.3. The place of regional languages

The French linguistic ideology is further seen in the way that language diversity has been treated. Indeed, the establishment of French as the language of the French republic has been pursued at the expense of France’s regional languages. In the name of unification, regional languages were erased from the public sphere. The famous quotation from Barère in his 1794 *Rapport sur les Idioms*\(^{16}\) testifies to early negative attitudes towards the use of languages other than French:

> “Federalism and superstition speak bas-Breton; immigration and hatred of the Republic speak German; counter-Revolution speaks Italian and fanaticism speaks Basque. Let us break these instruments of damage and error”\(^{17}\) (in Schiffman, 1996: 294, my translation).

Multilingualism being associated with federalism, regional languages and linguistic difference were suppressed and individual language rights disappeared (see also Wright, 2004: 181). For instance, in order to provide equal treatment for all French citizens, representatives from state institutions increasingly used French and refused to interact in other languages. As Spolsky puts it, “equality emerged as of higher value than liberty” (2004: 65). A good case in point is the French debate over the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* (Council of Europe, 1992). France was asked to join the Charter and thereby to promote the use of regional or minority languages in education, media, administrative and judicial settings, economic and social life, and cultural activities. However, due to Article 1 of the French constitution – which states that all citizens should be treated equally, regardless of their origin, race or religion – the French Constitutional Council forbade ratification of the Charter (see Conseil Constitutionnel, 1999: Decision Number 99-412). Therefore, constitutionally, regional languages cannot receive any institutional support.

Although this may look as if France’s *de facto* multilingualism has not been recognised, the debate over the Charter led to the acknowledgment of regional languages. Indeed, at the time of the debate, the French government made a list of the languages that would receive support, should the Charter be ratified. Taking

---

\(^{16}\) Literally, ‘Report on Languages’.

\(^{17}\) “Le fédéralisme et la superstition parlent bas-breton; l’émigration et la haine de la République parlent allemand; la contre-révolution parle l’italien et le fanatisme parle le basque. Cassons ces instruments de dommage et d’erreur” (Schiffman, 1996: 294, original version).
into account that dialects of the official language and the languages of immigrants do not fall under the *Charter*, seventy-five ‘languages of France’ spoken by ‘nationals’ were listed (Cerquiglini, 1999). As a result, the former *Délégation Générale à la Langue Française* became the *Délégation Générale à la Langue Française et aux Langues de France*\(^\text{18}\) (DGLFLF) in 2001. Nevertheless, on the homepage of the DGLFLF website, French is still promoted as the sole language that gives “a sense of belonging to a community” \(^\text{19}\) (see [http://www.dglf.culture.gouv.fr/](http://www.dglf.culture.gouv.fr/)). In brief, French monolingualism still holds sway in France’s language policy.

### 3.2.4. The place of immigrant languages

As early as the end of the nineteenth century, immigration shaped the French nation. Immigration from Eastern Europe, Southern Europe and Belgium was encouraged, so as to increase the population. Since then, immigrants have arrived from Italy in the 1920s, from Spain fleeing the civil war in the 1930s, from other European countries fleeing the rise of fascism, and from Africa and Portugal in the 1970s (for a full review of France’s history of immigration see for instance Noiriel, 2006 and Schor, 1996). According to the latest statistics, 5.1 million immigrants\(^\text{20}\) live in mainland France (see [http://www.insee.fr/fr/themes/tableau.asp?reg_id=0&ref_id=NATTEF02162](http://www.insee.fr/fr/themes/tableau.asp?reg_id=0&ref_id=NATTEF02162)).

Immigration from Europe is decreasing (41% in 2004 against 46% in 1999); while immigration from Asia (14% in 2004 against 12% in 1999) and Africa (42% in 2004 against 39% in 1999) is increasing (INSEE, 2005: 4). Unfortunately, to date there are no questions in the French census about language. As a consequence, few statistics are available about what languages are spoken by immigrants in France. One exception is a recent language survey (INSEE, 2002) that reveals that the

---

\(^{18}\) Literally, ‘General Delegation to the French Language and the Languages of France’.

\(^{19}\) In the original text: “un sentiment d’appartenance à une communauté”.

\(^{20}\) According to the definition imposed by the Higher Council of Integration in 1991, an ‘immigrant’ is a person born abroad who does not possess French nationality and who has entered France with the intention of settling there permanently - while a ‘foreigner’ is a person who does not have French nationality but who lives in France (INSEE, 2005: 3). It implies that not all immigrants are foreigners (i.e. some immigrants have acquired the French nationality – but remain immigrants as they were born in a foreign country) and, conversely, that not all foreigners are immigrants (i.e. some foreigners are born in France) (Noiriel, 2006: iii).
languages immigrants use most often at home are first Arabic (all varieties), then Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, German, Polish and Turkish.

In a nation that has been built around an ideology of sameness, linguistic diversity (immigrant and regional languages) is seen as a “problem” (Mühläusler, 1996) and as a challenge to the unity of France. In fact, to a large extent, immigration has been dealt with in the same way as regionalism. That is, immigrants have been asked to assimilate to the French nation. Unlike Britain’s multicultural model of integration – in which immigrant communities are recognised – France operates what can be called a ‘monocultural’ model of integration. In France, communities are not recognised. Instead, they are linguistically and culturally assimilated. In this respect, it has been noted that the notion of ‘community’ itself is absent from French political discourse (Laparra, 1993: 55) and those of ‘community rights’ and ‘multiculturalism’ are dismissed as “the ‘Anglo-Saxon’ approach” (Ager, 1996: 99). In brief, in France, individual particularities are disregarded in favour of a homogenisation process (see also Abdallah-Pretceille, 1998: 95). Speaking an immigrant (or a regional) language is not perceived as a sign of belonging to a specific community, but rather as an indicator of individual difference. Since all individuals should be treated equally regardless of their differences, individual particularities (and, in this case, speaking an immigrant language) are not supported, or even acknowledged, by state institutions. While this model of integration is now widely criticised among French scholars, on the basis that it ignores France’s *de facto* multiculturalism and multilingualism (e.g. Abdallah-Pretceille, 1998; Galligani, 2008; Lorcerie, 2002), it has often been seen as a necessary means of preserving the unity of the French nation and France’s social cohesion (e.g. Schnapper, 1991: 102).

The French language plays a major role in France’s integration policy. This is underpinned by the belief that knowing French is the “motor”, the “first asset” (DGLFLF, 2006: 55), and the “essential condition” (Boyzon-Fradet, 1997: 93) for the integration of newly-arrived immigrants. Just as French was used as a catalyst for the unification of the nation, it is used today as the vector of integration policies (see also Ager, 1996: 98). Indeed, mastering the French language has recently
become a key requirement for being granted either French nationality or a residence permit (see Loi n°2003-1119; Loi n°2006-911; Loi n°2007-1631). More specifically, immigrants have had to sign a *Contrat d’Accueil et d’Intégration*\(^{21}\) (Loi n°2005-32, 18 January 2005: Article 146, Chapter VII), which compels them to attend French language classes (between 200 and 500 hours) and to pass a language test. Should the latter be unsuccessful, residence permits and French nationality are not granted. For example, in 2005, 85000 contracts (90% of immigrants) were signed (Chiss, 2007: 386) and around 3000 requests for French naturalisation were rejected on the basis that candidates had failed their ‘linguistic integration’ (DGLFLF, 2006: 56). As for immigrants’ languages, they are not mentioned at any point in policy texts regulating integration processes, as if, as Galligani puts it, “immigrants accepted in this country have to forget their language(s) in order to be better absorbed by the official language”\(^{22}\) (2007: 290, my translation). In this regard, France’s model of assimilation has had a profound impact on the linguistic repertoire of the French population, leading, in some cases, to language death and loss of identity and, in other cases, to the creation of new languages (such as French-based creoles) and new hybrid identities.

### 3.3. France’s monolingual language-in-education policy

So far, I have presented France’s monolingual language policy. I now turn to France’s monolingual language-in-education policy, focusing on state primary schools where I have been given access in order to conduct a case study of an induction classroom. In this third section, I first present the role of French in state schools (§3.3.1) and then discuss the unequal provisions for the teaching of other languages, especially immigrant languages (§3.3.2).

\(^{21}\) Literally, a ‘Contract of Welcome and Integration’.

\(^{22}\) “Tout porte à croire que l’étranger admis sur cette terre d’accueil se doit d’oublier sa ou ses langues pour être mieux absorbé par la langue officielle” (Galligani, 2007: 290, original version).
3.3.1. French and school

Since the era of nation-state building in France, state schools have been a key tool for the spread of French and subsequently for the unification of France around a single language. Indeed, since their creation in the Falloux Law (1851), state schools have been using French as the sole language of instruction. After the Ferry Laws in the 1880s state schools became free, secular and compulsory. Every child received instruction in French; a highly efficient way of promoting the use of French across the territory. In fact, state schools have become the main tool of linguistic standardisation and homogenisation (Pooley, 2000: 132) and the main channel to promote a sense of national identity (of which the French language is a key symbol). As Wright puts it, “French education was education to be a French national” (2004: 63).

Nowadays, the French language still plays a fundamental role in state schools, especially primary schools. Still charged with the responsibility to inculcate Republican values, state primary schools are required “to remain the guarantor of the Republican ideal: allowing every child to become, through teaching, a free and enlightened citizen”23 (Darcos, 2008; Minister of Education and Culture). Being closely tied to Republican values, the French language thus remains at the core of the state education system. This is illustrated, for instance, by the fact that French gained the status of official language of instruction in 1994:

“The language of teaching, exams, entrance examinations, as well as theses and dissertations in public and private education institutions is French, except for the teaching of foreign and regional languages and cultures or, when teachers are visiting professors or foreign guests”24 (Code de l’Education: Article L-121-3: II, my translation).

Another example of the importance of French is that, in the latest educational programmes for state primary schools, the teaching of the French language takes up most of the teaching hours in the year; the aim being that pupils “master the French

---

23 “L’école primaire doit rester garante de l'idéal républicain : permettre à chaque enfant de devenir, par l'instruction, un citoyen libre et éclairé” (Darcos, 2008, original version).
24 “La langue de l'enseignement, des examens et concours, ainsi que des thèses et mémoires dans les établissements publics et privés d'enseignement est le français, sauf exceptions justifiées par les nécessités de l'enseignement des langues et cultures régionales ou étrangères, ou lorsque les enseignants sont des professeurs associés ou invités étrangers” (Code de l’Education, Article L-121-3: II, original version).
language”\(^{25}\) (MEN, 2008: 3, 9, 13). In short, state primary schools are ingrained in a “traditional monolingual *habitus*” (Hélot and Young, 2006: 69). This is illustrated further by the limited educational provisions for languages other than French in state primary schools.

### 3.3.2. Other languages and school

For a long time, primary schools have been impervious to languages other than French (Boulot and Boizon-Fradet, 1987: 163; see also Ager, 1996: 43). In 1951, the Deixonne Law gave limited status to four regional languages: Basque, Breton, Occitan, and Catalan. This status was subsequently extended to other regional languages such as Corsican. Since 2000, all regional languages can be taught in schools and their use in classroom talk is allowed to support the teaching of French (Code de l’Education: Article L312-11). Since 2002, the teaching of foreign and regional languages have been introduced as an integral part of primary school programmes, marking the end of the exclusivity of French in primary schools (MEN, 2002d). Presently, primary school pupils can choose, in theory, between: classes of ‘modern foreign languages’ (including English, German, Arabic, Chinese, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese and Russian), ‘regional languages’ (including Alsatian, Corsican, Provencal, Basque and Breton) and ‘languages of origin’, that is, immigrant languages \(^{26}\) (including Arabic \(^ {27}\), Moroccan, Turkish, Spanish, Portuguese and Italian) (MEN, 2007). However, in practice, 89.65% of state primary school pupils choose to learn English (DGESCO, 2009).

In fact, this tri-partite categorisation reflects (and feeds into) a hierarchy among languages other than French, at the top of which is English (Falip and Deslandes, 1990: 89; Hélot and Young, 2002: 96; Hélot and Young, 2006: 73). This hierarchy is also reflected in the fact that each category of languages receives unequal support. Foreign and regional language classes are fully integrated into the primary school curriculum (MEN, 2008: 16), while immigrant language classes are

\(^{25}\) “*Maîtrisent la langue française*” in the original version.

\(^{26}\) Throughout this thesis, I refer to the French ‘*langue d’origine*’ as ‘immigrant languages’.

\(^{27}\) Some languages are present in more than one category because classes of ‘languages of origin’ are open only to speakers of these languages, while ‘modern foreign language’ classes are open to beginners.
not. Bilingual programmes have developed in regional languages (in the form of partial immersion education\(^{28}\); see MEN, 2001), and have recently emerged in main European languages (in the form of Content and Language Integrated Learning\(^{29}\)). However, no such programme exists in immigrant languages. In brief, more support is given to monolingual children to learn an additional language than to existing bilingual children to maintain their home language (see also Hélot, 2003: 274; Hélot and Young, 2006: 75). Bilingualism in French and an immigrant language is “left in limbo” (Hélot and Young, 2006: 76). As Hélot writes, “it is also clear that linguistic and cultural diversity is seen as providing resources for the individual and the society in the case of dominant endogenous languages but not when it concerns immigrant languages” (2003: 272).

The lack of policy support for immigrant languages indicates that they are not as highly valued as regional and foreign languages. This is confirmed by some French scholars who claim that bilingualism in an immigrant language is perceived negatively in France’s education system. For instance, they report that it is perceived by education practitioners as “an obstacle” to learning French (Hélot, 2003: 258; Hélot and Young, 2002: 100; Varro, 1990: 6), as a source of learning difficulties and of education failure (Hélot and Young, 2002: 97; Hélot and Young, 2006: 73; Varro, 1994: 117), and as slowing down integration (Hélot, 2003: 258; Hélot and Young, 2006: 71). In the specific case of newly-arrived immigrant children, bilingualism in an immigrant language is perceived as “a handicap” rather than an asset (Abdallah-Pretceille, 1982: 13; Auger, 2009; Boizon-Fradet, 1997: 95; Hélot and Young, 2006: 76; Laparra, 1990: 9); so much so that newly-arrived children speaking an immigrant language apparently do not consider themselves to be bilingual (Auger, 2008a: 127; 2008b: 201). Varro’s interviews with Parisian induction teachers also show that the notion of ‘bilingualism’ is not used when referring to newly-arrived immigrant children’s linguistic repertoire (1990: 6). It is only used to refer to that of children speaking an ‘elite language’, that is, a major

---

\(^{28}\) In the model of ‘Partial Immersion Education’, children are taught half of the school curriculum in a regional language and the other half through French.

\(^{29}\) In the model of ‘Content and Language Integrated Learning’, one or two school subjects are taught in the medium of a foreign language.
European language. Likewise, negative attitudes are to be found among mainstream teachers, who perceive learners of French as an additional language as speaking a “hybrid language” that is neither French nor their home language (Mazurkiewicz and Varro, 2001: 45). In short, children’s bilingualism in an immigrant language has either a “mauvaise réputation” (i.e. literally ‘bad reputation’; Tabouret-Keller, 1990) or simply goes unnoticed (Hélot, 2003: 258; Varro, 1990: 5). This belief is reflected in educational provisions for newly-arrived immigrant children, which adopt a “compensatory” view of education; in which teaching aims to “overcome the ‘problem’ of lack of language proficiency among language minority students” (Mora et al., 2001: 412).

### 3.4. France’s educational provision for newly-arrived immigrant children

In the French education system, second generation immigrant children and newly-arrived immigrant children do not receive the same school-based support. The former receive the same treatment as other French pupils, while the latter attend induction programmes. This third section focuses on the educational provision for newly-arrived immigrant children. Firstly, I examine the target population (§3.4.1), before providing an overview of school-based support (§3.4.2) and a description of the functioning of induction classrooms at primary level (§3.4.3).

#### 3.4.1. The target population defined

Since the implementation of induction programmes in the 1970s, the target learning population has been defined in various ways (for a full discussion see Galligani, 2008). In some policy documents (e.g. MEN 1970, 1978, 2002a), induction programmes are said to be designed for “foreign children” and in others for “immigrant children” (e.g. MEN, 1975, 1976, 1977). Given that the terms ‘foreigner’ and ‘immigrant’ refer to children with different statuses, the use of one or the other term has had important implications in terms of demarcating whom

---

30 See note 20.
induction programmes are for. In fact, this inconsistency has led to the misunderstanding that induction programmes are meant to provide support for second generation immigrants (Hélot, 2003: 268). In order to overcome this confusion, the latest policy documents state that they are designed exclusively for “newly-arrived immigrant children”\(^{31}\) (MEN, 2002b). This new term means that these programmes can now admit “French immigrants”\(^{32}\): children born abroad who have obtained French nationality before entering France.

A specific definition of the target learning population of induction programmes can be found in the latest official instructions given by the French Ministry of Education (MEN, 2002b):

> “These programmes provide temporary educational provisions only to pupils recently arrived in France who can neither sufficiently master the French language nor display the appropriate learning to benefit immediately from the totality of teaching taking place in mainstream classrooms”\(^{33}\) (MEN, 2002b: 8, my translation).

This definition implies that French-speaking newly-arrived immigrant children can attend mainstream education immediately upon arrival – although the required level of French competence is not specified. A later note from the Ministry of Education specifies that induction programmes are created exclusively for children who are at least six years old and who have entered France less than a year prior to their registration (MEN, 2006: 1). It is also stated that immigrant children’s ‘newly-arrived’ status lasts for one year after registration. This means that they can attend induction programmes for a maximum of twelve months (MEN, 2006: 2). It should be added that newly-arrived immigrant children do not have to be in France legally to attend these programmes, since all children living in France are required to go to school by law (MEN, 2002a: 3-4).

---

\(^{31}\) In French, “les enfants nouveaux arrivants”. In this thesis, I use the term ‘newly-arrived immigrant children’ instead of the literal translation ‘newcomers’ to make clear that I am referring to children who have recently arrived in France and not to children who have recently started school.

\(^{32}\) French immigrants represent an important part of the newly-arrived immigrant children population, numbering 25.7% in 2004 (MEN, 2006: 4).

\(^{33}\) “Ces structures scolarisent de façon temporaire les seuls élèves nouvellement arrivées en France pour lesquels la maîtrise insuffisante de la langue française ou des apprentissages scolaires ne permet pas de tirer profit immédiatement de tous les enseignements des classes du cursus ordinaire” (MEN, 2002b: 8, original version).
Based on this definition, when this study was conducted (in 2007-2008), there were 34,907 newly-arrived immigrant children in the French education system, which represented 3.7% of the total population of pupils (MEN, 2009: 29). 17,280 of them were registered in primary schools and 1774 attended a school in the local education district under study (namely, the Académie of Versailles). Among these 1774 children, 93.9% attended an induction programme (MEN, 2009: 29).

3.4.2. School-based support for learners of French as an additional language

Different educational provisions for newly-arrived immigrant children have been implemented in various socio-linguistic contexts. These provisions range from, on the one hand, ‘withdrawal policies’ (also called ‘submersion policies’ or ‘pull-out policies’) in which children are withdrawn from mainstream classrooms to be taught the target language, and on the other hand, ‘mainstreaming policies’ in which children attend mainstream classes with no language support. Combinations of these two types are also found, such as in ‘structured immersion programmes’ in which minority students attend special classes until they are bilingual and then transferred to mainstream classes (Garcia, 1997). Since withdrawal policies are now frequently regarded as “segregationist” among scholars (e.g. Garcia, 1997: 412; Ellis, 1985: 2), other types of bilingual education programmes are being promoted. These include “two-way/dual language” programmes, in which minority and majority students learn both languages; “maintenance” programmes in which both dominant and minority languages are taught separately; and “two/multi-way mainstream bi/multilingual” programmes in which more than two languages are considered majority and are given equal value in the curriculum (for a review see, for example, Fishman, 1979b; Garcia, 1997; Garcia et al., 2006). In the UK, for instance, a strong mainstreaming policy was implemented in the mid-1980s, while nowadays, learners of English as a second language receive various types of support such as content through adapted English, English teaching and some kind of English sheltered immersion (see Leung, 2002: 96; Eurydice, 2005a: 4).
The school-based support provided to newly-arrived immigrant children in France (as well as in Belgium and Luxembourg; for a full review, see Eurydice, 2005c, d and Baetens Beardsmore, 1991) is of the withdrawal kind. Although the term ‘withdrawal policy’ is never used in policy documents – the term ‘structures d’accueil’ \(^{34}\) is used instead (MEN, 2002a: 8) – children are withdrawn from mainstream classrooms to attend induction classrooms for up to twelve months. In early policy documents, a full-time withdrawal programme was proposed in (MEN, 1986a and b). However, a part-time withdrawal programme is now advocated (MEN, 2002a and b, 2006) in order to avoid the frequently observed situation in which induction classrooms are cut off from the rest of the school and become “ghetto classes” (Berque, 1985: 11; Goï, 2005: 17). In this part-time or semi-withdrawal programme, children attend an induction classroom intensively at the outset. This support is then gradually reduced, while children increasingly attend their mainstream classroom.

The origin of induction programmes lies in the 1950s when informal education initiatives were implemented to support the numerous Algerian children entering France (de Miras, 2002: 44-46). Induction classrooms were then instituted in 1970 (MEN, 1970) and further regulated in 1986 (MEN, 1986a, 1986b). These latter policy documents have now been repealed and replaced by MEN 2002a and 2002b, which state clearly the options and procedures for school-based support for learners of French as a second language (see also Eurydice, 2005b: 5 where part of MEN 2002b is translated into English). Upon arrival into their local school, newly-arrived immigrant children are registered to a class of their age group. They are then tested on their French proficiency and their content subject skills in the language in which they previously received instruction. If the test results indicate that a child needs specific language or subject content support, he or she will then be sent to the school induction programme. As a result, children attending an induction programme are registered both in a mainstream classroom (their ‘administrative registration’) and an induction classroom (their ‘pedagogical registration’) (MEN, 2002b: 10).

\(^{34}\) Literally, ‘welcoming structures’.
The school-based support provided to newly-arrived immigrant children in France’s state education system varies according to their age and needs. At a pre-primary level, they receive no specific support. However, they can attend induction classrooms called Classes d'Initiation\textsuperscript{35} (or CLIN) at primary level (that is, between six and thirteen), and Classes d'Accueil\textsuperscript{36} (or CLA) at secondary level (between eleven and sixteen). Children who had never attended a school in their previous country of residence go to induction classrooms called Classe d'Accueil pour Enfants Non Scolarisés Antérieurement\textsuperscript{37} (or CLA-NSA). Those aged sixteen or over attend classes called Cycle d'Insertion Pre-Professionnel spécialisé en Français Langue Etrangère et en Alphabétisation\textsuperscript{38} (or CIPPA FLE-ALPHA) in which they learn French and vocational skills. These four types of classes are not found in all schools but only in education districts where there is a high concentration of newly-arrived immigrant children. It should be added that each class contains a maximum of fifteen children and a minimum of six. In cases in which the minimum number is not reached, children receive what is called Cours de Rattrapage Intégré\textsuperscript{39} (or CRI), that is, occasional support from an induction teacher who visits them in their mainstream classrooms. All these measures are provided for a maximum of twelve months, or twenty-four months if a child arrived with low or no literacy skills (MEN, 2002b: 8 and 11). Once children attend their mainstream classroom on a fulltime basis, they can still receive occasional support from their induction teacher (MEN, 2002b: 11).

Lastly, at primary level, newly-arrived immigrant children, along with immigrant children, receive heritage language classes called Enseignement des Langues et Cultures d’Origine\textsuperscript{40} (or ELCO). ELCO classes\textsuperscript{41} are a type of language

\textsuperscript{35} ‘Initiation classes’.
\textsuperscript{36} ‘Welcoming classes’.
\textsuperscript{37} ‘Welcoming classes for children who have not been to school before’.
\textsuperscript{38} ‘Pre-vocational insertion classes of French as a foreign language and literacy’.
\textsuperscript{39} ‘Integrated remedial lessons’.
\textsuperscript{40} Literally, teaching of languages and cultures of origin.
\textsuperscript{41} ELCO classes are different from the immigrant language classes mentioned above. ELCO classes are designed for children who already speak the language, while immigrant language classes are designed for beginners. Also, they differ from the classes found in complementary schools insofar as they are part of the French education system.
maintenance provision. Instruction is provided in the language used in the state schools of the children’s home country (for a full review see, for instance, Ager, 1996: 87; Chiss, 1997; Hélot, 2003: 267). At the time of writing (2010), France has agreed to ELCO classes being taught by teachers from Portugal, Italy, Tunisia, Morocco, Serbia, Montenegro, Turkey, Tunisia and Algeria. While it would seem that the French education system is opening to diversity, it should be stressed that ELCO classes are open only to speakers of the relevant languages and are therefore inaccessible to monolingual French pupils. Furthermore, they are marginalised. They take place out of school hours and their programme is not integrated into the French examination system (e.g. Berque, 1985; Boizon-Fradet, 1993).

3.4.3. Induction classrooms at primary level
This thesis focuses on induction classrooms at primary level.42 As a result, I present in this section a more detailed discussion of the learning population of these classes (§3.4.3.1), their functioning (§3.4.3.2) and the teacher training, teaching materials and programmes recommended in policy documents (§3.4.3.3).

3.4.3.1. A diverse learning population
The criteria used to decide whether a child is entitled to – or has to – attend an induction classroom have been discussed above (§3.4.1). Here, I would like to emphasise the considerable heterogeneity of inducted children43 (see also Abdallah-Pretceille, 1982: 12 and Chiss, 2007: 388-9). Indeed, in the same induction classroom, children belong to different age groups (ranging from seven to thirteen), they come from different parts of the world and already speak one or more languages. Although no statistics are available about the languages spoken by newly-arrived immigrant children, statistics on their nationality indicate that induction classrooms are indeed multilingual contexts. Table 1 below shows the latest statistics about the nationality of inducted children across France (MEN,

42 For practical purposes, from now on I use the term ‘induction classroom’ to refer to induction classrooms at primary level (CLIN).
43 By ‘inducted children’, I refer to newly-arrived immigrant children who are attending induction classrooms. As we have seen, not all newly-arrived immigrant children are inducted children. Some children may be proficient enough in French to attend mainstream classrooms upon arrival.
It should be noted that a large percentage of inducted children come from Africa (27.7% from the Maghreb countries\(^{44}\) and 9.4% from other African countries) and Asia (4.9% from China and 9.1% from other Asian countries). However, this distribution differs in each local educational district (called Académie). For instance, in the school year 2008-2009, ninety-four nationalities were represented in the induction classrooms of the Académie of Paris (see Table 2 below for more detailed information): 51.8% of inducted children came from eight countries: China, Russia, Algeria, Romania, Portugal, Korea, Bangladesh and Brazil. The rest (48.2%) came from the other eighty-five countries.

In addition to the linguistic heterogeneity of induction classrooms, inducted children have various levels of proficiency in French. Some of them may already have been exposed to French, as is the case with most newly-arrived immigrant children from North African countries. Others may have had none. Similarly, some may not have attended school in their previous country of residence and may thus have poor literacy skills. Furthermore, inducted children come from different socio-economic backgrounds. Some of them have been sent by their family to live with a tutor, while others may have entered France with their parents, who migrated for economic reasons. Lastly, inducted children do not all have the same ‘life plans’. Some have the intention of settling permanently to pursue the rest of their education in France, while others are sojourners and plan to leave France after a more or less definite period.

\(^{44}\) Maghreb countries are Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya and Mauritania.
Table 1. Distribution of inducted children’s nationality in 2004 in France.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of inducted children in France in 2004 according to their nationality (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maghreb countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other African countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian countries (excluding China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European countries outside the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America/Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2. Breakdown of inducted children in the Académie of Paris (2008-2009) by country of origin

Source: CASNAV, 2009: 9, my translation.
3.4.3.2. There and back again: living between two classrooms

As I described earlier (§3.4.2), initially, children attend an induction classroom on a full-time basis. As their level of French improves, they spend progressively more time in their mainstream classroom (MEN, 2002b: 11), finally moving there full-time. In policy documents, it is recommended that inducted children attend lessons in mainstream classes, such as sport, music and art – where mastery of the French language is thought to be less necessary (MEN, 2002b: 11). In practice, this means that children spend some parts of the school day in their induction classroom and others in their mainstream classroom; walking in and out of their induction classroom all day long. Furthermore, each child does so at different times of the day according to the time-table of his or her mainstream classroom. As a result, induction teachers rarely teach the whole class at the same time and children have sometimes to put aside an activity they are conducting in the induction classroom to attend a lesson in the mainstream one.

3.4.3.3. Teacher training, curriculum and teaching materials

Despite repeated calls from French researchers to create a teaching diploma specific to induction programmes, teachers do not receive any training prior to their allocation to an induction classroom (de Miras, 2002: 98). It has often been argued that this lack of a specific teaching qualification allows the Ministry of Education to remain flexible in regard to the number of induction classrooms. Should an induction classroom close down, the induction teacher could then easily be re-allocated to a mainstream classroom (e.g. de Miras, 2002: 98).

At present, mainstream teachers become induction teachers on a voluntary basis. They receive training and ongoing support in the form of workshops, which are organised by the Ministry of Education in academic centres called Centre Académique pour la Scolarisation des Enfants Nouveaux Arrivant et des Enfants du Voyage\textsuperscript{45} (or CASNAV) (MEN, 2002b: 14). CASNAV representatives coordinate all induction classrooms in their Académie and provide teaching materials, training

\textsuperscript{45} Literally, ‘Academic Centre for the education of newly-arrived children and travellers’.
and academic expertise for induction teachers, without evaluating their performance (MEN, 2002c: 22-3).

Similarly, no specific educational programme is set out in policy documents regulating induction classrooms (MEN, 2002a, b, 2006). It is only written that a minimum of twelve hours per week should be dedicated to the teaching of the French language and that subject content should also be taught (MEN, 2002b: 12). In this respect, induction classrooms are both language and subject content classes; although the exact content of these subjects is unclear. Though educational programmes are not mentioned, the aim of induction classrooms is clearly and frequently stated. The objective is “to help [newly-arrived immigrant children] to be rapidly integrated into a successful mainstream curriculum”\(^46\) (MEN, 2002b: 9, my translation, my emphasis; see also MEN, 2002b: 10-11). This integration is thought to be facilitated by the teaching of French: “The essential objective is mastering the French language used as the medium of instruction”\(^47\) (MEN, 2002b: 12, my translation).

Also noteworthy is the lack of precision regarding the level of language competence considered to be necessary for a child to attend a mainstream classroom on a full-time basis. Consider the following extract:

> “An inducted child can be integrated into a mainstream classroom when he/she has acquired a sufficient level of French, both in speaking and in writing, and when he/she has been sufficiently familiarised with the rules and functioning of school life or school institution”\(^48\) (MEN, 2002b: 13, my translation, my emphasis).

In fact, what this ‘sufficient’ level refers to is not specified. It is therefore up to induction and mainstream teachers to evaluate and decide whether an inducted child is ready to move on to full-time mainstream education. Lastly, no indication is given of which teaching materials induction teachers can use. These gaps are also present in earlier policy documents (MEN, 1970; 1986a and b). Scholars have

---
\(^{46}\) L’objectif est “d’aider [les enfants nouveaux arrivants] à leur rapide intégration dans un cursus de réussite” (MEN, 2002b: 9, original version).
\(^{47}\) “L’objectif essentiel est la maîtrise du français envisagé comme langue de scolarisation” (MEN, 2002b: 12, original version).
\(^{48}\) “Un élève accueilli dans une classe d’initiation ou une classe d’accueil peut intégrer une classe du cursus ordinaire quand il a acquis une maîtrise suffisante du français, à l’oral et à l’écrit, qu’il a été suffisamment familiarisé avec les conditions de fonctionnement et les règles de vie de l’école ou de l’établissement” (MEN, 2002b: 13, original version).
pointed this out, arguing that specific measures would reinforce the fact that induction classrooms are at odds with the Republican principle of Equality for All (e.g. Boyzon-Fradet, 1997: 93).

3.4.3.4. The lack of a declared language policy

In the policy documents that regulate induction classrooms (MEN 2002a, 2002b, 2006), there is also a conspicuous lack of any mention of language use, although they are, as noted earlier, multilingual contexts. No mention is made of which language(s) should be used as the medium of instruction and what place should be given, if any, to inducted children’s first languages (L1). Although the aim of induction classrooms is clearly “mastering French used as the medium of instruction”\(^{49}\) (MEN, 2002b: 12), no indication is given as to how this aim should be realised; whether French should be taught solely in the target language or also in children’s L1.

Two interpretations can be made of this lack of overt statements on language use. Firstly, the emphasis on the French language can be understood as an oblique way of stating that only French has a legitimate place in the classroom. Second, it has often been said that induction programmes are a breach of the principle of Equality for All as they provide for the specific treatment of a small number of the pupil population\(^{50}\) (for a discussion, see Lazaridis, 2001: 199). In this light, the lack of a declared language policy for induction classrooms can also be understood as a reminder that induction programmes are part of the wider French education system. They are therefore subject to the wider monolingual language policy discussed above (Code de l’Education: Article L-121-3: II; see also §3.3.1).

In addition to the fact that policy documents do not mention language use in induction classrooms, it should be noted that, in the policy documents regulating induction classrooms (MEN, 2002a, 2002b, 2006), inducted children’s bilingualism

---

\(^{49}\) In French, “l’objectif essentiel est la maîtrise du français envisagé comme langue de scolarisation” (MEN, 2002b: 12, original version).

\(^{50}\) In this respect, it should be noted (along with Hélot, 2003: 266) that bilingual provisions in regional and major European languages are, to the same extent, specific educational provisions for a minority of the pupil population. Nevertheless, it is rarely mentioned that this contradicts the Republican principle of Equality for All.
appears to not be valued and their language repertoire appears to be seen as being deficient. Inducted children’s L1 are not referred to as “heritage” or “community” languages – as, for instance, in the UK – but rather as “languages of origin”\textsuperscript{51} (MEN, 2002a, 2002b, 2006). This indicates that they are perceived as belonging to the children’s past and not to the linguistic ecology of France’s education system (see also Hélot, 2003: 258). Similarly, inducted children are referred to as “non-French speaking children”\textsuperscript{52} and not as “learners of an Additional Language” or “speakers of Other Languages”. This shows that they are defined by ‘what they lack of’ (i.e. French competence) as opposed to ‘what they already have’ (i.e. competence in one or more languages). This echoes the fact that, as we have seen, inducted children’s bilingualism in an immigrant language is either ignored or perceived negatively among educational practitioners (see section §3.3.2).

Interestingly, scholars have addressed neither the lack of a declared language policy nor the issue of language choice in induction classrooms. For the most part, they debate the ‘kind of French’ that should be taught in induction classrooms, offering competing labels such as Francais Langue Seconde, Francais de Scolarisation and Francais Langue Étrangère\textsuperscript{53} (e.g. Boyzon-Fradet, 1997: 107; Chiss, 2007: 388; Verdelhan, 2002). The only way in which the use of inducted children’s L1 in school is envisaged in the literature is when researchers suggest bilingual programmes in which ELCO classes would be integrated into mainstream education (e.g. Berque, 1985: 45; Billiez, 1990: 45; Boulot and Boizon-Fradet, 1987: 179). Likewise, some researchers advocate intercultural teaching activities in order to raise awareness of multiculturalism in the French education system (e.g. Abdallah-Pretceille, 1982: 160; Hélot, 2003; Hélot and Young, 2002 and 2006; Laparra, 1993: 62; Lorcerie, 2002: 170), leaving the issue of language choice in classrooms unaddressed. Few researchers propose actual linguistic activities with a view to creating space for inducted children’s L1 (e.g. Auger, 2005, 2008a, 2008b;

\textsuperscript{51} ‘Langues d’origine’.
\textsuperscript{52} In French, ‘enfants non-francophones’.
\textsuperscript{53} Respectively, ‘French as a Second Language’, ‘French as a Language of Instruction’ and ‘French as a Foreign Language’.
Galligani, 2007; Little, 2003). Therefore, the present case study of the practiced language policy in one of France’s induction classrooms will also provide an insight into actual language choice practices in these contexts.

3.5. The case study: an induction classroom at primary level

In the last section of this chapter, I describe the immediate socio-linguistic context of the case-study. Given the diversity of the learning population from one induction classroom to the next, it is fair to say that each induction classroom is a unique educational context. It should therefore be stressed at this point that the case study does not claim to be representative of all induction classrooms. Similarly, the practiced language policy of this induction classroom cannot be claimed to be representative of the practiced language policy of all induction classrooms especially since, as I explain in my trajectory of access (see Chapter 5, section §5.2.1), not all induction teachers allow the use of languages other than French in their classrooms.

3.5.1. The Académie

The induction classroom under study is based in a primary school, for which I use the pseudonym La Plaine, situated in the Académie of Versailles (see picture 1). This Académie is one of the largest in France, containing around 1,100,000 pupils or around 9% of pupils attending French primary and secondary state schools (see http://www.ac-versailles.fr/public/jcms/c_5013/l-academie, accessed on 21.02.10.). It is divided into four sub-districts called Inspections Académiques, which correspond to the four departments of Essone, Yvelines, Val d'Oise and the Hauts-de-Seine (see picture 2). La Plaine is located in the Inspection Académique of Hauts-de-Seine. This contains six-hundred state primary schools and thirty-one induction classrooms at primary level54 (MEN, 2009: 2). All mainstream and induction teachers are accountable to the inspector, who is himself accountable to

54As I mentioned earlier, not all primary schools run an induction programme. There is only one induction classroom in a primary school – hence the fact that it admits children of all age groups.
the *recteur* heading the *Académie*. The hierarchy of the French education system is well summarised by Hélot and Young:

“The French education system is very centralised and hierarchical. Decisions are taken at ministerial level in Paris and circulated down to teachers through a monthly official bulletin. General and regional inspectors are responsible for the implementation of new policies. While teachers do have pedagogical freedom in their classrooms, the very ambitious curriculum leaves little room for innovation. Pedagogical innovations at grass root level tend to remain confidential, and State-funded innovative programmes are often bogged down by bureaucracy. Most teachers are used to implementing top-down policies since they work under the authority of inspectors whose job it is to make sure such policies are put into practice” (Hélot and Young, 2006: 72).

**Picture 1. Académies in mainland France.**

3.5.2. The primary school: ‘La Plaine’

In December 2007 (the date when I first entered the induction classroom), La Plaine had two-hundred and eighty-three pupils aged between six and twelve. There were twelve mainstream classes covering the five primary school levels, one induction classroom and one ELCO class in Moroccan. In addition to these fourteen teachers, other staff members included an educational psychologist and two teachers who specialised in supporting pupils with learning disabilities. Until 2002, La Plaine was classified as an ‘Educational Priority Area’.

Thanks to the induction teacher having positive relationships with most of the school teaching staff, the induction classroom was usually integrated in school activities. For example, inducted children performed a play (‘Little Red Riding Hood’) in front of the rest of the school in their own languages. Similarly, inducted children were asked to teach songs in their own languages to their mainstream peers during an inter-class choir. A last example is that the induction classroom contributed to the school’s ‘Olympic Games’ where, interestingly, inducted children

---

55 In French, ‘zone d’éducation prioritaire’. These schools are recognised as being located in socially and economically deprived areas. They therefore receive special financial and educational support from the Ministry of Education.
decided to represent France. These examples show that the staff at La Plaine had positive attitudes towards the use of inducted children’s first language(s) during school games and cultural events. However, within their classrooms, mainstream teachers seemed to hold monolingual beliefs about language teaching and learning, only allowing the use of French. As one of the mainstream teachers said in an interview I conducted: “Here we speak French. The objective is that they learn French” (see Chapter Five for the methods of data collection used). In Spolsky’s (2004) terms, the language policy at the level of mainstream teachers’ language beliefs (language policy as discourse) seemed to be French monolingual.

3.5.3. The induction teacher

The induction teacher is a white French female in her late thirties, whom I refer to in my corpus with the pseudonym ‘Miss Lo’. French is her first language, although she also studied Russian and Hindi at a university level, used English when living and working in India for a year, and Malgash when living and working in Madagascar for five years. She has been a primary school teacher in France for the past ten years and has been teaching in this induction classroom since 2004, obtaining a permanent post at La Plaine in 2007. In recent personal communications, she said that she was now teaching in an induction classroom in Guadeloupe.

It should be noted that, during the school year before this study was conducted, Miss Lo returned to university to complete a post-graduate degree in teaching French as a foreign language at La Sorbonne Paris 3. There, she encountered the work of the French researcher Auger, who advocates the use of inducted children’s L1 in the classroom (especially Auger, 2005). As she later confirmed during one of our informal interviews, Auger’s work has very much shaped her teaching practices. A semi-structured interview with Miss Lo (see Chapter Five for details of methods of data collection) further revealed that she seemed to hold positive beliefs about inducted children’s L1. The following extract is a good example:

“[…] I’m not the kind of person who is going to tell one of my pupils: ‘right, my dear, you are in France and it’s to learn French. And you know, […”

56 The original quotation is: “Ici, on parle français. Le but est qu’ils apprennent le français”.
you’re ok, but Senegal…’ They know that I represent the institution, but that, at the same time, I don’t endorse that stuff about ‘we’re here to learn French, and that’s the only thing that matters and all the rest it’s a private issue’. Me, I say; ‘we’re here to learn French but you are Senegalese, and this interests me a lot’”57.

Clearly, she had an inclusive policy that respected inducted children’s multilingual and multicultural background.

3.5.4. The inducted children

In the school year 2007-2008, twenty children attended the induction classroom under study. Five of them left in December 2007 to attend their mainstream classroom on a full-time basis and thereafter came back once a week for an hour of language support. Three of the twenty arrived in mid-June 2008. Table 3 shows the biographical information collected from the twenty children. All names have been changed for ethical reasons.

Seven inducted children arrived in the induction classroom at the start of the school year in September 2007. Hakim and Cristina had already been there during the previous school year and, in fact, exceeded the authorised twelve months. However, since they both had literacy difficulties, they were allowed to stay for another year. Eight children were nine years old or over. Most children were registered in a mainstream classroom that corresponded to their age group – except for Hakim, Amkoulel, Samba and Cristina, who were registered in the mainstream classroom of an age group two years younger than theirs.

57 The original quotation is: “c’est pas moi qui vais lui tenir le discours : ‘ah non mon vieux, t’es en France, et puis c’est pour apprendre le français. Et puis écoute t’es bien gentil mais le Sénégal …’. Ils savent que moi je suis l’institution mais qu’en même temps je renvoie pas ce truc de ‘on est ici pour apprendre le français, c’est la seule chose qui existe et le reste c’est de l’ordre du privé’. Moi je dis : ‘on est ici pour apprendre le françois, mais t’es sénégalais, et ça ça m’intéresse énormément parce que voilà’.”
A wide range of literacy skills was found in this classroom. All children had attended a school in their previous country of residence, except for Samba who went to school for only two years and Amkouele who never went to school and was thus illiterate upon arrival. Maya, Talia and Martina had attended an English medium school before coming to France. The induction teacher also said that inducted children’s families had different ‘life plans’. While most of them had the intention to settle permanently in France, Kenji’s and Leila’s parents planned to return to their previous country of residence. Moreover, these twenty children came from different socio-economic backgrounds. For instance, Kenji’s and Leila’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Languages spoken</th>
<th>Date of arrival in the induction classroom</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maya</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>27/09/2007</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talia</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>27/09/2007</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leila</td>
<td>Argentinean</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>07/05/2007</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samba</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Peul</td>
<td>26/10/2007</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amkoulel</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Peul</td>
<td>28/09/2007</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>28/09/2007</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Ecuadorian</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>13/09/2007</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakim</td>
<td>Algerian</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>22/01/2007</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matilda</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>Lithuanian, English</td>
<td>29/09/2007</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>13/11/2006</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piotr</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>06/10/2007</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>09/09/2006</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>09/09/2006</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anika</td>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>12/01/2007</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Philippine</td>
<td>Filipino, English</td>
<td>10/10/2006</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>Philippine</td>
<td>Filipino, English</td>
<td>10/10/2006</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyon</td>
<td>South-Korea</td>
<td>Korean, English</td>
<td>15/06/2008</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mei</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>15/06/2008</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>15/06/2008</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
parents migrated to France for their job, while most of the other children’s parents migrated in the hope of finding employment. Amkouel and Samba migrated to France without their parents and were living with older members of their family.

Lastly, this induction classroom was linguistically heterogeneous (see Table 3 above). Twelve languages, including French, were co-available when, in addition to the twelve inducted children, the children receiving occasional language support were present and the last three children had arrived. The rest of the time (i.e. when the children receiving occasional language support were not present and the last three children had not yet arrived) eight languages were co-available. These were French, Spanish, English, Japanese, Peul (a language from West Africa also called Pulaar), Arabic, Lithuanian, and Polish (see Table 4 for an overview of the languages available and their respective number of speakers). Three semi-structured interviews with a total of eight of these inducted children revealed that two of the languages co-available were perceived as being allowed and appropriate in classroom talk. These were French and English. It also appeared that Spanish, Polish, Peul, Lithuanian, and Japanese were perceived as being allowed for specific purposes such as giving or asking for explanation. Arabic was said to be never used (see Chapter Five for details of methods of data collection). In brief, inducted children’s ideological policy was not strictly French monolingual.
3.5.5. Organisation of the induction classroom

These inducted children had different teaching needs, literacy skills and subject knowledge. As a result, the induction teacher divided them into three groups (see Table 5). The less advanced group (Group 1) consisted of the youngest children as well as those who needed to improve their literacy skills. In the middle group (Group 2) were children of roughly the same age group and the same competence in subject knowledge. In the more advanced group (Group 3) were the eldest children, who shared the same level of subject knowledge. Table 5 shows the distribution of the twelve inducted children in these three groups.\(^{58}\)

---

\(^{58}\) The five children attending a mainstream classroom on a full-time basis but who benefited from language support formed a group of its own an hour a week. The three children who arrived at the end of the school year (and thus at the end of the data collection process) joined Group 1.
Table 5. Distribution of the inducted children in groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maya</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Talia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martina</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Leila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakim</td>
<td>Samba</td>
<td>Piotr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amkoulel</td>
<td>Cristina</td>
<td>Kenji</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classroom was organised around this group distribution. Children within the same group sat next to each other to facilitate group work, as the following sitting plan (see picture 3) and photo (see picture 4) show.

Picture 3. Seating arrangement in the induction classroom
All inducted children attended physical education lessons with their mainstream peers. If they had sufficient proficiency in French, they attended Maths, History and Geography lessons. For instance, in January 2008, children from group 3 as well as Hakim, Andrea, Karen and Samba attended Maths lessons twice a week in their mainstream classrooms. Leila and Piotr also went to their mainstream classrooms for history and geography in addition to Maths. In short, each inducted child had their own daily schedule. As a consequence, children were continually going back and forth between their induction and mainstream classroom during the day. To give an idea of the integration schedule in this induction classroom, I reproduce in Table 6 the Monday timetable from the second semester (January-June).

59 Faces have been hidden for ethical reasons.
Table 6. Integration schedule. The example of Mondays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30 – 10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15 – 11.15</td>
<td>Karen Samba</td>
<td>Leila Talia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Piotr Maths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15 – 12.00</td>
<td>Maya Martina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30 – 14.45</td>
<td>Hakim Sport</td>
<td>Andrea Sport</td>
<td>Talia Piotr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kenji Maths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aft. Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00 – 16.00</td>
<td>Karen Samba</td>
<td>Talia Piotr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Hist/Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In practice then, the twelve inducted children were only together at the same time at the first hour of the morning. For the rest of the day, due to children’s different schedules in their mainstream classroom, only six children, on average, were present at any given time in the classroom.

3.6. **Summary**

In this chapter, I have introduced France’s monolingual language policy and language-in-education policy, discussing the available policy documents (policy as text) and the beliefs about language reported in the literature (policy as discourse). I have then introduced France’s educational provision for newly-arrived immigrant children, focusing in more detail on induction classrooms at primary level. In this regard, I have emphasised the lack of an overt LP in policy documents regulating induction classrooms and examined the beliefs about the use of inducted children’s first languages in the classroom as collected in previous research and as revealed in existing policy documents. Lastly, I have presented La Plaine and the *Académie* in
which it is located. More specifically, I have provided a detailed profile of the induction classroom participants, mentioning the language policy at the level of what Spolsky calls “language beliefs” (2004) held in the school at large and in the induction classroom in particular.
4.1. Introduction
The main claim of this thesis, as already indicated, is that Conversation Analysis (CA) is an efficient approach to the study of ‘practiced language policies’. To substantiate this claim, I conducted a case study of a practiced language-in-education policy in an induction classroom in France, which I have described in the previous chapter. In this chapter, I present the proposed theoretical framework for the study of practiced language policies, that is, a broad view of Conversation Analysis incorporating both sequential and categorisation analysis (Membership Categorisation Analysis). In adopting a broad view of CA, I hope to provide “an integrated analysis of talk” (Housley and Fitzgerald, 2002: 61). I also present the more specific theoretical framework adopted for the case study. Since I have investigated a practiced language-in-education policy in a multilingual educational context, I have used the CA approach to code-switching and classroom code-switching (e.g. Auer, 1984; Bonacina and Gafaranga, 2010; Gafaranga, 2001, 2009; Li Wei, 2002).

4.2. Some Conversation Analytic principles
It is important to stress at the outset that a full review of CA is impossible because “there is no fixed CA theory” but rather a “body of CA knowledge consist[ing] of a variety of research findings that have not been put together into one coherent whole” (Gafaranga, 2009: 115). For this reason, CA is usually referred to as a “mentality” (Schenkein, 1978; Gafaranga, 2009), a “cast of mind, or a way of seeing” (Seedhouse, 2004: 14). Therefore, following previous scholars, who focused their review of CA principles on those important for their object of
4.2.1. Principle 1: talk as social action

Influenced by Goffman’s (1959) seminal study of everyday interactions in the Shetland Islands and Garfinkel’s (1964, 1967, and 1988) Ethnomethodological approach to sociology, Sacks set the methodological orientation of CA as being the description of the “methods persons use in doing social life” (1984a: 21). More specifically, Sacks took from Goffman (1959) the idea that the study of speaking is not simply a matter of studying the linguistic features used by speakers but also, and more importantly, a matter of studying the structures of language-in-use. From this viewpoint, the study of speaking thus requires analysis of actual instances of talk as opposed to idealised and hypothetical sentences. From Garfinkel (1964, 1967, and 1988), Sacks took the idea that talk is social action; a “normal everyday human activity” (Liddicoat, 2007: 1). To explain the relationship between CA and Ethnomethodology, Seedhouse writes:

“Ethnomethodology studies the principles on which people base their social actions, whereas CA focuses more narrowly on the principles which people use to interact with each other by means of language” (Seedhouse, 2004: 3).

CA deals with social acts, and especially with talk as social action. In this respect, it is assumed that talk is a series of interconnected social actions between conversational participants. For this reason, CA practitioners are said to study talk-in-interaction and base their analysis on ‘everyday naturally occurring talk’.

It should be noted that, although CA was initially used to study talk as social action in everyday social settings (‘mundane talk’), it has also been used to study talk taking place in institutional settings (‘institutional talk’), such as classrooms (e.g. McHoul 1978, 1990; Macbeth, 2004; Markee, 2005; see also Mori and Zuengler, 2008 for a review of CA studies of classroom talk), courtrooms (e.g. Atkinson and Drew, 1979; Manyard, 1984), medical practices (ten Have, 1991;
Gafaranga and Britten, 2003) and emergency services (Whalen & Zimmerman, 1987; Zimmerman, 1994). In fact, as Liddicoat puts it:

“Conversation analysts do not see an inherent distinction between the formal and the informal, the everyday and the institutional; rather they see talk in interaction as a social process which is deployed to realise and understand the social situations in which talk is used” (2007: 6).

It is in accordance with this argument that I have used a CA approach to the study of a practiced language policy in the institutional context of a classroom.

4.2.2. Principle 2: talk as an orderly activity

A second principle underlying the CA mentality is that talk, as any other social activity, is an orderly activity. Contrary to Chomsky’s (1965) view that talk is too disorderly to be used for the study of language (for a discussion see for instance Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998: 22), Sacks wrote that in conversation, as in any other social activity, “there is order at all points” (1984a: 22); or again, that “there is overwhelming order” (1984a: 23). Order is assumed since, otherwise, social action would be impossible. Indeed, social actors engage in social action – including that of talking – methodically. To put it differently, the social activity of talking is accomplished methodically by participants. In this sense, rather than seeing order as being a “pre-existing framework” (Liddicoat, 2007: 2) that is externally imposed on social actors, Sacks saw order as being co-accomplished by participants and in talk-in-interaction.

Social actors, and therefore conversational participants, bring order through a psychological process that Garfinkel (1967) calls the ‘documentary method’. This term refers to the fact that social actors make sense of social encounters by categorising them into patterns, which they use subsequently to interpret similar or new social encounters. It is because conversational participants orient to such patterns (referred to as ‘practice’ in CA) that they are able to make sense of each other’s actions and, consequently, to “produce orderliness” (Psathas, 1995).

In brief, as Liddicoat puts it, CA is an approach “to the study of social action which sought to investigate social order as it was produced through the practices of everyday talk” (2007: 4). Precisely, the aim of CA is to describe “the intrinsic orderliness of interactional phenomena” (Psathas, 1995: 8), that is, the orderliness
produced by conversational participants in talk-in-interaction. Order is said to be produced on a turn-by-turn basis and, as a consequence, Conversation Analysts conduct ‘sequential analyses’ of talk-in-interaction. Conversation Analysts thus describe the set of procedures that conversational participants have identified through the documentary method and deployed to engage in, and make sense of, their talk activities. In the process, they identify the sequential organisation of talk-in-interaction (e.g. Schegloff, 2007).

4.2.3. Principle 3: Conversational structure and conversational practice

A third principle is that Conversation Analysts identify two levels of talk organisation, namely the structural level and the practice level. A conversational structure is what can be observed when looking at the sequentiality of acts; it is ‘what is done on an occasion’. When describing the structural level of talk organisation, CA practitioners describe the “context-free mechanisms” (e.g. Sacks et al, 1974), the “machinery” (Seedhouse, 2004: 252) of a talk-in-interaction. A typical structure CA practitioners have observed in talk-in-interaction is the adjacency pair (e.g. Schegloff and Sacks, 1973); whereby a first utterance (e.g. question), known as a first pair part, calls for a second utterance (e.g. an answer), known as a second pair part. Adjacency pairs are ‘context free mechanisms’ insofar as they are observed in a variety of interactional contexts and across different speakers.

A conversational practice is a pattern of a sequence of acts that happens repeatedly in a given context; it is ‘what is usually done’. When describing the practice level of talk organisation, CA practitioners describe interactional routines speakers engage in in talk-in-interaction; routines which may vary from community to community and from one context to the next. Such routines are also referred to as “interactive practices”, “communicative practices” and “discursive practices” (e.g. Young, 2008). In turn, practices are defined as “recurrent activities that have their own structures” (Young, 2008: 61, my emphasis). A typical practice is the greeting routine as found in many communities. Structurally, it is organised in the form of an
adjacency pair whereby a first greeting calls for a return greeting. As the exchange of such pairs is a recurrent activity, it can be seen as a practice in the communities in which it is observed. As an example, consider the following fictive extract:

Example 1: on the bus in the morning
1. Bus driver: good morning
2. Pete: good morning

Here, the conversational structure is that of an adjacency pair. Because this structure happens repeatedly every morning in the bus, it becomes a conversational practice, namely that of ‘greeting’.

As a last example of the difference between the structural and the practice level of talk organisation, consider the preference organisation in the act of ‘offers’ as discussed by Schegloff (1988, 2007). Schegloff differentiates two “alternative groundings of preference” (2007: 62): “sequence-structure-based preference” and “practice-based preference” (1988: 454). At the structural level, he shows how the conversational structure of ‘offers’ is that of an adjacency pair, and how a second pair part is a preferred response to a first pair part. At the practice level, he shows how, in most cases, the practice is that of a ‘preference for acceptance’ after an offer has been made in a first pair part. He further shows that, in some other cases, such as in the case of initial offers of second helpings of dessert, a ‘decline’ rather than an ‘acceptance’ is preferred (1988: 454).

The notion of ‘conversational practice’ is important in a CA approach to practiced language policies because it echoes Spolsky’s observation that language (choice) acts form “sets of patterns” (Spolsky and Shohamy, 2000: 29), which are then said to be underlined by a set of “deducible, implicit rules” (ibid: 2) – what Conversation Analysts call ‘interactional norms’.

4.2.4. Principle 4: Interactional norms
A fourth assumption in CA is that speakers have an implicit understanding (i.e. ‘common sense knowledge’) of whether an act is appropriate in a given context or not. In CA terms, this understanding is referred to as “interactional norms” (Hymes, 1972). Drawing on Ethnomethodology, Conversation Analysts understand norms “as a point of reference or action template for interpretation” (Seedhouse, 2004: 10).
That is, speakers use norms as “schemes” (Garfinkel, 1967) or “grids” (Heritage, 1984a) of interpretation of each other’s (language) acts. In this regard, the following passage from Seedhouse (2004: 10) is helpful:

“This does not mean that interactants have to slavishly follow these norms, but rather that these are points of reference through which we can design and perform our social actions, analyse and evaluate the conduct of another, draw conclusions, and hold the other accountable. So, for example, interactants can and do deviate from the norms, interrupt others, or fail to provide the second part to an adjacency pair, and fellow interactants can evaluate these actions as noticeable and accountable by reference to the norms” (Seedhouse, 2004: 10, his emphasis).

The assumption that norms are used for the interpretation and production of acts is grounded in the Ethnomethodological principles of the ‘reciprocity of perspectives’ and the ‘documentary method of interpretation’. The former implies that social actors hold each other to have the same perspective, while the latter implies that “any actual real-world action is a ‘document’ or an example of a previously known pattern” (Seedhouse, 2004: 7) and can thus be interpreted with reference to that pattern. To go back to example 1 above, I have said that since this particular event has been taking place repeatedly every morning in the bus, Pete has identified it as a conversational practice (documentary method). Therefore, next time Pete takes the bus in the morning and that the bus driver greets him, he will assume that the bus driver orients to the same practice (reciprocity of perspective) and will greet him back. In this sense, Pete will use his knowledge of the practice of greeting being appropriate with the bus driver as a norm of interaction, to which he will orient to in order to interpret language acts. It is with reference to this norm that if, one day, Pete does not greet the bus driver back, Pete’s lack of greeting will be noticed and interpreted.

One important aim of CA is to uncover and make explicit these interactional norms, since, as Silverman puts it, “social life, unlike foreign films, does not come with subtitles attached” (1998: 85). As I have claimed earlier (see section §2.5.5), CA’s understanding of ‘norm’ is central to approaching practiced language policies. Indeed, CA’s notion of ‘norm’ is what Spolsky calls alternately “the idea that members of the community have of appropriate behaviour” (Spolsky and Shohamy, 2000: 29), “the deducible, implicit rules that seem to underlie the language use of a defined community” (ibid: 2), or the “force that accounts for language choice by
participants” (Spolsky, 2007: 4); what I have proposed to call ‘a practiced language policy’. In the same way as Conversation Analysts are concerned with making explicit the interactional norms speakers orient to in talk-in-interaction, Spolsky calls for deriving from the study of language use “a set of descriptive and explanatory rules that would somehow capture the idea that members of the community have of appropriate behaviour [i.e. the norms in CA terms]” (Spolsky and Shohamy, 2000: 29). In this regard, I claim that a CA approach to practiced language policies consists in stating and describing the norms speakers orient to in their language acts.

4.2.5. Principle 5: An emic approach to context

Another key principle that needs to be introduced for investigating practiced language policies is the CA understanding of ‘context’. Two understandings of context emerge in the CA literature. A first sense of context is proximal and endogenous (e.g. Heritage, 1984a, 2004) insofar as a speaker’s turn provides the context for the second speaker’s turn, which in turn provides the context for the first speakers’ second turn. In this regard, contributions are “context-shaped” and “context-renewing” (e.g. Heritage, 1984a, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004). An interactional act is “context shaped” in the sense that its meaning can only be interpreted with regard to “what happens before” (Psathas, 1995: 48). It is ‘context-renewing’ in the sense that it provides the background for the interpretation of the next turn – that is, “what comes next” (Psathas, 1995: 48). Similarly, Heritage explains that “the context of a next action is repeatedly renewed with every current action” (1984a: 242). In short, context is actively co-constructed by conversational participants and dynamic insofar as it is renewed with each turn. For this reason, Conversation Analysts undertake sequential analyses of talk-in-interaction, that is, a turn-by-turn analysis of speaker’s acts. Sequential analysis is one of CA’s central methods to investigate the organisation of talk-in-interaction.

In addition to this first understanding of context, Conversation Analysts also acknowledge the ‘exogenous’ sense of context, that is, the situatedness of talk. Aspects of the situatedness of talk include speakers’ age, gender, identity, power
relations and, where relevant, institutional roles. However, these aspects of the context of talk are not taken for granted; they are not assumed to exert a deterministic or causal force on speakers’ interactional acts. As opposed to the ‘bucket view’ (Drew and Heritage, 1992; Sidnell, 2010) of context whereby context is “a container for action” (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998: 171), Conversation Analysts adopt instead an “active perspective” (Seedhouse, 2004: 42) to context whereby participants are seen to talk context into being. This means that aspects of the situatedness of talk such as social structures and institutional roles are co-constructed within talk-in-interaction. As a result, Conversation Analysts adopt an “emic” approach (Pike, 1967) – as opposed to an “etic” approach (i.e. the analyst’s perspective) – to context. Pike defines an emic perspective as the study of “behaviour as from inside the system” (1967: 37). An emic approach to context means that Conversation Analysts determine which elements of the situatedness of talk are relevant for speakers themselves. This issue of “relevance” (Schegloff, 1992) involves the need for analysts to show which aspects of context speakers demonstrably orient to while talking. As Psathas explains, “the matters selected for study are those that persons in the setting are themselves demonstrably aware of and/or oriented to in the course of their actions” (1995: 46). For example, in CA studies of talk in institutional settings (see for instance the seminal volumes edited by Drew and Heritage, 1992 and 2006), Conversation Analysts solely take into account the social structures and speakers’ characteristics that are demonstrably relevant to speakers themselves (for a full discussion on CA and talk in institutional setting see for instance Drew and Heritage, 1992; Heritage, 2004; Sidnell, 2010). Schegloff further adds that Conversation Analysts have not only to study aspects of contexts that are relevant for speakers but also show the “procedural consequentiality” of these specific aspects of contexts; that is, “how does the talk is being conducted in some setting (say, ‘the hospital’) issue in any consequences for the shape, form, trajectory, content, or character of the interaction that the parties conduct” (Schegloff, 1992: 111). In other words, the analyst has to show whether an aspect of context that has been identified as being relevant by participants is also consequential for the ongoing interaction.
4.2.6. A discussion of some common criticisms made of CA

I would now like to discuss briefly some common criticisms made of CA found in the literature. This will help highlighting the specificity of CA in examining talk-in-interaction compared to other discourse analytic methods. To do so, I will draw on debates between Schegloff (1997, 1999a, 1999b) and Billig (1999a, 1999b) in the first place and Schegloff (1997) and Wetherell (1998) in the second place, all published in the journal *Discourse and Society*.

As a response to Schegloff’s (1997) attempt to explain the differences between Conversation Analysis (CA) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Billig (1999a) enumerates a series of criticisms against CA. Importantly, Billig criticises Conversation Analysts’ claim of what he calls “epistemological naivety” (1999a: 546; 1999b: 573); that is, of examining “participants’ talk in ‘their own terms’” (1999a: 543). He argues that, in fact, Conversation Analysts use their own rhetoric, which conveys a view of the world that is not always that of the participants’ themselves (1999a: 544). This criticism had also been made by Segerdahl (1984), for instance, who was concerned with the relevance of the technical terms of CA to the participants. In my opinion, this criticism shows an important misunderstanding of one of CA key principle. When Conversation Analysts claim to study participants’ talk in their own terms, they do not mean using participants’ words to describe talk but rather using participants’ own acts; that is, what participants take to be relevant in talk. As Wooffitt points out, this criticism is based on a misreading of CA (2005: 161). Furthermore, Schegloff argues that “there is no ideological veil in CA that precludes analysts finding in a strip of interaction what is going on there” (1999a: 567).

Another recurrent criticism made of CA is that in focusing on the technical aspect of talk it fails to address its argumentative and oppositional character (see for instance Billig, 1999a: 551). While it is true that CA gives primer importance to the unfolding of interaction, this does not mean that it cannot account for unequal power relationships and argumentative talk. In fact, a detailed analysis of talk can reveal the multiple ways in which arguments and conflicts are constructed in
interaction. For instance, as Schegloff highlights (1999a), a fundamental paper in CA (Sacks et al., 1974) explicitly demonstrates how the study of turn-taking reveals unequal participation rights among participants. Similarly, Kitzinger (2000) has efficiently used CA to conduct socially engaged research, addressing mainly feminist issues. In turn, Wooffitt (2005) points that rhetorical psychologists such as Billig run the danger to seek an argumentative basis for the way people talk rather than looking at what is really going on in interaction. As he puts it:

“The claim that discourse is essentially argumentative imposes an unnecessarily restricting focus for research, thus leading analytic attention away from more mundane interactional practices in everyday communication, and, paradoxically, away from the subtle argumentative and persuasive resources which are used in building controversial or contested accounts” (2005: 167).

The last common criticism made to CA is that it ignores the notions of agency and discourse, which are thought to be shaping talk. Wetherell’s (1998) reply to Schegloff (1997) is a significant example of this kind of criticism; what Wooffitt calls the “Foucauldian criticism of CA” (2005: 184). In brief, she argues that CA is too narrow and should therefore be combined with CDA to account for the discourses at play in talk, and more generally, to account for the broader historical, political and ideological influences affecting talk. In his reply to Wetherell, Schegloff (1998) reiterates that CA is able to link talk with broader social issues should these issues be demonstrably relevant to participants themselves (1998: 416). In his comparative and critical introduction to Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis, Wooffitt (2005) takes the discussion further. He raises methodological questions and asks what exactly constitutes ‘discourses’ and what method should be used to identify them (2005: 182). He also claims that utterances are not produced in “an interactional vacuum” (2005: 173). Analysing them with a view to identify discourses invites researchers to disattend to the interactional circumstances in which these utterances were produced, which, as a consequence, leads to a kind of analysis that “does not illuminate the subtle organisation of talk-in-interaction, but which merely reflects
the theoretical perspective of the analyst and the immediate concerns of their project” (2005: 182).

Thus far, I have presented the key principles of CA necessary for the study of practiced language policies and discussed the common criticisms made of CA. I have developed the claim made in this thesis that CA is a possible approach to the study of practiced language policies. More specifically, I have claimed that a practiced language policy is what Conversation Analysts refer to as ‘norms of interaction’. Consequently, I have claimed that a CA approach to the study of a practiced language policy involves the identification of language practices (i.e. recurrent language acts) and the identification of the interactional norms speakers orient to in the interpretation of each other’s language acts. A CA approach to the study of practiced language policy results in the statement of the norms speakers orient to in their language acts. In this regard, I would like to reformulate the research question driving the case study as follows:

1) What are the language choice and alternation practices observed in the target induction classroom?
2) What are the norms of language choice and alternation practices that the classroom participants orient to in the interpretation and production of language choice and alternation acts?

In the remainder of this chapter, I present the CA approach to code-switching (§4.3) and classroom code-switching (§4.4) that I have used to specifically investigate the practiced language-in-education policy in the target classroom. Finally, since I have adopted a broad view of CA, incorporating both a sequential and categorisation analysis to classroom talk, I describe the salient features of Membership Categorisation Analysis (MCA) as well as the specific MCA approach to code-switching (§4.5).
4.3. **Conversation Analysis (CA) and bilingual talk**

The central concern of research on bilingual talk is to explain the alternate use of two or more languages in interaction. This phenomenon is commonly called ‘code-switching’ (CS) or ‘language alternation’ (for a discussion of what counts and what does not count as ‘code-switching’ see Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998; Auer, 1984; Gafaranga and Torras, 2002). Given that the present case study involves the investigation of bi/multilingual talk, I now turn to the field of ‘code-switching research’ with a view to exploring why CA has been used to study bilingual talk (§4.3.1), what CA models of bilingual talk are available (§4.3.2, §4.3.3), and whether CA has been used to describe interactional norms in terms of policy.

4.3.1. **Situating a CA approach to bilingual talk**

Language choice and alternation phenomena in bilingual talk at the community level have been widely researched from a variety of perspectives, the most recent of which being CA. Although a full review of approaches to code-switching (CS) research is beyond the scope of this section (for detailed reviews see for instance Li Wei, 1998, 2002, 2005; Gafaranga, 2007b), it should be noted that researchers adopting CA to the study of bilingual talk wanted to move away from the “identity-related perspective” to code-switching research (see Table 7 from Gafaranga, 2007b: 35).

**Table 7.** Approaches to the study of language alternation at the community level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study of language alternation</th>
<th>Grammatical perspective</th>
<th>Local order (Auer, 1984)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational explanation</td>
<td>Overall order (Gafaranga, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-functional perspective</td>
<td>Identity-related explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Gafaranga, 2007b: 35*
To put it briefly, researchers working within a “grammatical perspective” to bilingual talk aimed to describe the “structural constraints that are said to determine where and how code-switching could occur” (Li Wei, 2005: 375). This was the case of Poplack (1980) and Myers-Scotton (1993a, 1993b, 1995, 2001, 2002, 2006, etc.). As illustrated in Table 7, research within a “socio-functional perspective” can be divided into two strands, namely an “identity-related perspective” and an “organisational perspective”. Researchers working within an “identity-related perspective” to bilingual talk conducted macro-level sociolinguistic analyses to account for the meaning of language choice and alternation phenomena; they argued that speakers’ language choice was based on the societal values of languages, and consequently, set out to explain the meaning of CS with regard to the societal categories of the speakers’ speech communities. As Li Wei (1998) puts it, they aimed to explain the ‘why’ of CS. A good example is Gumperz (1982; Blom and Gumperz, 1972) who argues that in a specific speech community language choice indexes either a ‘we code’ or a ‘they code’. Likewise, in her markedness model of CS, later referred as the ‘rational choice model’ (Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai, 2001), Myers-Scotton (e.g. 1993a, 1993b) attempts to account for speakers’ motivations to use a marked language over an unmarked one (for a detailed review of this model see for instance Gafaranga, 2007a: 289-297).

It was in reaction against this “overwhelming tendency” to attribute a meaning to CS and to claim that this meaning was intended by the speaker (Li Wei, 2002: 164 and 2005b: 381) that some scholars moved away from ‘identity-related’ explanations of CS. These researchers started to leave aside the ‘why’ of CS to focus on the ‘how’ of CS (Li Wei, 1998). In this sense, they began to see CS first and foremost as a conversational activity and to study its organisation (e.g. Auer, 1984, 1998; Sebba, 1993; Gafaranga, 2007a; Li Wei and Milroy, 1995). In this respect, this shift of perspective can be referred to as the “organisational
perspective” to bilingual talk (see Table 7 and Gafaranga, 2007b). Li Wei summarises the key tenet of this perspective as follows:

Previous models of CS “seem to have drawn many researchers away from the fact that code-switching is essentially a conversational activity; it takes place within specific conversational contexts; it is structured in accordance with the general conversational organisation. The starting point of any meaningful analysis of bilingual code-switching must therefore be its location in the conversational context in which it actually occurs” (Li Wei, 2005a: 276).

From this standpoint, language choice was understood as a significant aspect of talk organisation. Since CA is the study of talk organisation, it presented itself as the most appropriate approach to this new perspective on CS research. Furthermore, CA allows an analysis of language choice in its sequential environment and invites the analyst to adopt the Ethnomethodological ‘attitude of indifference’ (Garfinkel, 1967), taking into account solely the meaning “brought about” by speakers themselves (Auer, 1992; see also Li Wei 2002: 167).

To summarise, a CA approach to CS research represents a move away from interpreting language choice with regard to social factors external to interaction itself and aims “to reveal the underlying procedural apparatus by which conversation participants themselves arrive at local interpretations of language choice” (Li Wei, 2005b: 381; see also Li Wei, 2002: 167). Proponents of a CA approach to bilingual talk at the community level include Auer (e.g. 1984, 1988, 1995, and 1998), Li Wei (e.g. 1998, 2002, and 2005) and Gafaranga (e.g. 2007a, 2007b, and 2009).

4.3.2. Auer’s CA model of code-switching

As illustrated in Table 7, two strands of research have developed in organisational accounts of bilingual talk at the community level, namely one that accounts for language choice practices vis-à-vis the local order of talk-in-interaction and one which does so vis-à-vis the overall order of talk-in-interaction. I first present the former approach developed by Auer (1984, 1988, 1995, 1998, 2000, etc.). Auer is the first scholar to have introduced a CA approach to the study of bilingual talk and is thus one of the first to see CS as a ‘language choice act’. In a seminal contribution, he writes that his aim is to investigate “members’ procedures to arrive
at local interpretations of language alternation” (1984: 3, his emphasis). Clearly, the terms “members’ procedures” and “local interpretation” indicate an emic perspective to analysis typical of an Ethnomethodological/Conversation Analytic frame of mind (see section §4.2.5).

More specifically, in his model of code-switching, Auer draws on two CA concepts. First, he uses Sacks et al.’s idea that talk is sequentially organised in a series of “turn-constructional units” (TCU) (Sacks et al, 1978). Second, he uses the notion of ‘preference’ (e.g. Pomerantz, 1984 and Schegloff, 1988) – to be understood as “a structural property of the organisation of talk” (Gafaranga, 2007a: 298) – whereby a specific act calls for another specific act, which will be a ‘preferred’ act. Building on these two concepts, Auer argues that language alternation is orderly with reference to a “preference for same-language talk” (1984: 23). That is, according to him, the norm against which speakers orient their language choice acts is that talk should be conducted in the same language as the one used in the preceding turn or TCU. In this view, instances of language alternation are interpreted as ‘dispreferred’ acts, that is, as deviant from the norm. It is because Auer analyses language choice on a turn-by-turn basis that his model is said to be based on the ‘local order’ of bilingual conversation (Gafaranga, 2007a and 2007b). In his model, Auer proposes two types of language alternation: one that he calls “code-switching” – when language alternation concerns a particular point in conversation – and another one that he calls “transfer” – when language alternation concerns a particular conversational structure. He further states that both are “contextualisation cues” (Gumperz, 1982) that signal something either about participants (language alternation is then said to be ‘participant-related’) or the organisation of talk (it is then said to be ‘discourse-related’).

Although Auer’s model has been highly influential in studies of bilingual talk (e.g. Li Wei and Milroy, 1995; Cromdal, 2004 to name but a few), some limitations of this model have recently been noted; most consistently by Gafaranga (1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2007a, 2007b, 2009) and Gafaranga and Torras (2001, 2002), who have in turn proposed an alternative CA model of code-switching.
4.3.3. Gafaranga’s CA model of code-switching

In a series of publications, Gafaranga (1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2007a, 2007b, 2009) and Gafaranga and Torras (2001, 2002) have developed an alternative CA model of code-switching building mainly on two limitations they have noted in Auer’s model. The first limitation concerns the assumption that language alternation is orderly at the local level of the turn or TCU. Indeed, Gafaranga stresses that Auer’s assumption that speakers organise their language choice acts with reference to the language used in the preceding turn or TCU leaves instances of language alternation within a turn or TCU unaccounted for (2007b: 133). Furthermore, taking the example of what Auer (1995) calls ‘language negotiation sequences’ – that is, sequences where speakers more or less explicitly negotiate, at the start of a conversation, the language in which they will interact – he convincingly argues that these sequences would be “meaningless” (2007b: 134) if language choice acts were accountable only at the level of individual turns and TCUs. Building on these observations, Gafaranga (1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2007a, 2007b, 2009) and Gafaranga and Torras (2001, 2002) suggest taking into consideration an aspect of talk organisation other than turns and TCU, namely the overall order of conversation. They argue that language alternation is orderly at the overall level of talk organisation. In this sense, Gafaranga calls his approach the ‘overall order perspective’ to the study of bilingual talk (see Table 7 and also Gafaranga, 2007b: 135; 2007a: 303; 2009: 124).

A key premise in this alternative model is the notion of ‘medium’, developed against that of ‘language’ in Auer’s notion of ‘preference for same language talk’ (for a full discussion see Gafaranga, 2007b: 143-145; 2007a: 304; Gafaranga and Torras, 2001). In this respect, the second limitation that Gafaranga raises about Auer’s model is the assumption that talk is conducted in a ‘language of interaction’, that is, in a ‘base language’. Auer (2000) uses the notion of the ‘base language’ as a “scheme” of interpretation (Garfinkel, 1967) and claims that speakers orient to it for their language choice acts. However, he also acknowledges that, in some cases, it is impossible to identify what is the base language of a
conversation insofar as the languages in use are too closely intertwined. Auer (1984, 1997) therefore tentatively suggests that, in such cases, language alternation itself must be the code. Building on this observation, researchers such as Alvarrez-Cáccamo (1998) propose differentiating the notion of ‘language’ from that of a ‘communicative code’ to account for the fact that, in some bilingual conversations, speakers may be using more than one language as one code. In a similar vein, Gafaranga suggests the notion of ‘medium of interaction’ to refer to speakers’ understanding of the communicative code and to differentiate it from the analyst’s understanding of language (see mainly Gafaranga and Torras, 2001). ‘Medium’ is thus defined as “the actually oriented-to linguistic code’ that is, the ‘communicative code’ (Alvarez-Caccamo, 1998) in which bilingual conversationalists themselves perceive their talk to be conducted” (Gafaranga and Torras, 2001: 196). To put it differently, the notion of ‘medium’ is to be defined “not in terms of linguistic items, but rather in terms of speakers’ own orientation to their language choice acts” (Gafaranga and Torras, 2001: 204). As a result, the medium of a bilingual conversation is the norm – that is, the “scheme” (Garfinkel, 1967) of interpretation – against which speakers organise their language choice acts. Gafaranga phrases this new organisational principle as ‘preference for same medium talk’ (e.g. 2007b: 145; 2007a: 305; 2009: 124).

In this model, a medium can be either monolingual or bilingual if two languages are oriented to normatively. Gafaranga and Torras (2001) further specify the notion of bilingual medium, saying that it exists firstly, in the form of a ‘parallel mode’ “when one speaker consistently uses language A while the other consistently uses language B without any orientation to the other party’s choice as divergent” (2001: 205); secondly, in the form of a ‘mixed mode’ “when all participants alternate between their languages, both between turns and within turns, without attending to the linguistic origin of the various elements they are using” (2001: 206); and thirdly, in the form of a ‘halfway-between mode’ “while one participant consistently uses one language, the other participant consistently alternates between the two languages in his/her repertoire” (2001: 207).
Insofar as the ‘medium’ is a type of social norm, any instances of language alternation must therefore be interpreted as being either a case of direct application of the norm or a case of deviance from it (Gafaranga and Torras, 2001: 204). On this basis, Gafaranga proposes a classification of different types of language choice and alternation phenomena (see mainly Gafaranga, 2007a: 306; 2007b: 145 and also Table 8). As illustrated in Table 8, in Gafaranga’s CA model of code-switching, language alternation is either, one the one hand, a medium per se (this is the case of a ‘bilingual medium’) or, on the other hand, a case of deviance from a medium (whether it be monolingual or bilingual). In the latter case, language alternation is an instance of ‘medium repair’ if it is oriented to by speakers as a repairable matter. Deviance from a medium can also be functional, what is termed ‘interactional otherness’ in Table 8. In turn, functional deviance can be either a case of ‘medium suspension’ or a case of ‘medium switching’; the former consisting of “a momentary deviance from the medium which is not repaired” (Gafaranga, 2007b: 146) and the latter consisting of participants that “stop using one medium and negotiate to use a different one for whatever reason” (Gafaranga, 2007b: 147).

**Table 8. Gafaranga’s model of language alternation**

```
Language alternation
    Alternation itself as the medium
    Alternation as deviance
        Medium repair
        Interactional otherness
            Medium suspension
            Medium switching
```

(Source: Gafaranga, 2007a: 306)
To summarise, language choice and alternation phenomena have recently been studied at the community level from a CA perspective. In this perspective, two models have been proposed, namely Auer’s and Gafaranga’s. Although both share a CA mentality, I have shown that Auer’s model is based on the norm of ‘preference for same language talk’ while Gafaranga’s is based on that of ‘preference for same medium talk’. It should be stressed at this point that none of the above CA models of bilingual talk formulate norms of interaction in terms of ‘policy’; a step that I will undertake in the present thesis. In the next section, I discuss how studies of bilingual classroom talk have built on CA models of bilingual talk.

4.4. Conversation Analysis and bilingual classroom talk
Given that the investigation of the practiced language-in-education policy in the target classroom involves the investigation of bilingual classroom talk, I now turn to the research field commonly referred to as ‘classroom code-switching (CS) research’ with a view to exploring why CA has been used to study bilingual classroom talk and whether it has been used to describe interactional norms in terms of policy. In this section, I first describe briefly how CS models developed at the community level have been used in classroom CS research (for a full review see for instance Lin, 2008; Martin-Jones, 1995; Ferguson, 2003) (§4.4.1). Next, I review significant studies that have used a CA approach to classroom CS (§4.4.2), and then discuss the ways in which language policy is explored in classroom CS studies (§4.4.3).

4.4.1. Situating a CA approach to bilingual classroom talk
In the same way as language choice and alternation phenomena are observed in bilingual talk at the community level, they are also observed in talk taking place in bilingual classrooms. The term ‘classroom code-switching’ is usually used to refer to “the alternating use of more than one linguistic code in the classroom by any of the classroom participants (e.g. teacher, students, teacher aide)” (Lin, 2008: 273). Since its emergence in the 1970s, the study of bilingual classroom talk, more
commonly referred to as ‘classroom code-switching research’, has been cross-disciplinary. In fact, classroom CS research has followed, on the whole, the CS models discussed above which were developed at the community level (Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain, 2005; Martin, 1999; Martin-Jones, 1995). CA is thus one of the main approaches to the study of bilingual classroom talk. A brief overview of the different perspectives on the study of classroom CS will enable me to situate a CA approach to bilingual classroom talk, which I will detail in the next section.

As discussed in Martin-Jones (1995, 2000), Ferguson (2003) and Lin (2008), early studies of classroom code-switching in the 1970s were conducted in the US in bilingual programmes for ethnic minority children, and aimed at comparing the use of their first language (L1) with the use of the target language (e.g. Frohlich et al, 1985). These studies relied on quantitative methods and provided percentages of talk in both languages (for detailed reviews see Ovando and Collier, 1985; Ramirez, 1980; Wong Fillmore and Valadez, 1986). Then researchers started combining quantitative methods with qualitative ones, with a view to investigating the values and attitudes conveyed by classroom participants’ language choice (e.g. Milk, 1981, 1982 and Guthrie, 1984). In this tradition, classroom discourse was still analysed as a series of individual acts that researchers would code into pre-existing and static categories. It was under the influence of interactional sociolinguistic and Conversation Analytic studies of bilingual talk that scholars started approaching bilingual classroom talk in its “sequential flow” (Martin-Jones, 1995: 95). At the same time, scholars broadened their investigation to post-colonial classroom contexts where the language of instruction is usually children’s second language (e.g. Pennington, 1995; Canagarajah, 1993, 1995; Ndayipukamiye, 1994, 1996; Merritt et al. 1992; for a detailed account see Ferguson, 2003).

From this point onwards, studies of classroom code-switching have drawn on CS models developed at the community level (Martin-Jones, 1995; Martin, 1999; Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain, 2005). This said, it should be noted that grammatical approaches to the study of bilingual classroom talk have occasionally

---

60 In this chapter, the use of the term ‘discourse’ refers to ‘language use’ or ‘interaction’. It does not refer to Ball’s (1993) understanding of discourse as a set of beliefs and ideologies.
been used (e.g., Shin, 2002); and so has Myers-Scotton’s (1993a, 1993b) markedness model (e.g. Hancock, 1997; Taylor, 2002). However, Gumperz’s (1982; Blom and Gumperz, 1972) ‘sociolinguistic’ and ‘contextualising’ accounts of language alternation, as Cromdal (2000) describes them, have influenced two separate strands of research.

On the one hand, researchers drawing on Gumperz’s sociolinguistic account used his notion of ‘we/they code’, along with Goffman’s (1974) ethnography of communication, to account for language alternation vis-à-vis the macro-societal values of languages in speakers’ speech community. To name but a few, researchers like Camilleri (1996; Grima-Camilleri, 2001), Lin (1996), Heller (1996), and Liang (2006) have adopted Gumperz’s framework to account for language alternation in bilingual classrooms. For instance, in her study of code-switching in Maltese classrooms, Camilleri (1996) argues that Maltese is used to “convey friendliness and warmth and to reduce the distance between the teacher and the learners” while English is used “to increase the social distance between the participants” (1996: 85). This first strand of research further developed to take into account the asymmetrical social relations conveyed by classroom participants’ code-switching practices. Martin-Jones and Saxena (1995, 1996, and 2003) have pioneered the analysis of classroom code-switching in light of social relations “in the classroom, in the school and beyond” (Martin-Jones, 1995); an approach which has been taken up by many researchers (see for instance the special issue of Linguistics and Education edited by Martin-Jones and Heller in 1996). Recently, influenced by critical social theory (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977) and critical research paradigms, scholars in this first strand of research have developed critical approaches to the study of classroom code-switching (see for instance Heller and Martin-Jones’s 2001 edited volume), showing the relationship between local discourse practices and the wider social and ideological order (Martin-Jones, 2007: 171).

On the other hand, a second strand of research drew on Gumperz’s (1982) ‘contextualisation’ account of language alternation (Cromdal, 2000) and analysed CS as a contextualisation cue in talk-in-interaction, following at first Auer’s model and, more recently, Gafaranga’s model of CS. This second strand of research being
of greater interest to the study at hand, as it uses a CA approach to CS, is reviewed in more detail in the next section.

4.4.2. CA models in classroom code-switching studies

As I stated earlier, Auer (1984, 1988, 1995, 1998 etc.) has laid the ground for interpreting language alternation from an organisational perspective. Building on Gumperz’s (1982) notion of code-switching as a “contextualisation cue”, he has argued that language alternation contextualises interactional activities on a turn-by-turn basis. Drawing on insights from Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis, he has thus adopted a pragmatic approach to CS research and claimed that language alternation is a conversational activity that should thus be studied in its sequential environment (sequential analysis). One feature of Auer’s model that has been frequently used in classroom CS studies is the distinction between “participant-related” and “discourse-related” code-switching. More specifically, as Martin-Jones (1995, 2000) argues, the notion of ‘participant-related’ CS can account for most language choice and alternation phenomena in bilingual classrooms where learners have a low competence in the medium of instruction.

Auer’s framework has been adopted to explain language alternation across a very wide range of classroom contexts such as primary classes in Botswana (Arthur, 1996), Brunei (Martin, 1999, 2003), and the United States (Shin and Milroy, 2000). Recently, it has also been used to study talk in higher-educational contexts such as a foreign language class in a Canadian University (Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain, 2005) and a class of English as a Foreign Language in a Turkish university (Üstünel and Seedhouse, 2005). As an illustration, let us consider two of these studies. In their study of learners’ code-switching in a German as a foreign language classroom, Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain (2005) claim the need to “tie” the analysis of code-switching in non-institutionalised context to that of institutionalised contexts such as classrooms (2005: 235). Using Auer’s model, their main argument is that learners – and not only teachers, as previously argued – use code-switching for discourse-related functions. Shin and Milroy (2000) also use Auer’s sequential approach to CS in their study of young Korean-English bilingual schoolchildren in
New York City. They demonstrate how CS is used by classroom participants to serve specific functions such as negotiating the language of an interactional episode or accommodating other participants’ language competences and preferences (2000: 381). They further show how it contributes to the organisation of conversational tasks including repair and turn-taking (2000: 351).

However, as discussed above, one major criticism of Auer’s framework is its inability to account for frequent language alternation in bilingual talk. In this regard, Auer concedes that in some cases, “it is impossible to decide if language A or B is the ‘base language’” (1995: 126). This difficulty has also been encountered in studies of classroom code-switching. For instance, in his investigation of classroom talk in Brunei classrooms, Martin notices that the two languages co-available, namely English and Malay, are “woven together” (1999: 138). Similarly, Bonacina (2005) observed in a French complementary school classroom in Scotland that some instances of language alternation, where the two languages at hand (namely French and English) are alternately used within and across turns, cannot be accounted for by reference to the notion of ‘language’. Examples such as these, where two languages are closely knit, contradict Auer’s assumption that bilingual speakers organise their language choice acts with reference to a ‘base language’. In fact, as has been argued by Gafaranga and Torras (2001), the grammarian’s notion of ‘language’ itself cannot account for instances where bilingual speakers use two languages as one code. It is in recognition of this argument that, as explained above (see section §4.3.3) researchers have recently adopted the notion of “medium of interaction” (Gafaranga 1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2007a, 2007b, 2009; Gafaranga and Torras, 2001, 2002).

Torras (2005; Torras and Gafaranga, 2002) was the first scholar to apply Gafaranga’s notion of ‘medium of interaction’ to the study of bilingual talk in an institutional context, namely service encounters in Barcelona, Spain. The notion has since been used in the study of bilingual classroom talk, mainly by Cromdal (2005), Slotte-Lüttge (2007), and Bonacina (2005; Bonacina and Gafaranga, 2010).
Cromdal (2005) describes how two students engage in the production of a written text in an English medium school in Sweden using an English and Swedish bilingual medium (2005: 339). Slotte-Lütte (2007) focuses on teacher-learner talk in a Swedish medium school in a Finnish speaking area in Finland. She shows how pupils make language alternation relevant by orienting to its “other-languageness” (Gafaranga, 2000) in talk-in-interaction (Slotte-Lütte, 2007: 106). She further argues that, by orienting to the other-languageness of Finnish, pupils orient to a monolingual norm, namely a Swedish monolingual medium. Bonacina (2005) and Bonacina and Gafaranga (2010; see also a copy in Appendix 8) have re-specified the notion of ‘medium’ for the study of bilingual classroom talk and have suggested the notion of ‘medium of classroom interaction’ as being the most appropriate ‘scheme’ (Garfinkel, 1967) for the interpretation of language choice and alternation phenomena in bilingual classroom talk. In the investigation of the practiced language-in-education policy, I will follow this recent development and adopt the notion of ‘medium of classroom interaction’ to study language choice and alternation practices in the target classroom.

I have reviewed thus far the different approaches to the study of bilingual classroom talk and discussed in more detail the Conversation Analytic one, focusing on how the two main CA models of code-switching, namely Auer’s one and Gafaranga’s one, have been drawn upon in studies of classroom code-switching. A last point that needs to be addressed is to what extent classroom code-switching research, and especially those studies using a CA mentality, relates to issues of language-in-education policy and whether anyone has attempted to describe what, building on Spolsky (2004, 2007, 2008), I have called a ‘practiced language-in-education policy’.

### 4.4.3. Classroom code-switching studies and language policy

Regardless of the approach used, the main body of classroom code-switching studies has focused on educational settings where there is an ongoing debate about language-in-education policy, such as bilingual programmes in the United States or
schools in post-colonial countries (Martin-Jones, 1995: 90). More specifically, debates on the use of children’s first languages in the classroom are often intertwined with monolingual teaching ideologies whereby it is thought that learning is best achieved through a maximum of exposure to the target language, that is, the language of instruction prescribed by the school language policy (Lin, 2008: 281). Against this background of monolingual teaching ideologies and monolingual language-in-education policies, researchers studying classroom talk in bilingual contexts have more or less pursued one single objective, namely that of showing the functionality of language alternation practices in the classroom (e.g. Pennington, 1995; Arthur, 1994, 1996; Addendorff, 1993; Martin, 1996; 1999). In this sense, findings of classroom code-switching studies converge to show that language alternation is a potential resource in content-based classes taught through a foreign language of instruction (Ferguson, 2003: 48). Specifically, it has been observed in a variety of settings that classroom CS is used for facilitating “curriculum access” or “transmitting knowledge” to pupils with low competences in the language of instruction; for “classroom management discourse”, and lastly for “interpersonal relations” (Ferguson, 2003: 39; see also Ferguson, 2009). In short, the aim of the majority of classroom CS studies has been to challenge monolingual language teaching ideologies and language-in-education policies by showing that language alternation is orderly and useful for classroom participants (see Lin, 2008: 282 for a critique of what she calls a “limited research agenda”). In this sense, the first and most common link between classroom CS studies and language-in-education policies lies in the fact that the latter usually triggers the former; that is, language-in-education policies that are monolingual prompt researchers to show the functional use of more than one language in the classroom.

A second link between classroom CS research and language-in-education policy is that, in many studies, the language of instruction prescribed by the school language policy is used as a benchmark against which language alternation is analysed (e.g. Heller, 1996; Martin, 1999; Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain, 2005). This second link flows from the first one since it is because researchers aim to show
the functionality of code-switching that they focus solely on the use of languages other than the language of instruction prescribed by the school language policy. In fact, as I have argued elsewhere (Bonacina and Gafaranga, 2010), language choice and alternation phenomena in bilingual classroom interaction is either analysed from a ‘local order’ perspective – that is, focusing on the local contrast between the alternative use of two languages – or from an ‘overall order’ perspective. In the latter, it is assumed that the language of instruction – also referred to as the ‘medium of instruction’ – prescribed by the school language policy are systematically the language of classroom interaction. From this perspective, the use of languages other than the language of instruction is seen as deviance. In other words, the ‘base language’ of classroom interaction is assumed to be the language of instruction and ‘code-switching’ is thought to be a unidirectional phenomenon, from the language of instruction to another language. This is the case, for instance, in McGlynn and Martin (2009), Probyn (2009), Butzkamm (1998), Heller (1996), Martin (1999) and, Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain (2005). In McGlynn and Martin (2009), for example, the use of Wolof and Mandinka is seen as a ‘break of the rule’, because it deviates from the normative use of English, the prescribed language of instruction. To take an example of a study conducted within a CA perspective, Martin (1999) stresses “the need to consider codeswitching in the classroom in the wider context of language policy implementation” (1999: 131). In his study of teacher-learner talk in an upper primary classroom in Brunei, he takes as the base language the “institutionally-sanctioned language” (1999: 127), that is, the language of instruction of the classroom.

Researchers adopting an overall order perspective on the organisation of bilingual classroom talk have explicitly emphasised the potential mismatch between monolingual language-in-education policies and actual multilingual classroom practices (see for instance the special issue of the International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism edited by Li Wei and Martin, 2009 and also Lin and Martin, 2005). As already discussed in Chapter Two (see section §2.5.3), in this strand of research, scholars focus on the use of languages other than the language of
instruction to stress the ‘conflicts and tensions’ between policy and practice (Li Wei, 2008: 147; Li Wei and Martin, 2009). Recently, however, Bonacina and Gafaranga (2010) have demonstrated that not all cases of language choice and alternation phenomena in bilingual classroom talk can be interpreted vis-à-vis the language of instruction. In a study of a French complementary school classroom in Scotland, we first acknowledge that some instances of talk can indeed be interpreted vis-à-vis the policy-prescribed language of instruction: these were instances of talk conducted in French, the policy-prescribed language of instruction. Then, however, we move on to instances of talk conducted in English and in both English and French and show that, in these cases, the language of instruction (i.e. French) cannot be used as an analytic framework. Therefore, with a view to accounting for the totality of our data, we draw on Gafaranga’s overall order model of language alternation and adopt the notion of ‘medium of classroom interaction’ as an alternative ‘scheme’ (Garfinkel, 1967) of interpretation to that of ‘language of instruction’. This alternative approach entails that bilingual classroom practices are no longer analysed with reference to the policy-prescribed language of instruction, but rather with reference to the ‘medium’ which speakers orient to while talking. In CA terms, the medium of classroom interaction is the “scheme” (Garfinkel, 1967) of interpretation, which speakers orient to in order to make sense of their language choice acts.

At this point, it is necessary to stress that, while the shift of perspective introduced by Bonacina and Gafaranga (2010) brings us closer to Spolsky’s (2004, 2007, and 2008) idea of a language policy at the level of language practices, interactional norms have never, to my knowledge, been formulated in terms of policy in previous studies of classroom code-switching. That is, bilingual language practices have not yet been analysed with regard to a language policy inherent to these same practices. In this sense, the present study continues to explore the ongoing relationship between classroom code-switching studies and language policy issues by investigating the practiced language policy speakers orient to in their sense-making activities. To do so, I have analysed the corpus of classroom interaction, audio-recorded in the target classroom, using Bonacina’s (2005) and
Bonacina and Gafaranga’s (2010) notion of ‘medium of classroom interaction’, insofar as it refers to the interactional norm classroom participants use to interpret their language choice acts.

4.5. Membership Categorisation Analysis (MCA)

As I have shown, Conversation Analysts study the organisation of talk-in-interaction, as well as the organisation of language choice and alternation in bilingual talk, in its sequential environment. Sequential analysis is thus one of CA’s central methods. Another central aspect of speakers’ way of producing activities is to generate categories in order to make sense of particular events. The study of categorisation (i.e. categorisation analysis or Membership Categorisation Analysis; MCA) also originates from Ethnomethodology and Sacks’s (1972a, 1972b) work. MCA consists of analysing “the methodology and relevance of Members’ activities of categorising Members” (Sacks, 1972c). In the analysis of the language-in-education policy of the target classroom, I have adopted a broad view of CA, incorporating both sequential and categorisation analysis. I thus present here an overview of the salient properties of MCA that have been useful for the study of the corpus at hand (§4.5.1). Next, I turn to key findings of MCA studies of bilingual talk (§4.5.2) and classroom talk (§4.5.3).

4.5.1. Salient properties of MCA

A first feature of MCA is the view that social actors organise their social world into “categories”, that is, “collections of things”. Sacks proposed the notion “membership categorisation device” (Sacks, 1972a, 1972b) to describe a collection of categories. For example, the terms ‘teacher’ and ‘pupil’ can be heard as part of a more general category collection that can be described as ‘school members’. Categories are not simply labels but a “doing being”. This term reveals MCA’s Ethnomethodological roots. Indeed, MCA’s main concern is “how categories are discursively produced on particular occasions and what members accomplish by using or invoking them” (Kasper, 2009: 6). In this regard, MCA entails identifying what categories members are orienting to and for what purpose. Silverman writes that “membership categorisation devices are local members’ devices, actively employed by speakers and hearers to formulate and reformulate the meanings of activities and identities” (1998: 97).

A second key notion of MCA is that membership to a categorisation device corresponds to doing specific “category-bound activities”. That is, in doing an activity bound to a certain category, a social actor makes membership to that particular category. Conversely, a social actor who claims membership to a certain category is normatively expected to perform activities bound to that category. To give an example relevant to the case at hand, a classroom participant performing the activity of ‘giving instructions’ makes membership to the category ‘teacher’. Conversely, if a classroom participant claims membership to the category ‘teacher’, he or she is expected to perform teacher-like activities such as giving instructions. As Schegloff puts it, “among the items that compose category-based common-sense knowledge are kinds of activities or actions or forms of conduct taken by the common-sense or vernacular culture to be especially characteristic of a category’s members” (2007: 470). For that reason, categories are said to be “inference rich” insofar as what is known about the category is presumed to be known about a member of that category (Schegloff, 2007: 469). Such category-bound activities are, for instance, features, predications, and rights and obligations.
A third significant aspect of MCA is that each person has a multitude of identities and can therefore have membership of many categories. However, not all identities/categories are relevant in an instance of social action. For participants to know when a category is relevant, Sacks states that they follow what he calls the “hearer's maxim” (1974: 221). According to this maxim, if there seems to be a bound relationship between an activity and a category, participants “hear it that way” (1974: 221). Furthermore, Sacks argue that there is an “economy rule” which contributes to the fact that participants recognise what category is relevant in a given social event. This rule holds that although participants may have many categories, one category is enough to identify a person (Sacks, 1974: 219). Sacks also postulates that there exists a maxim and a rule of application through which speakers display their affiliation to a category. The “consistency rule” holds that “if one person has been described by a category from a collection, then the next person may be described by the same or another category from the same collection” (Sacks, 1995a: 246). That is, if a person is seen as making membership to a category, the other participants will orient to the same category or to a category that belongs to the same categorisation device. The “viewer's maxim” holds that, since categories and activities are co-selective, the activity tells the category and the category tells the activity. 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, then: see it that way” (Sacks, 1972b: 338).

In short, MCA takes into account only the categories that are demonstrably and locally relevant and consequential (see the notion of procedural consequentiality discussed in §4.2.5) for social actors themselves. A category is relevant if, and only if, it is possible to show that it has accomplished a work in talk-in-interaction. And, conversely, aspects of talk organisation can be shaped by categories (e.g. Watson’s 1994, 1997 notion of ‘turn-generated categories’). This shows that, although MCA and CA have for long been considered two competing approaches (e.g. Schegloff, 2007; for a discussion see Carlin, 2010), they are indeed “two sides of the same coin” (Silverman, 1998: 152) (e.g. Hester and Eglin, 1997;
Housley, 1999, 2000a, 2000b; Watson, 1997 for a discussion). In this respect, Hester and Eglin write that “in practice, these aspects (the sequential and the categorisational) are so closely intertwined as to be separable only for the purposes of analysis” (1997: 2). Therefore, in the analysis of the language-in-education policy of the target classroom, both aspects of talk organisation (sequential and categorisational) will be drawn upon when relevant, pursuing what Housley and Fitzgerald call “an integrated analysis of talk” (2002: 61).

4.5.2. MCA studies of bilingual talk

I have shown above that studies of bilingual talk have been conducted initially from an identity perspective wherein language alternation was mainly considered as a *symbolic action*, that of reflecting society (see Gumperz, 1982 and Myers-Scotton, 1993 discussed in §4.3.1). This is what Cameron (1990) calls the “language-reflects-society” approach. A Conversation Analytic perspective on language alternation (see Auer, 1984; Li Wei, 1998 and Gafaranga, 2000, discussed in §4.3.2 and §4.3.3) represented a move away from this approach, in the sense that social structure is mentioned in CA if, and only if, it is demonstrably relevant for participants themselves. A CA approach to language alternation was indeed a turning point in the study of bilingual talk, for it apprehended it not as symbolic action but as *practical social action*. This standpoint has recently had major implications in the study of language alternation and identity. A significant contribution in this regard is Gafaranga’s (2001) study of language alternation from an MCA perspective. He (2001, 2005) argues that, insofar as language alternation is a social activity, it indexes a category. In other words, language alternation is a category-bound activity. He further argues that language alternation is an activity bound to a “language-based categorisation device”, which he calls “language preference” (Gafaranga, 2001: 1916; see also Gafaranga, 2005: 294). The notion of ‘language preference’ was introduced by Auer (1995, 1998) and defined as “interactional processes of displaying and ascribing (language-related) predicates” (1998: 8 in Gafaranga, 2001: 1916). In this sense, speakers “ascribe co-participants language preference and display their language preference” through their language
choice and alternation activities (Gafaranga, 2001: 1928). Crucially, Gafaranga argues that “in order to talk, bilingual speakers categorise themselves and one another either as monolingual or as bilingual and in which language(s)” (2001: 1921).

Since then, an MCA approach to language alternation has been taken up by other researchers such as Cashman (2005), Curcó (2005), Greer (2003), Higgins (2009), Kasper (2009), Mondada (2007), and Torras and Gafaranga (2002). To take an example, Torras and Gafaranga (2002) investigated tri-lingual service encounters in Spain following Gafaranga’s (2001) MCA approach to bilingual talk. One of their main findings was that in ‘medium repair’, when speakers suspend the medium they are currently interacting in to solve an interactional difficulty they also suspend one identity in favour of another (2002: 543). In ‘medium suspension’, however, speakers were found to “depart temporarily from the identity they have adopted so far, not because of any difficulty on the level of current medium but rather to enhance expressivity” (2002: 543). Similarly, Cashman (2005) studied language alternation from an MCA perspective at a senior citizens’ day program at a social service agency in an urban Latino community in the Midwestern United States. Following Gafaranga (2001, 2005), he showed how speakers “do social identities” using language alternation and language preference as a resource (2005: 302). More specifically, he showed how participants’ language choice and alternation acts are a resource for them to ascribe, accept or reject group memberships (2005: 307). A last example is Higgins’s (2009) study of a Swahili-English conversation recorded between two journalists in a newspaper office in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Extending Gafaranga (2001, 2005), Higgins examined how these two journalists used language alternation to resist and disaffiliate from categories they had been ascribed to by their interlocutor. One of her main observations was that “language alternation co-occurs with the disjunction in MCDs (Membership Categorisation Devices)” (2009: 132). These three examples show that MCA has recently proven to be a useful method for investigating identities in bilingual talk as a practical social action.
4.5.3. MCA studies of bilingual classroom talk

Membership Categorisation Analysis offers itself as a key tool for the study of talk in institutional contexts such as classrooms insofar as it aims to show the relevance of institutional roles and other social structures in the unfolding of talk-in-interaction. As Kasper argues, MCA provides “a systematic link between talk and social structure as it examines how participants invoke and use their commonsense knowledge of social context through membership categorisation” (2009: 12). Categorisation analysis – along with sequential analysis – thus enables one to see how an institutional context or identity is “talked into being” (Heritage, 1984: 290).

For these reasons, a number of researchers have studied everyday life in classrooms from an MCA perspective, focusing on how the relational pair ‘teacher’ and ‘student’ is constructed in interaction and in turn, contributes to classroom management. These include Dashwood (2005), Freebody and Herschell (2000), Green and Dixon (1994), Payne and Cuff (1982), Richards (2006), Talmy (2009), and Weiyun He (2004). Baker and Freebody (1987, 1996) have also applied MCA to the study of textbooks. I present two recent studies as a way of illustrating how MCA is currently applied to the study of classroom talk (full reviews of MCA studies of classroom talk can be found in Watson, 1992 and Baker, 1997). A first important study is He’s (2004) investigation of identity construction in two Chinese heritage language schools in the US. Using both a sequential and categorisation analysis, she showed how, through the interactional mechanism of repair (Schegloff et al., 1977), the classroom identities were “expressed and negotiated on a moment-by-moment basis” (2004: 203). More specifically, she demonstrated that students of these Chinese heritage language classes challenged the teacher’s categorisation as the ‘expert’. Furthermore, students were seen to make membership to both the categories of ‘Chinese learner’ and ‘American pupil’, moving in and out of these group identities principally through the use of personal pronouns (2004: 212). A second influential MCA study of classroom talk is Richards (2006). In his study of classroom extracts from a variety of educational contexts, Richards’s primary aim
was to show that ‘conversation’ was possible in classroom interaction when the teacher was not ‘doing being’ the teacher and related to the other classroom participants on an equal footing. Of interest in his study is his call to see the category ‘teacher’ and ‘student’ not as analytically given but rather as being constructed and oriented to in interaction (2006: 59). Drawing on Zimmerman’s (1998) categories of identity – namely, discourse, situated and transportable identity – he stated that the “default position” in classroom talk was characterised by “orientation to situated identities, realised through their characteristic discourse identities and with no evidence of transportable identity” (2006: 61). That is, the default position was when the adult was doing being the teacher by relying on discourse features bound to the category teacher, such as controlling the floor, asking questions and issuing instructions. In short, these two examples of MCA studies of classroom talk show that researchers adopting an MCA approach to classroom interaction consider the roles of ‘teacher’ and ‘student’ to be practical social identities enacted by different interactional patterns in talk-in-interaction. They further show that CA and MCA are related approaches that can fruitfully be combined.

Last but not least, this brief overview of MCA of classroom talk indicates that, although some of the studies mentioned above were conducted in bi/multilingual educational contexts (e.g. Dashwood, 2005; He, 2004), it seems that very little attention has yet been given to the relationship between categories and language choice and alternation phenomena in the classroom. The only exception is Talmy’s (2009) study of ESL learners resisting ‘ESL categories’ in Hawaii classrooms. Conducting what he calls an “M/CA” approach to classroom interaction (2009: 183), Talmy observed that a teacher switches from English to the local Pidgin in order to induce a ‘bad’ student to comply with his directives. He writes that by switching, the teacher talked “into relevance his membership in a new candidate category in which standardised English and Pidgin, the language of Local identity and culture, are spoken” (2009: 198). In Chapter Seven, I will show how categories play an important role in participants’ language choice practices.
4.6. **Summary**

In this chapter, I have presented the key principles of Conversation Analysis and Membership Categorisation Analysis useful for the present study. I have also introduced CA models of bilingual talk and bilingual classroom talk, emphasising principally the notion of “medium of classroom interaction” (Bonacina, 2005; Bonacina and Gafaranga, 2010) – built on the notion of “medium of interaction” (Gafaranga, 2007a etc.) – which represents the ‘scheme’ (Garfinkel, 1967) of interpretation that classroom participants use in their language choice activities.
5.1. Introduction

In this chapter, I present the methods I adopted to collect the data. I present the rationale behind methodological decisions (§5.2) and explain the specific set of data I focused on and the steps of data analysis I undertook (§5.3). Lastly, I discuss some practical and ethical issues I encountered, focusing especially on ethical issues in access negotiations with gatekeepers, issues of self-presentation with a variety of research participants, issues linked to the observer’s paradox and issues in transcribing multilingual talk (§5.4).

5.2. Methods of data collection

In designing a methodology for the present case study, a number of constraints needed to be taken into consideration. First, I made the hypothesis that language policy issues would be more salient in contexts where more than one language would be used in interaction. It was therefore essential to conduct a case study in a bi/multilingual educational context. In this regard, induction classrooms for newly-arrived immigrant children seemed an ideal context to illustrate a Conversation Analytic approach to the study of a practiced language policy, so long as bi/multilingual practices were occurring. Thus, a first consideration while designing the methodology was to find a way to access an induction classroom where newly-arrived immigrant children’s first languages were used in interaction. A second key aspect for consideration was the methods to be used to collect good quality and naturally occurring classroom talk, as this is a basic requirement for conducting a Conversation Analysis. This needed to be considered carefully given that classroom contexts are usually noisy environments. A third point that necessitated careful
planning was the design of a method to collect contextual information on the classroom participants, and especially on their beliefs about language use. Indeed, while previous studies provide contextual information on the language ideologies held in French society as well as in the French educational system (see section §3.2 and 3.3), information needed to be collected regarding language ideologies in the target classroom to provide an enriched context. However, eliciting language ideologies from inducted children with a low proficiency in French would potentially be difficult. The last aspect of the methodology design concerned ways of providing accessible feedback to the researched community.

Based on these requirements and building on Holmes and Stubbe’s (2003: 21–23) four-fold model of data collection in the workplace, I designed a methodology that would be carried out in five stages, namely (1) gaining access, (2) semi-participant preliminary observation, (3) semi-participant observation and audio-recording, (4) collecting additional information, and (5) feedback. These five stages are discussed in the sections below. Ethical considerations are discussed in §5.4.1.

5.2.1. Trajectory of access

For data collection to be possible as well as useful for the purpose of the study, I needed to obtain access to an induction classroom, and more specifically to its potential bi/multilingual language practices. Based on my experience as a pupil in a French state school and on explanations available on the official website of the French Ministry of Education (see http://www.education.gouv.fr/), I came to understand that the inspector of an Inspection Académique61 grants permission to enter schools provided that informal consent has first been given by the head-teacher of a school and by the teachers who are targeted by the study (see Table 9 for a graphic representation of the hierarchy of the French state educational system). Obtaining this informal consent was the first difficulty I encountered in my “trajectory of access” (Bruni, 2006) insofar as I did not have informal contacts in schools. A further and related issue that soon arose was that, as an outsider to
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61 To recall, Inspection Académiques are local educational authorities.
French state schools, I did not have access to the list of primary schools running an induction programme for newly-arrived migrant children. In brief, I could not approach induction teachers informally because I did not know in which schools they were working.

As a consequence, I decided to contact the CASNAV of Paris, which, as explained above (see section §3.4.3.3), is an academic centre that provides training to induction teachers and coordinates induction programmes in their Académie. Although each CASNAV is directly attached to the Ministry of Education (see Table 9), their representatives do not evaluate teaching practices. In this sense, they initially represented the ideal “intermediate gatekeeper” (Wanat, 2008: 199), who could act as my “guarantor” (Gobo, 2008: 121) and introduce me informally to head-teachers and induction teachers. Indeed, following access negotiations initiated in January 2007 and reported in more detail in section §5.4.2 as well as in Bonacina (forthcoming; see also Appendix 6), CASNAV representatives introduced me to two induction teachers in the Académie of Paris in April 2006.

Table 9. The hierarchy of the French state educational system.
These two induction teachers invited me to their classroom for a short period of preliminary observations. The inspector gave his permission after close examination of my application, which consisted of: a letter explaining my motivation for the study, proof of studentship and an agreement letter signed by the head of my department, my supervisor and the head teacher for him to sign also. I visited the first induction classroom for two weeks in May 2007 to conduct the second stage of my research, namely semi-participant observation. There I observed that the classroom participants interacted in the many languages co-available. I thus arranged to conduct a longer period of actual data collection; moving to the third stage of my research and explicitly stating to the induction teacher my research interest in multilingual practices. However, on my return to this classroom in September 2007, I observed that the teacher interacted with the pupils strictly in French and systematically interrupted or discouraged the use of children’s first languages. One of the explanations I posit for such a change in behaviour is that the teacher became aware of her multilingual practices through my own observations and subsequently adjusted her teaching method to be in line with either her own monolingual ideology of language teaching and learning, or with that of the CASNAV representatives. The point here is that the practiced language policy was immediately identifiable as being one where French was the sole language allowed in the classroom, and thus rendered data collection and analysis pointless. As a consequence, I decided to turn to another classroom where language choice practices would be more complex.

Based on this first experience, I visited the second induction classroom in October 2007, stating the focus of my research to the induction teacher from the outset. However, this upfront explanation led the teacher to conduct what can be called a ‘demonstration class’. Despite my best efforts to explain that I was interested in observing naturally occurring classroom talk, she kept suspending interactions to explain why a language other than French had been used. At the end of the arranged two weeks of preliminary observation, she said she had shown me all the practices in her classroom and refused to take part in the actual process of
data collection. It is most likely that she refused to give me access to un-staged classroom practices because she perceived me as an evaluator associated with the CASNAV rather than an independent researcher.

In fact, it was only by approaching induction teachers without the direct mediation of the CASNAV that I finally gained access to teachers willing to grant me both entry to their classroom and access to their “de facto language policy” (Shohamy, 2006). Adopting a “bottom-up approach to access” (Silverman, 2000), I sent, in November 2007, a call for participation to induction teachers via an internal mailing list given to me by the CASNAV of the Hauts-de-Seine department, which had been recommended by the CASNAV of Paris. This mailing list was used and read only by induction teachers, which gave me the opportunity to introduce myself as someone with internal access to the educational system (and, therefore, as trustworthy) while dissociating myself from gatekeepers. In the call for participation, I explicitly stated my interest in multilingual classroom practices, which allowed induction teachers to self-select for participation according to their ideologies of language teaching and learning. It was through this call that I met, in December 2007, the induction teacher of the target classroom who, as described earlier (see section §3.5.4), held positive ideologies towards the use of children’s first languages in the classroom.

My “route of access” (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007) has thus been a circuitous and lengthy one, which started in January 2007 and led me to the target classroom in December 2007. It clearly shows that, although all induction classrooms are linguistically heterogeneous, not all of them display multilingual practices. In this regard, the induction classroom where I chose to undertake the proposed study cannot be said to be representative of all induction classrooms in France. It was chosen because multilingual practices were observed and that I made the hypothesis that language policy issues would be more salient in contexts where more than one language would be used in interaction.
5.2.2. Preliminary semi-participant observation

Once the Inspector of the Inspection Académique of the Hauts-de-Seine department had granted me access to the target primary school (which I call by the pseudonym La Plaine), I was able to move on to the second stage of my project and to conduct a two week period of preliminary observation in December 2007 both in the school at large and in the induction classroom. The objectives were:

i. to familiarise myself with the context to be studied
ii. to build rapport with children and staff
iii. to find the least obtrusive place to sit in the classroom and role to play in the school in order to reduce the “observer’s paradox” (Labov, 1972)
iv. and to assess the type of recording equipment needed for the third phase of the methodology design.

In line with objective (i), I chose to conduct these preliminary observations myself and thought it best to conduct ‘semi-participant observation’: that is when the researcher engages only partially with activities in the community observed (e.g. Martin et al., 2003: 5), as opposed to the more traditional ‘participant observation’ when the researcher fully engages with activities in the community observed (e.g. DeWalt and DeWalt, 2002: 1). This meant that I was engaging only partly in classroom and school activities, which gave me the necessary time and space to test out the recording material. This strategy also helped me maintain a more or less ‘neutral’ status in the school, avoiding being associated with trainee teachers to whom a ‘positive image’ of the school and of teaching is usually presented. It further helped dissociate me from the role of ‘teacher’ that inducted children first allocated me (for a full discussion see §5.4.2 below), in the hope of later eliciting language beliefs and ideologies that they may not have disclosed to a teacher.

At the end of these two weeks of preliminary semi-participant observations, I had gained a better understanding of the organisation of the school and the induction classroom. I had also developed solid foundations on which to build a trusting and collaborative relationship with the staff of La Plaine and the induction teacher. Furthermore, I found that the least intrusive place to sit in the induction classroom – which Duranti aptly calls the “blind spot” (1997: 101) – was the right
hand corner at the back of the classroom (see Picture 3 in Chapter Three for a seating plan in the induction classroom). It also happened to be the best place to record classroom talk as it was away from the windows, which were usually open and thus let in outside noise in the classroom. Assessment of the recording equipment indicated that I would need to use an external bi-directional soundcatcher microphone in order to be able to audio-record both teacher-led and peer-led talk. On the whole, the induction classroom participants seemed to have adjusted to my presence as well as to the audio-recorder (for a full discussion see §5.4.3 below), which meant that I could now move on to the third phase of the methodology, which consisted in undertaking classroom audio-recording and further semi-participant observation.

5.2.3. Audio-recording and semi-participant observation

The third phase of the research I designed for the present study consisted of an extensive period of semi-participant observation along with audio-recording of interaction in the target induction classroom. This phase was carried out over the second term of the school year, during the eight weeks between January and the winter break. In this period, I visited the induction classroom three and a half days a week on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays and left the classroom participants to ‘rest’ from my presence on the Friday afternoon and Saturday morning (see Appendix 3 for a list of the days I visited the induction classroom). Note that the school was closed on Wednesdays.

The rationale for recording classroom talk lies in the fact that Conversation Analysis, being the study of talk-in-interaction, requires a minute analysis of actual occurrences of talk. This involves repeated listening to interaction, which is only possible if talk has been recorded. Another key requirement is to be able to collect naturally occurring classroom talk. With this in mind, I continued to conduct semi-participant observations, which allowed me to reduce to a minimal level any effects of the “observer’s paradox” (Labov, 1972; see also section §5.4.3 below). Furthermore, the recording needed to be of good quality so that the data collected could be accurately transcribed and shared during dissemination activities within
the academic community. To overcome the background noise of the classroom, I chose to use a digital audio-recorder (Iriver solid state recorder) in combination with an external bi-directional soundcatcher microphone (Sony MS907 Electret Stereo microphone) and to record sound as WAV files (which have a better resolution than Mp3 files). One advantage of using an external microphone was that it could record sounds produced on the other side of the classroom, which was not possible with the built-in microphone. Moreover, its bi-directionality meant that I could record both dyadic talk and multi-partied talk. This was crucial since, as already reported (section §3.5.5), inducted children were usually asked to work in pairs or small groups. A bi-directional microphone also meant that the background noise was reduced when recording dyadic talk. This was highly useful since, given the semi-withdrawal principle of the target induction classroom, children were moving chairs around and chatting as they moved in and out of the classroom. It should also be noted that the digital audio-recorder was small and portable (which meant that I was able to carry it around the school and the induction classroom), protected from any potential accidents in the classroom by a leather padded pocket, and equipped with a long life battery and ample memory space (which meant that I could use it all day long without having to recharge it or download files). I was thus able to record good quality, naturally occurring classroom talk, and the full spectrum from teacher-led interaction to peer-led interaction.

Decisions also had to be made regarding the amount of audio-recording I was going to make, when I would record, and what small group I would record if not all three small groups. Based on preliminary observations conducted during the second stage of the methodology design, I noticed that the induction teacher organised her lessons around a topic, a story or a cultural event over several consecutive days, if not weeks. For this reason, I decided to record a series of consecutive days in order to collect large amount of data where the classroom participants would most likely be engaging in a limited range of tasks or topics. The motivation for this decision was to facilitate and limit the collection of contextual information relating to the recorded talk. I thus chose to conduct 11 days of audio-
recording in the second half of my visit, recording all day (from 8.30am to 4.15pm) on Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays and half a day on Fridays (see Appendix 3 for a calendar where the days I conducted audio-recordings are noted). The day being divided into five sessions (see Table 6 in Chapter Three for an example), I tried, on the whole, to open a new sound file only at the start of each of them. In total, I audio-recorded 30 hours of classroom talk, divided into 46 sound files. These 30 hours seemed enough as they covered a wide range of classroom activities and included both teacher-led and peer-led interaction. Lastly, it should be noted that I chose to focus audio-recordings of peer-led interaction on the advanced group (i.e. Group 3; for a description see section §3.5.5) where children were given tasks that required intensive collaborative work (and therefore talking), as opposed to the other two groups where children were asked to work mainly individually on their literacy skills.

The fact that I conducted audio-recordings of classroom talk invites two questions: first, why conduct only audio-recording and not video-recording; second, why only within the induction classroom and not outside the classroom? Although video-recording would have provided more contextual and non-verbal information, I chose to solely conduct audio-recording because the induction teacher stated at the start of the preliminary observation period that she would feel more comfortable being audio-recorded than video-recorded. Second, although it would have been interesting to collect interaction taking place outside the classroom walls, it was not necessary in order to investigate the practiced language-in-education policy of the target classroom. Therefore, due to time constraints and the focus set for this study, I decided to limit the audio-recording process to talk taking place within the inducted classroom. One potential issue I foresaw in using only audio-recording was that it would probably be difficult to identify speakers’ voices and retrospectively to understand what activity speakers were engaging in. For this reason, I pursued semi-participant observations in the induction classroom while audio-recordings were made. Furthermore, being in the classroom allowed me to move the microphone according to whether the classroom participants were
interacting as a whole class or in small groups. Most importantly, it enabled me to make “contextual notes” (Holmes and Stubbe, 2003: 23) in a fieldwork notebook regarding the type of activity speakers were engaging in, the number and identity of children present at the time of a specific recording and where they were seated. I also noted the digital time showing on the audio-recorder when I observed language choice issues, in order to have a first indication of where and when to find language alternation phenomena in the corpus. Other contextual information was collected to supplement the audio-recorded data, including photographs of the blackboard when the induction teacher used it and photocopies or photographs of exercise sheets and other teaching materials used by the classroom participants while being recorded. These have been included in the transcripts when necessary (see Appendix 9).

5.2.4. Collecting additional information

The fourth stage of the research consisted in collecting additional information to supplement the recorded data, or as Aberbach and Rockman (2002: 673) put it, “to fill in pieces of a puzzle or confirm the proper alignment of pieces already in place”. One aspect of this process involved collecting all written documents available in La Plaine regarding the functioning of the school (such as the number of registered pupils and the number of school staff). Likewise, the induction teacher consented to let me photocopy her paperwork regarding the organisation of her classroom (such as time tables and lesson plans) and biographical information on the inducted children (such as their age and nationality). To recall, ethical considerations are discussed in section §5.4.1.

Another aspect of this process involved eliciting background information from the school staff involved with the education of inducted children as well as from the inducted children themselves. The aim was to elicit two different types of data; on the one hand, “factual information” (Codó, 2008: 161) about educational provisions for inducted children and on the other hand, “perspective information” (ibid.) about language beliefs and ideologies. This second type of data was necessary in order to be able to relate the practiced language policy observed in the target induction classroom to the policy at the level of language beliefs and
ideology, as well as the one at the level of language management (Spolsky, 2004; see also section §2.5.4 for a full discussion of Spolsky’s model of language policy). To recall, the aim of this study was not to provide a full picture of the language policy of the target induction classroom, but rather an account of its practiced language policy using a Conversation Analysis approach. Nevertheless, it was felt that the value of investigating a practiced language policy would be best appreciated if one was able to relate it to the other two levels of language policy (i.e. language beliefs and language management). Given that overt language management is absent in the specific context of induction classrooms (as already mentioned in section §3.4.3.4), only language beliefs and ideologies needed to be elicited.

Therefore, in order to elicit participants’ “frame of reference” (Drever, 1995: 15), I chose to visit La Plaine a third time for a week (in June 2008) to conduct interviews with the head-teacher, three mainstream teachers who welcomed inducted children on a part time basis, the induction teacher and the inducted children. Following the model of the ‘elite interview’ (e.g. Aberbach and Rockman, 2002), I conducted with the head-teacher a semi-structured interview with a majority of open-ended questions. Such open questions were of the following type: what language policy do you think you have to implement? What language policy would you rather implement? What language policy do you think is actually practiced in your school? The interview took place in her office towards the start of my third visit, lasted for forty five minutes and was not recorded as she expressed a strong preference for me taking notes rather than audio-recording her. I conducted similar semi-structured interviews with the three mainstream teachers individually, asking a similar set of questions. Each interview lasted for about twenty minutes, was audio-recorded and took place in the school library, which is a more neutral (and quieter) place than classrooms or staff rooms. With the induction teacher, I conducted one audio-recorded semi-structured interview, which was an hour and a half in length. This took place in her classroom after school hours and towards the end of my third visit. It should also be mentioned that more informal ‘open-ended
interviews’ were conducted during my second visit as the induction teacher and I spent many of our lunch breaks together. Due to the spontaneous and unplanned character of these conversations, they were not audio-recorded. However, information was noted in a field notebook soon after.

With the inducted children, the issue arose as to how to elicit beliefs and ideologies about language given their young age and low proficiency in French. As has already been noted, “the types of aspects researchers on bilingualism seek details on, like values, attitudes, beliefs, and motivations, tend to be difficult to verbalize” (Codó, 2008: 162). This is all the more true when trying to elicit them from young language learners. With this in mind, I organised semi-structured group interviews with the inducted children around a card game I designed for that specific purpose. This card game was “something [for children] to do” during the interviews, which is a recommended practice in interviews with children (Keats, 2000: 92). Furthermore, it created a playful atmosphere, which contrasted with the usual classroom tasks and encouraged the children to reflect upon their language choice practices without feeling the pressure to provide ‘the right answer’. The informal character of the interviews was reinforced by the fact that they were held in a room different from the children’s usual classroom and that the card game was played on the floor as opposed to desks. In addition to facilitating communication, this card game served as the point of departure for more open discussions within each group. I chose to interview two or three children together in order to elicit divergent perceptions among the inducted children as well as to put them at ease in the interviewing process. Children self-selected to participate in these interviews and a total of eight children volunteered. I grouped children who were used to working or playing together in order to facilitate conversation and collaboration in the accomplishment of the task given to support the interview. The eight children were thus allocated to three groups. The first group consisted of:

- Amkoulel†62 (Peul speaker),
- Andrea (Spanish speaker) and

62 These names are pseudonyms.
- Hakim (Arabic speaker).

The second group was made up of:
- Talia (Spanish and English speaker),
- Leila (Spanish speaker) and
- Karen (English speaker).

The third group was made up of:
- Kenji (Japanese speaker) and
- Piotr (Polish speaker).

The three interviews lasted approximately twenty minutes each and were all audio-recorded. The outcomes of the game were photographed.

The card game itself consisted of a board and a set of cards (see Appendix 4 for the set of cards). Using pictograms, the cards represented a total of twelve actions such as ‘eating and drinking’ along with language actions such as ‘speaking in Arabic’ or ‘speaking in French’. The eight languages co-present in the classroom\(^{63}\) (i.e. French, English, Spanish, Peul\(^{64}\), Japanese, Polish, Lithuanian and Arabic; see also Table 3 and 4) were included in the card set. To represent the action of speaking in a particular language, I used the flag of the children’s home countries, grouping the British and American flags for English and the Ecuadorian, Mexican, Argentinean and Columbian flags for Spanish. Although representing a language by a flag is a debatable procedure, it appeared to be the most intelligible way to indicate to the children what languages were being discussed in the interview. The card game had two objectives. The first was to investigate the children’s “set of beliefs about appropriate language practices” (Spolsky, 2004: 14, my emphasis). To this end, children had to classify the twelve actions in two columns: one for actions they ‘had the right to do’ (column entitled in French “on a le droit”) and one for actions they ‘didn’t have the right to do’ (column entitled in French “on n’a pas le droit”). I chose these two French expressions based on ethnographic observations of the classroom where I noticed that children were

\(^{63}\) Taking into account only the languages co-available when the inducted children were present and excluding the languages of the children benefiting from one hour support as well as those of the three children who arrived towards the end of the school year.

\(^{64}\) Peul is a language from West Africa. It is also called Pulaar or the Fula language.
familiar with the teacher’s set phrase “non, tu n’as pas le droit” (no, you’re not allowed). Picture 5 gives an example of what an outcome of the first task looked like.

**Picture 5. Example of an outcome from task 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On a le droit</th>
<th>On n’a pas le droit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second objective was to investigate the children’s set of beliefs about actual language practices, that is, what languages children said they were using in specific domains of their induction classroom. To this end, children had to classify the eight language actions in four columns: ‘Avec la maîtresse’ (with the teacher), ‘avec un ami’ (with a friend), ‘en petits groupes’ (in small groups) and ‘à l’écrit’ (in writing). These four domains had been identified prior to the interviews and correspond to the way in which classroom activities were organised. Picture 6 gives an example of what an outcome of the second task looked like.
Given that the central focus of this thesis is to investigate a practiced language-in-education policy from a CA perspective to support the claim that CA is an efficient approach for the study of practiced language policies, I have included findings from interviews in Chapter Three as a way to give a richer context to the study.

### 5.2.5. Providing feedback

The last stage of the methodology designed for the present study consisted of finding ways to provide accessible feedback to the school staff. Given the time scale necessary to complete the analysis of the data collected, it was felt important to provide at least some general feedback at the end of each of my three visits. I thus gave brief and informal oral presentations to the head-teacher and all interested school staff on the research activities I conducted. More detailed feedback was given to the induction teacher, who asked to see samples of transcriptions of audio-recordings in order to improve her own teaching techniques, and also copies of audio files of specific teaching sequences.
Liaison with the head-teacher and the induction teacher continued well beyond the actual data collection process, which gave me an opportunity to inform them regularly about the progress of my study and my various dissemination activities in the academic community. Further dissemination activities targeted for induction teachers and inducted children of the Académie have been planned and will be conducted during a Post-Doctoral Fellowship funded by the ESRC. Such activities include a workshop for induction teachers and one for inducted children based on the interactional data I collected and a hopefully accessible summary of my research to be uploaded on the CASNAV website of Paris and the Hauts-de-Seine department.

5.3. Data and steps for data analysis

An early question that arose at the start of the data analysis process concerned the selection of the data to be analysed and the way in which I would integrate the multiple types of data I collected. In answer to that question, I decided to focus principally on the corpus of audio-recorded classroom interaction, as the investigation of a practiced language policy from a CA perspective necessitated mainly a sequential and categorisation analysis of classroom talk. That said, the ethnographic data I collected in the target classroom as well as in the school at large has informed to a certain extent the analysis. More specifically, ethnographic information has been used cautiously and sparingly, following Mori and Zuengler’s (2008) advice:

“When ethnographic information can help researchers emulate the ways in which the participants themselves interpret or construct each turn at talk, it is only through the careful explication of the detailed manner in which each turn is delivered and each sequence of talk is developed that researchers can ground their characterisations of participants or settings” (2008: 24).

In this sense, ethnographic data has been used to throw light on particular aspects of identities or in-house terms that the classroom participants were referring to. Otherwise, as I have already said, it has mainly been used as background information in Chapter Three and as a way to relate the observed practiced
language-in-education policy to the other levels of language policy in the classroom and beyond in Chapter Nine.

In this section, I describe step by step how I undertook the analysis of the corpus of interaction. The first step in the data analysis process consisted of organising the 30 hours of audio-recordings. To do so, I used a labelling system indicating the visit number in which the recording took place (e.g. T1), the school (e.g. S1), the day of recording (e.g. D1) and the voice file number (e.g. V1). At a later stage, when I organised voice files into extracts, I added to this labelling system the extract number (e.g. E1). To give an example, an extract labelled “T2S1D1V1E1” indicates that it is the first extract from voice file 1, which was audio-recorded on day 1, in school 1 during the second visit. To recall, data audio-recorded during the first visit were not included in analysis as they were conducted to test the recording equipment and to familiarise the classroom participants with being audio-recorded (see also section §4.4.3). A full list of voice files made during the 11 days of audio-recording along with their respective length and labelling can be found in Appendix 2.

The second step of the data analysis process consisted of transcribing the audio-recorded data. I transcribed twenty-five out of the thirty hours of audio-recordings and inserted, when necessary, photographs of textual material as well as a seating plan of the classroom (see Appendix 9 for a copy of the transcripts). Decisions on what to transcribe were based on the quality of the recording and the amount of talk taking place during the recording. For instance, in small-group interaction, I only transcribed sequences where pupils were interacting audibly with each other. Furthermore, field notes taken during semi-participant observation helped localise sequences when more than one language was used in interaction. Although the totality of the data has not been transcribed, efforts have been made to transcribe full interactional sequences. As for the transcription process itself, I played repeatedly a stretch of talk using a foot pedal and typed its transcription in a Word document. At the start and the end of each extract, I have indicated the timing
of the audio-recordings in order to facilitate future listening to the transcribed passage. Furthermore, in order to provide what seemed the best “trade-off between readability and comprehensiveness” (Seedhouse, 2004: 15), I used a set of transcription conventions based on Jefferson (1985, 2004) and McHoul (1978) (see Appendix 1 for a list of transcription conventions).

To transcribe talk conducted in languages other than the two languages I am fluent in – that is, French and English – I used the services of native speakers. For most languages, the translation process was limited to a few occurrences of talk. However, for Spanish and Japanese, which are frequently used in my data, I trained two translators of Spanish and one translator of Japanese in transcribing techniques and hired them to transcribe talk in these two languages. Issues linked to the transcription of multilingual talk are discussed in more detail in section §5.4.4.

Once the audio-recordings had largely been transcribed, the next step consisted of repeated listening to the audio-recordings in conjunction with close inspection of the transcripts, as recommended by most CA practitioners (e.g. ten Have, 1999: 155). The aim was to identify practices of language choice and alternation phenomena by conducting sequential analysis of the transcribed interaction. With this in mind, I aimed to answer the CA question ‘why that, in that way, right now?’; which, as Seedhouse writes, “encapsulates the perspective of interaction as action (why that) which is expressed by means of linguistic forms (in that way) in a developing sequence (right now)” (2004: 16).

Initially, structures were identified, noted in the margins of transcripts and entered in a content log of transcriptions. The main structure I focused on was the identification of the ‘medium of classroom interaction’ (Bonacina, 2005; Bonacina and Gafaranga, 2010) that the participants oriented to. Due to the lack of many ‘medium negotiation sequences’, identification of the medium was undertaken by examination of repair sequences, deviant cases and word searches. As noted by Gafaranga, ‘medium repairs’ are “crucial, for analysts can use [them] to tell the medium as participants themselves view it” (2007b: 146). Indeed, repair sequences were of interest insofar as, while repairing a language choice act, speakers indicate
to the other speakers as well as to the analyst what medium they are orienting to. Likewise, deviant case analyses (Heritage, 1984a) were helpful in order to discover what language choice speakers oriented to as being normative. Lastly, word searches were particularly helpful to examine whether or not speakers decided to rely on their bi/multilingual linguistic repertoire to overcome the fact that they were lacking a ‘mot juste’. Next, frequent structures led to the identification of regularities, that is, practices. However, as Liddicoat (2007) puts it, I did not stop at a description of regularities but sought to show “that regularities are methodically produced and oriented to by participants” (2007: 11). Further examination of the corpus enabled me to see whether new instances of language choice and alternation phenomena were instances of deviance from an existing practice or a first occurrence of a practice yet to be discovered.

Next, I aimed to account for the norms of these observed language choice and alternation practices, that is, the reference points that the classroom participants drew upon to organise and make sense of their language acts. In order to unravel these points of reference (i.e. the commonsense knowledge of the appropriateness of language choice and alternation acts in this particular classroom), I set out to identify what aspects of the talk – either sequential or categorisational – occasioned certain language choice and alternation practices. To do so, I analysed the classroom participants’ orientations to sequential or categorisational aspects of interaction and examined to what extent they were linked to language choice and alternation practices. The main aim was to determine a set of norms for language choice and alternation practices; what Spolsky and Shohamy call “the idea that members of a community have of appropriate behaviour” (2000: 29). As a result, the set of identified norms of language choice and alternation practices is part of the practiced language-in-education policy of the target classroom.

5.4. Practical and ethical issues

In this last section, I report and discuss some of the practical and ethical issues encountered during the data collection and data analysis processes described above.
I first give an account of ethical considerations (§5.4.1), then discuss issues of self-presentation (§5.4.2). I finally turn to the solutions adopted to overcome initial signs of an observer’s paradox (§5.4.3) and problems in transcribing a multilingual corpus (§5.4.4).

5.4.1. Ethical considerations

Ethical issues linked with the processes of data collection and data analysis described above were carefully considered before and during the study, as well as during the dissemination of findings. I have adhered to the codes of ethics of the ESRC (2005) and BAAL (2007). This project also obtained approval from the ethics committee of the Linguistics and English Language Department of the University of Edinburgh. It also conforms to the ethical requirements for applied linguistics research conducted in France (Baude, 2006).

More specifically, before entering La Plaine, I sought written consent from the inspector of the Inspection Académique of the Hauts-de-Seine department, the head-teacher and the induction teacher to conduct ethnographic research. Once in the school, I obtained written consent from parents or carers of inducted children to conduct audio-recordings of classroom interaction and to use biographical data (such as age, sex, nationality and languages spoken) in this thesis and in any other disseminating activities (see Appendix 5 for a copy of a consent form for parents and carers). Similarly, the induction teacher, the three mainstream teachers and the head-teacher signed a consent form prior to their interviews. I also asked permission to use information collected during informal conversations I had with the induction teacher over our lunch breaks.

On each occasion, I gave participants the option of non-participation and stressed that they could withdraw from the research at any point. I further explained that they could ask me to delete any stretches of recorded talk they did not want me to include in my data. With all participants, it also was agreed that anonymity would be preserved in the thesis and in any other disseminating activities. To this end, I have changed participants’ names, disguised their faces on photos and deleted
any information (such as the name and the location of the school) that could reveal participants’ identity.

Obtaining informed consent from the school staff and the induction classroom participants was a straightforward matter because their language ideologies converged with the research focus of the study. This was not the case in access negotiations with representatives of the Parisian CASNAV during the first stage of the methodology design (see section §5.2.1). Aware of possible monolingual language ideologies in the French educational system, and therefore of a potential “conflict of interest” (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 52) between my object of enquiry and their perceptions of such enquiry, the question arose as to how I could provide CASNAV representatives with enough information so that they could give me an ‘informed consent’ as required by codes of practice, while at the same time not jeopardising access to schools. During initial conversations, I indeed observed that the use of inducted children’s first languages in the classroom was a “taboo area” (Gray, 1980: 320) that was best avoided when establishing and maintaining a positive relationship with CASNAV representatives. Indeed, subsequent meetings confirmed that these representatives held negative attitudes towards the use of induction children’s first languages in the classroom (for a full discussion see Bonacina, forthcoming, reproduced in Appendix 6). It thus became clear that I would not be able to disclose the specificity of my research topic, as we did not share the same basic assumptions in this area. As a result, I presented it in broad terms, saying that I would investigate ‘classroom interactions – teacher-led interactions as well as peer-led interactions’. In avoiding stating the specific focus of multilingual interactions, I maintained the rapport established with gatekeepers while conforming to the ethical requirements of displaying research aims.

5.4.2. Issues of self-presentation

Access being a “relational process” (Feldman et al., 2003: vii), self-presentation issues were most acute during access negotiations with Parisian CASNAV representatives. In order to build a common ground of understanding on which we could relate, I tried to emphasise in my self-presentation certain social categories
within my “portfolio of identities” (Harrington, 2003: 607) that I thought would be shared by Parisian CASNAV representatives. These were the fact of being French, of having been a teacher of French as a foreign language, and of being a researcher. However, these identity claims were all challenged. Indeed, CASNAV representatives categorised me as an “outsider” with a “British mindset”, expressed suspicions about my real motives as a researcher, and argued that my experience of teaching French as a foreign language had no relevance to the teaching goals in induction classrooms (for a full discussion see Bonacina, forthcoming). In this sense, the fact that I was French did not facilitate access as initially hoped (see §1.4). It was only once CASNAV representatives had redefined the identity of their group membership, mainly specifying their monolingual ideologies of language teaching and learning, that they granted me access to two induction classrooms.

Similar misalignment in the bilateral process of self-presentation (Goffman, 1959) occurred in the period of preliminary observation in the first two induction classrooms I visited. As explained above (section §5.2.1), the two teachers refused to grant me access to their de facto language policy; one refused to participate in a long period of observation and the other monitored and changed classroom language practices once she knew of my specific research focus on language choice. I believe that this was the result of them perceiving me as an evaluator affiliated to the CASNAV rather than as a researcher. This self-presentation issue led me to contact induction teachers without the direct mediation of the CASNAV by sending a call for participation, as reported in §5.2.1.

A last self-presentation issue that arose was at the start of my observation in the target induction classroom. Although I had explained to the children that I was not another teacher but, rather, “one of them” – insofar as I also had migrated from my home country to live and work in Scotland – they initially viewed me as “the other teacher” as the following extract shows.

Extract 1: (T2S1D1V1E10)
46. Talia: [...] maîtresse!
Being perceived as a teacher could have affected the naturalness of the talk collected. Indeed, one of my aims was to collect peer-led interaction, that is, small group talk when the teacher (Miss Lo) is not around. If children had continued to perceive me as a teacher, it is most likely that they would not have interacted freely in my nearby presence. I thus decided to change as much as possible my perceived status of ‘teacher’ to that of ‘observer’. This was one of the reasons why I decided to conduct semi-participant observation, engaging in classroom activities only occasionally and never as an evaluator. I also decided to engage in children’s play during break times, which is something that the teachers never did. In the same vein, when conducting interviews with inducted children, I decided to establish an atmosphere that was not classroom-like. To do so, I chose to conduct interviews in a room other than their classroom and asked them to sit on the floor as opposed to sitting at a desk.

5.4.3. Reducing the observer’s paradox

A key tenet of Conversation Analysis is to work on naturally occurring data, that is, “interactional phenomena that would have occurred regardless of whether the researcher had come upon the scene” (Psathas, 1995: 45). However, it is common to encounter during the data collection process indications of ‘the observer’s paradox’ (see mainly Labov, 1972), that is, the fact that we cannot observe something without changing it. For a discussion of the observer’s paradox in classroom based research see Mori and Zuengler (2008: 23). Such indications were noticed during preliminary observation in my first visit to the target induction classroom. By way of example, consider extract 2 below, where children discontinue language alternation practices when remembering that they are being recorded (64-5).
This excerpt shows that the presence of the audio-recorder affected the naturalness of children’s interaction because it seemed that it was perceived as an authority figure close to that of the teacher. In order to overcome this problem, I decided to add an external microphone to the digital recorder I was using. This meant that the recorder could now catch interaction from afar, without needing to be placed right in front of the children. As a result, the inducted children seemed to gradually forget that they were being recorded. Because of this, I disregarded the audio-recordings conducted during my first visit and during the first three weeks of my second visit. I started using the audio-recorded data for analytical purposes when episodes like the one illustrated in extract 2 became rare. In fact, extract 2, which is from the first day of recording that I transcribed and analysed, is the last occurrence of such a phenomenon in my data.

5.4.4. Issues in transcribing multilingual talk

The issue of how to translate data in the language of a thesis or publication (i.e. in my case, translating instances of French talk in the language of this thesis) has been addressed in several textbooks on Conversation Analysis (e.g. ten Have, 1999: 93; Liddicoat, 2007: 46). There is a consensus in studies of bilingual talk and bilingual classroom talk that language contrast should be represented in transcription by a bold font. However, such a transcription convention is not sufficient in cases where
more than two languages are used in interaction. In fact, researchers do not yet seem to have reached a consensus on a convention to represent language contrast in transcriptions of multilingual talk. Given the focus of this study on language choice and alternation phenomena, I felt it important to represent language contrast as clearly as possible. To do so, I adopted a colour coding system whereby a different colour is allocated to each of the languages used in the corpus (see transcription conventions in Appendix 1). It should be noted that at the time of audio-recording, twelve children were attending the induction classroom and eight languages were co-available. To recall, these were French, Spanish, English, Japanese, Peul, Arabic, Lithuanian, and Polish (see also Table 3 and 4). However, identifying a language in the corpus of audio-recording was not always a straightforward matter. As I already stated, I used translators to transcribe and translate talk in languages other than French and English, but the translators and I both faced the following transcription issues.

First, we encountered the issue of transcribing stretches of talk where children use a lexical item from one language and the pronunciation from another language. In extract 3, for instance, Miss Lo is trying to explain to Spanish speaking child Talia how to spell the sound /œ/ in French; a sound spelt ‘eu’ as in words like ‘peur’ (fear) and ‘fleur’ (flower). Since Talia remains silent (43), the Spanish speaking child Leila decides to help Talia and pronounces the French lexical item ‘fleur’ with a Spanish pronunciation, namely /fleure/. By uttering the word ‘fleur’ with a Spanish pronunciation, Leila pronounces the two letters ‘e’ and ‘u’ and thus conveys to her peer Talia that the sound /œ/ in French can be spelt ‘eu’.

Extract 3: (T2 S1 D1 V1 E8)
41. Miss Lo: [...] voilà (.) peur! (.) tu te rappelles
42. Miss Lo: pas comment on écrit peur↑
43. Talia : (.2)
44. Miss Lo: fleur euh: (. ) comme euh:
45. Leila: /fleure/

To recall, Peul is a language from West Africa. It is also called Pulaar.
41. Miss Lo: [...] there you go (. ) fear! (. ) you don’t
42. remember how to write fear↑
43. (.2)
44. Miss Lo: flower erm: (. ) like erm:
45. Leila: /fleure/

To signal that the item /fleure/ (45) is pronounced with a Spanish pronunciation, I have used a red font. However, to signal that, despite its Spanish-like pronunciation, it is not a Spanish lexical item, I have transcribed it using a broad IPA transcription. In the English translation following the original transcription, the lexical item is kept in IPA symbols. This system has been used for similar instances of talk, such as in T2S1D1V1E7 lines 7 and 18, T2S1D1V1E8 line 26, and T2S1D1V1E10 lines 67, 76, 78, and 80 (see Appendix 9).

A second issue that the translators and I encountered concerns the transcription of stretches of talk that do not belong to any existing lexicon but that are, nevertheless, attempts to utter a lexical item in a specific language – usually a child’s foreign language. Consider extract 4 by way of illustration. Miss Lo asks the Japanese speaking child Kenji how to say ‘dictionary’ in Japanese (198-200).

**Extract 4: (T2 S1 D10 V38 E3)**

198. Miss Lo: comment il s’appelle- comment on dit
199. dictionnaire en:: (. ) comment on appelle
200. ça en japonais↑ (. ) ça là↓
201. Kenji: ça↑
202. Miss Lo: ouais
   ➔203. Talia: /diksonade/
204. Kenji: ça c’est::
   ➔205. Talia: /diksonade/
206. Kenji: non

---------------------------------------------------------------------
198. Miss Lo: how is it called- how do you say
199. dictionary in:: (. ) how do you call this
200. in Japanese↑ (. ) this here↓
201. Kenji: this↑
202. Miss Lo: yeah
203. Talia: /diksonade/
204. Kenji: this it’s::
205. Talia: /diksonade/
206. Kenji: no
Since Kenji does not provide a second pair part to Miss Lo’s summons (200), the Spanish speaking child Talia proposes a second pair part by making up a Japanese word with what she perceives as being a Japanese pronunciation (203 and 205); a suggestion that is not ratified by Kenji (206). The transcription issue arising here is that the word /dıksə𝚗әdә/ does not belong to the Japanese lexicon. It is nevertheless intended to be a Japanese word by Talia since it occurs as a second pair part to Miss Lo’s call for a Japanese word. To deal with this issue, I have used a broad IPA transcription to signal that the item does not belong to any lexicon and a blue font to signal that it is intended to be a Japanese word.

A third and related transcription issue was how to transcribe long stretches of non-lexical vocalisation such as in extract 5. In this example, the Polish speaking child Piotr and the Japanese speaking child Kenji are imitating the Spanish speaking child Leila speaking in Spanish (lines 163-167) with Talia while the four of them are engaged in a shared activity.

Extract 5: (T2 S1 D4 V13 E5)

160. Leila: [...] no quiero saber más nada del colegio! (. ) cállate un poco (. ) no quiero que ( )
161. Piotr: cállate (. ) tais-toi (. ) cállate (. )
162. Kenji: cállate cálla /tæ/
163. Piotr: /pɛɾə/ /kærə/ /tɜɾə/ /tʃu/ /kærətʃu/
164. Kenji: /kɒŋtʃiŋæ/ /kɒŋtʃiŋæ/!
165. Piotr: /pɛɾə/ /kærə/ /tɜɾə/ /tʃu/ /kærətʃu/
166. Piotr: /me/ /tʃu/ /mi/ /tʃuʃ/ /kærə/ /tuəɾ/!
167. Talia: ils parlent en italien
168. ((all children laughing))
169. ((all children laughing))
170. Leila: [...] I don’t want to hear anything more
171. Piotr: about college! (. ) shut up for a bit (. )
172. I don’t want that ( )
173. Piotr: shut up (. ) shut up (. ) shut up (. ) shut up
174. Kenji: /kɒŋtʃiŋæ/ /kɒŋtʃiŋæ/!
175. Piotr: /pɛɾə/ /kærə/ /tɜɾə/ /tʃu/ /kærətʃu/
176. Piotr: /me/ /tʃu/ /mi/ /tʃuʃ/ /kærə/ /tuəɾ/!
177. Talia: they’re speaking in Italian
178. ((all children laughing))
Piotr starts imitating Leila by repeating what she has just said, ‘cálla te’ (163), and then translating it into French. He then transforms the Spanish word into ‘calla /tæ/’ (164). Next, Kenji and Piotr continue the imitation and mimicry of Spanish by using sounds that they seem to perceive as being Spanish-like (165-167). Here again, to signal that these sounds are supposed to sound like Spanish items, I have used a red font. However, I have transcribed them using a broad IPA translation to differentiate mimicry of Spanish from actual talk in Spanish. This system has been used for transcribing other instances of mimicry such as in T2S1D3V8E1 line 843, T2S1D9V36 E3 lines 83, 86, 98, 100, 104, 114, and T2S1D1V1E3 line 93 (see Appendix 9).

5.5. Summary

In this chapter I have discussed the five stages of the data collection in the present study, namely:

1) Obtaining access to an induction classroom with multilingual practices
2) Undertaking preliminary semi-participant observation in the three induction classrooms to which I was given access
3) Conducting audio-recordings and further semi-participant observation in the target induction classroom
4) Collecting additional information in the target school
5) Giving feedback to the researched community.

I have also argued that the investigation of a practiced language policy (and in the present case, a practiced language-in-education policy) involves principally the analysis of a corpus of interaction, and explained that the other types of data collected have been used in this thesis as background information (presented in Chapter Three) and as a way to relate the observed practiced language policy with the policy at the level of language beliefs and language management (discussed in Chapter Nine). In the last part of this chapter, I have discussed the solutions I adopted to overcome certain practical and ethical issues encountered during both data collection and data analysis.
In the remainder of this thesis, I turn to the analysis of the corpus of interaction collected in the target induction classroom. In Chapter Six, I present an overview of the language choice and alternation practices observed in the target classroom. In Chapter Seven, I account for language choice practices and present the three norms classroom participants draw upon in talk-in-interaction. In Chapter Eight, I account for language alternation practices, especially those that are licensed by the teacher, and present the norm(s) that classroom participants used in such cases.
6.1. Introduction
Chapter Six is the first of three chapters devoted to a Conversation Analytic investigation of the practiced language-in-education policy of the target induction classroom. Across the three chapters, analysis is conducted using the tools and following the analytical steps described in Chapter Five (see section §5.3). The present chapter, then, aims to describe the types of language choice and alternation acts frequently observed in the target induction classroom. Because they occur frequently in the data, they are thought to be practices; that is, to represent ‘what is usually done’. As I mentioned earlier, I observed in this classroom that eight languages were used in talk-in-interaction. These were French, English, Spanish, Peul (also called Pulaar), Japanese, Polish, Lithuanian, and Arabic. In section §6.2, I show how talk in this classroom is conducted either in French, English or Spanish, or in both French and English or French and Spanish. In section §6.3, I show how that, while talk is conducted in one or other of these three languages, certain patterns of language alternation occur.

6.2. Language choice practices
In this section, I describe the language choice practices of the target induction classroom. I show how, in this classroom, talk is conducted either in French (a language common to all classroom participants), in English (a language common to four pupils), in Spanish (a language common to five pupils), or in both French and English or French and Spanish. More specifically, I adopt an emic perspective,
characteristic to a CA approach to talk-in-interaction and show how speakers use one or more of the co-available languages as their “communicative codes” (Alvarrez-Cáccamo, 1998). I call these codes “mediums of classroom interaction” (Bonacina, 2005; Bonacina and Gafaranga, 2010). Building on Gafaranga’s (e.g. 2009) CA model of language alternation at the community level, Bonacina and Gafaranga define a ‘medium of classroom interaction’ as the “linguistic code’ that classroom participants actually orient-to while talking, as opposed to the policy-prescribed medium of instruction” (Bonacina and Gafaranga, 2010: 12-3; see also a copy in Appendix 8 and Chapter Four section §4.4.2 for a discussion of the notion). Mediums of classroom interaction will be identified by doing sequential analyses of the corpus of classroom interaction. Special attention will be paid to instances of talk where language choice acts are oriented to by speakers as deviant – what Heritage (e.g. 1984a) calls “deviant case analyses” – since “dispreference markers” (Pomerantz, 1984) are a clear indication of what medium speakers orient to. In total, three monolingual mediums and two bilingual mediums of classroom interaction have been identified. These are a French monolingual medium (§6.2.1), an English monolingual medium (§6.2.2), a Spanish monolingual medium (§6.2.3), a French and English bilingual medium (§6.2.4) and a French and Spanish bilingual medium (§6.2.5).

### 6.2.1. A French monolingual medium

In the corpus of interaction audio-recorded in the target induction classroom, talk is often conducted in a French monolingual medium. That is, classroom participants orient to French as being the default choice against which the use of other languages is seen as deviant. Clear evidence is found in word searches, namely when a child is lacking a *mot juste* to express him/herself (see also Gafaranga, 2000b and Cromdal, 2005 for discussions of the use of word searches to tell the medium of an interaction). By way of illustration, consider extract 6 below. Matilda is telling the teacher what she did over the weekend. The extract starts when she is saying that she watched a movie. To recall, transcription conventions can be found in Appendix 1.
In keeping with previous talk, Matilda starts her turn in French (77). However, she soon runs into difficulty finding the *mot juste*, as evidenced by various “trouble markers” (Gafaranga, 2000b) (pauses, euh, self-interruptions). She then says that she is lacking the word in French (79) but that she knows it in English (81), asking in this sense permission to switch to English. These first few lines of the extract show that Matilda is orienting to a French monolingual medium where the use of English is seen as deviant and not allowed. Note that the teacher does not immediately allow Matilda to switch to English, instead checking first of all what
she is trying to say (82-84). At this point, Matilda reiterates that she does not know the title of the movie in French, leaving room for the teacher to license a switch to English (85-86); which she does in the following turn (87-88). However, even though the teacher has licensed a switch to English, Matilda first laughs, pauses, and finally switches to English (89). The laughter and the pause signal that Matilda is not comfortable switching to English as she orients to it as being a deviance from the French monolingual medium, even though the teacher has licensed it. These dispreference markers indicate the deviant character of an upcoming switch. Going back to the extract, it should be noted that the switch to English is an initiation of repair. Indeed, in the following turn, speakers conduct what Gafaranga (e.g. 2000b) calls a “medium repair”. The pause (90) following the switch shows that the teacher does not repair it, allowing Matilda to self-repair (a preference for self-repair in conversation was noted by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks, 1977); which she attempts in the next turn (91-92). However, the numerous ‘trouble markers’ (euh, pauses, elongation of vowels and reformulations) signal that Matilda is still lacking the French word and is thus unable to self-repair. As a consequence, the teacher turns to the rest of the class and selects Karen, an English native speaker, to ask her to conduct other-repair (93). The English item is finally repaired a few lines later (110), as can be seen in Appendix 9. Clearly, the fact that English is repaired shows that it is deviant from the medium, which is thus monolingual in French.

A more striking example can be found in extract 7 below. Here, Matilda is telling the teacher that her mother invited one of her male friends, who came with his daughter. As shown in the extract, she is lacking the word for daughter (i.e. ‘fille’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 7: (T2 S1 D5 V15 E3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 47. Matilda: et après il a- (.).
| 48. il vient avec le- le- le:: |
| 49. (.2)                        |
| 50. Miss Lo: avec le gâteau↑    |
| 51. Matilda: non! pas (.).
| 52. il- il vient avec le- (.2)
| 53. le- (.2) comment on dit↑   |
| 54. ((laughing)) je sais        |
| 55. pas comment on dit         |
| 56. Miss Lo: oui mais moi je sais pas ce que c’est |
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55. alors tu vois soit tu le dis en anglais
56. [soi-
57. Matilda: [c’est le enfant de- de l’ami de
58. ma mère
59. Miss Lo: avec son fils↑
60. (.3)
61. Miss Lo: son↑
62. (.2)
63. Matilda: no!
64. Miss Lo: ah
65. Matilda: daughter
66. (.)
67. Miss Lo: sa fille!
68. Matilda: oui avec sa fille

This extract is another example of a word search where a switch to English is conducted to initiate repair. As in the previous extract, Matilda is talking in French when she encounters a difficulty finding the mot juste. This is signalled by a series of “trouble markers” (Gafaranga, 2000b) such as interruptions, pauses, recycles and elongation of vowels (47-48). After a two-second pause (49), the teacher suggests a word (50), which is rejected by Matilda (51), who then formulates her problem by saying explicitly that she does not know how to say it (52-53). That is, she initiates repair. However, given that the teacher does not know which word Matilda is lacking, she is unable to help her. She thus asks her to say it in English (55); a suggestion that Matilda rejects, as she embarks in defining, in French, the word she
is lacking (57-8). In other words, she reiterates an initiation of repair, but using French. The teacher repairs it, suggesting the French word ‘fils’ (58). However, the three-second pause (59) shows that Matilda is unable to ratify the repair. As a consequence, the teacher switches to English (61) to translate the French word she suggested as a repair and to check that it is the word Matilda is lacking. After a two-second pause (62), Matilda rejects the English suggestion using English (63) and finally names the English word that she is lacking in French (65), namely ‘daughter’. In 67, the teacher repairs the English word by providing the French translation and, in 68, Matilda ratifies it by repeating it. Clearly, the fact that Matilda does not use English when she is lacking a word in French – and even when the teacher asks her to switch – indicates that English is deviant from the current medium. Interestingly, it is the teacher who initiates a switch to English, to check understanding. It is only once the teacher has switched to English that Matilda uses English too. Matilda’s reluctance to use English and the translation process that follows the switch show that the use of English is a repairable matter and, by implication, deviant from the current medium. Therefore, speakers are orienting to a French monolingual medium.

Another way of illustrating the fact that speakers orient to a French monolingual medium is by showing instances of language alternation that are interrupted by the teacher. Consider extract 8 below. Maia is describing her weekend to the teacher in French and lacks a specific word. The start of this word search is inaudible, due to background noise. We thus join the interaction when the teacher is suggesting words in French to help Maia.

Extract 8: (T2 S1 D7 V25 E3)

03. Miss Lo:   je suis allée↑ (.) alors (.) où ça↑
04. (.10)
05. Miss Lo:   je sais pas moi (.) au parc (.) au magasin↑
06. (.) [au cinéma↑
07. Leila:       [à la forêt↑
08. Miss Lo:   chez une copine↑
09. Maia:  mais (.) no se como se dice [(al cinema)
  [tatatatata (.)
10. Miss Lo:   pas de traduction!
11. Talia:  cinéma
At the start of the extract, the teacher is trying to solve the word search in French and guess the word Maia is lacking (03-06; 08). Leila joins in and suggests a word too (07). The long pause (04) and the multiple short pauses between suggestions of words (03-08) show that Maia does not recognise the word she is lacking. Therefore, in 09, she turns to her Spanish speaking peer Talia and addresses her in Spanish. She thus opens a side sequence, in which she switches from a French monolingual medium to a Spanish monolingual medium to solve her problem. According to Gafaranga (2007a, b), this is an instance of “medium switching”. The fact that this switch takes place in a side sequence shows that the children orient to the use of Spanish as being deviant in the teacher-led interactional episode. However, the teacher interrupts Maia’s switch of medium and side sequence by overlapping her turn (10) and by explicitly forbidding translations (11). In this sense, the teacher asks the children to interact solely in a French monolingual medium and to remain in the interactional episode they are currently engaging in. Nevertheless, Talia managed to hear Maia’s call for help and provides the French translation in 12,
namely ‘cinéma’. At this point, the teacher asks Talia not to provide the translation (13) but she repeats it anyway (14). As a result, the problem is solved in a side sequence despite the teacher’s attempts to interrupt it. In the end, the teacher resumes the word search she was engaging in with Maia (16-17). She suggests the word ‘cinéma’ (17), which Maia ratifies in 18, and closes the sequence by repeating the full sentence ‘je suis allée au cinéma’ (19-20). Clearly, the teacher’s interruption of children speaking in Spanish shows that she orients to a French monolingual medium. A similar situation can be found in extract 9 below. Maia wants to ask a question to the teacher but she is lacking a particular word.

**Extract 9:** (T2 S1 D1 V5 E3)

01. Maia: maîtresse!
02. Miss Lo: oui Maia
03. Maia: euh (.) "( )"
04. (.2)
05. Talia: que quieres decir↑
06. Miss Lo: non non non Talia (.) elle- elle essaie de le dire en français
07. Maia: un show
08. (.3)
09. Talia: show↑ (. ) show↑
10. Maia: es el de caperucita roja
11. (.3)
12. Talia: que↑
13. (.2)
14. Maia: el de todos los idiomas
15. Talia: que si lo vamos a hacer
16. Miss Lo: Maia!
17. Talia: elle a dit que si on va faire le- ( .)
18. Maia: le show ( .) le petit chaperon rouge↑
19. (.1)
20. Miss Lo: non mais ( .) après ( .) pas tout de suite

Extract 9:

01. Maia: miss!
02. Miss Lo: yes Maia
03. Maia: euh ( .) "( )"
04. (.2)
05. Talia: what do you want to say/
06. Miss Lo: no no no Talia ( .) she- she tries to say it in French
07. Maia: un show
08. (.3)
09. Talia: show↑ (. ) show↑
10. Maia: that of Little Red Riding Hood
11. (.3)
12. Talia: what↑
13. (.2)
As the transcript shows, talk is initially conducted in French. Maia asks for the teacher’s attention in French (01), which she gets in the following turn (02). However, the hesitation marker ‘euh’, the pause, and the inaudible stretch of talk uttered in a low voice (03) show that Maia is encountering a difficulty expressing herself in French. After a two-second pause (04), the problem remains unsolved. As a consequence, Talia steps in and addresses Maia in Spanish (05), their shared language. She offers to translate what she wants to say into French. That is, she opens a side sequence to solve the problem in a different medium. However, as in extract 8 above, the teacher forbids this medium switch (06) and asks Maia to try and solve her problem in French (07). In 08, Maia gives a clue to what she is trying to say by uttering the word ‘un show’. Since Maia’s turn is followed by a three-second pause (09), Talia reiterates her offer to open a side sequence in 10. This time, Maia accepts and interacts with Talia in a Spanish medium over a few turns (10-15). She asks Talia the question she wanted to ask the teacher, that is, whether they were going to rehearse the play based on Little Red Riding Hood. In 16, Talia replies to Maia’s question and says that they will be doing the play later. At this point, the teacher interrupts them (17); which triggers Talia to translate back to the teacher what Maia was asking (18-19). In 21, the teacher replies to Maia and says that they will not be rehearsing the play right now. In doing so, she re-establishes a teacher-led interaction. This translation process and the fact that the children open a side sequence to use Spanish show that speakers orient to a French monolingual medium in the current teacher-led interactional episode. In short, these four extracts indicate that a first pattern of language choice in the target induction classroom is the choice of French as a monolingual medium. When this pattern has been selected, the children’s other languages may be used with the teacher’s permission (extracts 6
and 7) and side sequences in languages other than French may be blocked (extracts 8 and 9).

The four extracts above illustrate a French monolingual medium in teacher-learner talk, but children can also orient to a French monolingual medium in small-group interaction. As extract 10 below illustrates, children can use French as their medium of interaction. The children from the advanced group (namely, Talia, Leila, Kenji and Piotr) are doing a written exercise in which they have to fill in sentences using verbs in the present tense.

Extract 10: (T2 S1 D4 V14 E5)

109. Kenji: Piotr (.). ‘couche’ aussi↑
110. (.1)
111. Piotr: non::!
112. Kenji: il lui dit ‘couche’
113. Leila: ‘couche’ aussi↑
114. (.2)
115. Piotr: ‘coucher’!
116. Leila: oui c’est bien
117. Kenji: ‘couche’ aussi↑
118. Leila: non! mais pas (.). parce que ça c’est
couche (.). c’est pas ‘coucher’
119. Piotr: ah!
120. Leila: pour dire ‘coucher’ c’est avec un ‘r’ à la
fin (.). c’est pas ‘coucher’

In this extract, talk is conducted in French. More specifically, the text which the children are working on (indicated by inverted commas) is referred to in French, which is also the language used to talk around the text. An even more interesting
example is extract 11 below, where Kenji signals to his peers that Spanish is deviant from the current medium he is orienting to. The children from the advanced group are working together on an exercise about pronouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 11: (T2 S1 D4 V14 E1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03. Talia: Leila! <em>que cara de animal me ves</em>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04. Kenji: Talia <em>tu fais ça:</em>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05. Leila: <em>no se</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06. Piotr: <em>c’est quoi ça</em>↑ (. ) ‘<em>je’ vous ‘regarde’</em> (. )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.          j’ai fini ça ici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08. Kenji: ici</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 03, Talia opens a side sequence in Spanish to chat with her Spanish peer Leila. Kenji attempts to interrupt this side sequence and asks Talia, in French, to come back to the task at hand (04). However, in 05, Leila replies to Talia. In the rest of the extract, Kenji and Piotr continue working on the exercise in French. What attracts my attention is that Kenji asks Talia to come back to the task. By doing so in French, he signals that the use of Spanish is deviant from the current medium of their small-group interactional episode.

In summary, the six extracts discussed thus far show that, in the target induction classroom, talk can be conducted in a French monolingual medium – either within a teacher-led interaction or in small-group interaction.

### 6.2.2. An English monolingual medium

As the following extracts illustrate, a second pattern of language choice that I have observed in the data is the use of English as a monolingual medium. In extract 12, the teacher is showing to the class the front page of a new book and asks children to read its title, namely “John Chaterton”. We join the sequence when the teacher calls on the children to read the last name of the character.
As the transcript shows, talk between the teacher and the pupils is conducted in French. In 13, Talia suggests the name “Johnny Depp” as a second pair part to the teacher’s summons (11). Although it is rejected by the teacher (15), it triggers a side sequence involving Matilda and Talia (23 and 24), in which English is used. Matilda and Talia thus switch from a French monolingual medium in a teacher-led episode to an English monolingual medium in a peer-led side sequence.

This second pattern of language choice is also observed in small-group interaction. This is the case in extract 13, where Matilda and Talia talk in English while engaging in a drawing activity next to each other.
Extract 13: (T2 S1 D7 V28 E1)

Matilda: tu fais pour moi
Talia: no because now you’re not my best friend
Talia: because I did that for you! (.) and that’s
really- and you said no!
Talia: because (..) I didn’t want it (..) you could
keep it if you want

After a silence of nineteen seconds (309), Matilda proposes to interact in French (310), while Talia proposes to interact in English (311). Following this “medium negotiation sequence” (Gafaranga and Torras, 2001; Gafaranga, 2009; called “language negotiation sequences” in Auer, 1984, 1995), Matilda converges to Talia’s choice of English – resulting in the talk being conducted in an English monolingual medium. Extract 14 below is another example of peer-led interaction conducted in an English monolingual medium. Matilda and Talia are arguing over who took the glue that was lying on their table.

Extract 14: (T2 S1 D11 V46 E6)

Matilda: c’est pas moi qui (a la colle)
Talia: yeah it’s you!
Matilda: c’est- c’est-
Talia: you (..) c’est toi (..) and you do
everything
Talia: but I didn’t do that!
Talia: yeah
Matilda: and you-
Talia: yeah you do
Matilda: no it was Piotr
Talia: no he don’t use that glue

17. (.20)
18. Matilda: c’est pas moi qui (a la colle)
19. Talia: yeah it’s you!
20. Matilda: c’est- c’est-
21. Talia: you (..) c’est toi (..) and you do
everything
22. Matilda: but I didn’t do that!
23. Talia: yeah
24. Matilda: and you-
25. Talia: yeah you do
26. Matilda: no it was Piotr
27. Talia: no he don’t use that glue
28. (.15)
17. (.20)
18. Matilda: it’s not me who (has the glue)
19. Talia: yeah it’s you!
20. Matilda: it’s– it’s–
21. Talia: you (. ) it’s you (. ) and you do
22. everything
23. Matilda: but I didn’t do that!
24. Talia: yeah
25. Matilda: and you–
26. Talia: yeah you do
27. Matilda: no it was Piotr
28. Talia: no he don’t use that glue
29. (.15)

In 18, Matilda uses French and claims that she does not have the glue that Talia was looking for during the twenty seconds of silence (17). In 19, Talia uses English and accuses Matilda of having stolen the glue. In 20, Matilda still uses French and makes an attempt to justify herself – unsuccessfully however, as she is interrupted by Talia in 21, who reasserts her accusation in English. After a short pause, Talia reiterates her accusation a third time but this time in French, departing in this sense from her previous choice of English. Here, French is not oriented to as being deviant, but has the function of emphasising Talia’s point that she already stated twice in English. In Gafaranga’s model, this instance of French is a “medium suspension” (e.g. Gafaranga and Torras, 2002; Gafaranga, 2007a, 2007b), that is, a “momentary deviance from the current medium which is not oriented to as repairable” (Gafaranga, 2007a). Since Matilda does not insist on her position – as the short pause shows in 21 – Talia returns to her previous choice of English and widens her accusation against Matilda, saying that she is responsible for ‘everything’ (22). Interestingly, at this point, Matilda uses English to reply to Talia’s accusation (23). In so doing, she converges to Talia’s choice of medium. In the rest of the extract, Matilda and Talia are talking in an English monolingual medium.

In summary, extracts 12, 13, and 14 show a second practice of language choice in the target induction classroom, namely the choice of English as a monolingual medium, either in side sequences within teacher-led interaction or in small-group interaction.
6.2.3. A Spanish monolingual medium

As I mentioned earlier, five children spoke Spanish as a first language: Talia and Maia spoke Mexican Spanish, Cristina Columbian Spanish, Andrea Ecuadorian Spanish, and Leila Argentinean Spanish (see Chapter Three, §3.5.4). Talia and Leila were in the advanced group, where most of the audio-recording of small-group interaction was conducted. Therefore, they appear in the corpus more often than the other Spanish-speaking children. In what follows, four extracts are analysed to demonstrate that talk in the target induction classroom can also be conducted in a Spanish monolingual medium. Consider extract 15 below as a first example. Here, the teacher is conducting a “label quest” (Heath, 1986) and trying to elicit the label for ‘films policiers’ (i.e. ‘detective films’).

Extract 15: (T2 S1 D1 V6 E8)
25. Miss Lo: donc c’est quoi ce genre de films
26. (.)
27. Miss Lo: [des films policiers::
28. Talia: [como se dice de misterio↑
29. Miss Lo: vous ne [connaissez pas les films
30. policiers↑
31. Leila: [yo no se Talia
-------------------------------------------------------------
25. Miss Lo: so what is that type of movie
26. (.)
27. Miss Lo: [detective films::
28. Talia: [how do you say those that are fantastic↑
29. Miss Lo: you don’t [know detective
30. films↑
31. Leila: [I don’t know Talia

In keeping with previous talk, the teacher uses French and reiterates the attempt to elicit the label ‘films policiers’ that she had already tried a few turns before (see 17 in T2 S1 D1 V6 E8, Appendix 9). However, the pause in 26 indicates that the children are not able to provide the requested label. As a consequence, the teacher gives it herself in 27. Simultaneously, in a turn overlapping with that of the teacher, Talia turns to her peer Leila and asks her to translate in French what she thinks is the Spanish equivalent of the requested label (28). In so doing, Talia opens a side sequence parallel to the teacher-led interaction, in which she uses a Spanish monolingual medium. In 29, as no-one provides an indication of “new information
receipt” (Schegloff, 2007a: 118), the teacher goes on to check the pupils’ understanding of the new label. In an overlapping turn, Leila replies to Talia’s request in Spanish and says that she does not know the requested translation (31). Therefore, while, at first sight, talk seems to be conducted in both French and Spanish, a sequential analysis of the extract shows that the teacher is talking to the class in a French monolingual medium, while Talia and Leila are talking to each other in a side sequence in a Spanish monolingual medium. Extract 16 below is a similar example. The teacher is interrupting her teaching sequence to send Hakim and Andrea to their mainstream class, where they will be attending a Maths lesson.

**Extract 16:** (T2 S1 D1 V6 E3)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>Miss Lo: allez-y Hakim et Andrea (.) vous allez en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>mathématiques (.) à toute à l’heure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>((noises of chairs being pushed on the floor))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>Leila: Andrea! cuaderno te falta!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.</td>
<td>Talia: si ella lo tiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.</td>
<td>Miss Lo: euh (.) Amkoulel (.) est-ce que tu peux [...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 01-02, the teacher sends Hakim and Andrea to a Maths lesson in their respective mainstream classroom. As Andrea is about to leave the room, her Spanish peer Leila reminds her, in Spanish and in a loud voice, not to forget her notebook (04). In the following turn, Talia reassures Leila and states that Andrea remembered to take it with her. In 06, the teacher moves on to continue the activity she was conducting with the pupils. Andrea, Leila and Talia thus use a Spanish monolingual medium across the classroom, and in front of the teacher and the rest of their peer, in a side sequence to the teacher-led interactional episode.

Extracts 15 and 16 contain examples of a Spanish monolingual medium used in side sequences while the teacher is talking to the whole class. Talk in a
Spanish monolingual medium is also found in small-group interaction, as extracts 17 and 18 illustrate. Leila is telling a story to her peer Talia.

Extract 17: (T2 S1 D9 V36 E3)

226. Leila: Amanda elle me dit (.) tiens ça c’est
227. mexicain mais c’est pas avec- (.) / País /
228. (.5)
229. Talia: que te dijo Amanda↑
230. Leila: me dijo (.) toma esto no tiene chile (.)
231. (me disimulo) (.) lo probé y casi lo
232. vomito
233. (.1)
234. Talia: que tenía↑
235. (.)
236. Leila: chile

In 226-227, Leila starts her story in French. This is about her friend Amanda, who made her taste Mexican food, which was allegedly chilli-free. Leila uses French and only French, even when she runs into a difficulty at the end of her turn. Indeed, in 227, Leila interrupts herself and pauses, as she is lacking the French word for ‘chilli’ (i.e. ‘piment’). However, rather than switching to the language that she shares with her interlocutor, Leila uses what she thinks might be the French word for ‘chilli’, basing herself on the Spanish item ‘chile’. That is, as she is lacking the mot juste in French, she uses the Spanish equivalent and tries to insert it in her French talk by pronouncing it with a French accent (/ País /). In so doing, she indicates to Talia (and, as a corollary, to the analyst) that she is orienting to a French monolingual medium. Therefore, Leila proposes to Talia that they interact in a French monolingual medium. However, the five-second pause that follows Leila’s turn (228) shows that Talia is encountering a problem; it is most likely that either
she has not heard Leila or she has not understood her. In fact, in 229, Talia asks Leila to repeat what she just said but she does so using Spanish. This is less a request for repetition than a request for a change of medium; what Gafaranga (2010) calls a “medium request”. At the start of this extract, Talia and Leila engage in a “medium negotiation sequence” (e.g. Gafaranga, 2007a, 2007b) whereby Leila suggests interacting in a French monolingual medium and Talia suggests interacting in a Spanish monolingual medium. In 230, Leila converges to Talia’s choice of a Spanish monolingual medium. She repeats the start of her story and then finishes it, using Spanish throughout. A further example of a Spanish monolingual medium in small-group interaction is extract 18 below. Here, Talia and Leila are working together on a written exercise about how to form the plural in French.

Extract 18: (T2 S1 D1 V1 E8)

66. Talia: le pluriel (. ) como dice ↑
67. Leila: con un s al final
68. Talia: /fleuros/
69. Leila: (si)

66. Talia: the plural (. ) how do you say ↑
67. Leila: with an s at the end
68. Talia: /fleuros/
69. Leila: (yes)

In this extract, Talia and Leila are interacting in Spanish and use French to refer to the exercise on which they are working (66). Here, French is deviant from the choice of Spanish adopted in the rest of the talk but it is functional insofar as it is used to refer to text. It is a ‘functional deviance’ or what Gafaranga calls a “medium suspension” (e.g. Gafaranga and Torras, 2001; Gafaranga 2007a, 2007b). It can be noted in passing that examples of functional language alternation to refer to text have been widely observed in other bilingual classroom contexts by Cromdal (2005), Martin (1999, 2003), and Tien (2009) to name but a few. In 68, Talia shows understanding of how to construct the plural of nouns in French, by giving the example ’/fleuros/’; which is the French lexical item ‘fleur’ (i.e. ‘flower’ in English)
at the plural form but pronounced with a Spanish accent. To build on Gafaranga’s framework, I propose to refer to this switch in terms of a ‘medium semi-suspension’. This term indicates that any aspect of a medium can be suspended for functional purposes. In this case, it is the Spanish lexicon that has been suspended to switch to the French lexicon. Yet, other aspects of the Spanish medium have not been suspended, such as pronunciation (the item is pronounced with a quasi-Spanish accent) and morphology (the item undergoes morphological transformation, in line with the plural formation in Spanish). In brief, Talia and Leila talk here in a Spanish monolingual medium and deviate from it for functional purposes.

Thus far, I have shown how talk in the target induction classroom can be conducted either in a French monolingual medium, in an English monilingual medium and in a Spanish monolingual medium, and that different types of language alternation can occur from these mediums. In the following two sections, I show how talk can also be conducted in a bilingual medium, namely a French and English bilingual medium, and a French and Spanish bilingual medium.

### 6.2.4. A French and English bilingual medium

When orienting to a bilingual medium, the classroom participants use two languages without any of them being functional or repaired. As Gafaranga puts it, in a bilingual medium “alternation itself is the medium” (Gafaranga, 2007a: 306). A first type of bilingual medium is therefore a French and English bilingual medium, where both French and English are used without being oriented to as functional or repairable. Extract 19 below gives an example of such a pattern of language choice. Matilda and Talia are seated next to each other (as well as next to Maia). This exceptional situation is caused by many of their peers being away in their mainstream classrooms. They are painting and drawing what they saw at their last visit to the Quai Branly museum. Matilda is explaining that she is drawing a woman (167).

---

66 Strictly speaking, this plural marker is in fact a Spanish one, since not only an ‘s’ is added but also an intermediary ‘e’ – whereas in French, only the marker ‘s’ would be required.
Extract 19: (T2 S1 D7 V28 E1)

161. Maia: c’est quoi ça?
162. (.)
163. Matilda: [mais attends! (.)] tu vas voir après!
164. Talia: [I don’t know what it is]
165. Matilda: parce que je vois ça à le musée
166. Talia: tout est (différent) (.)] like this
167. Matilda: c’est femme
168. Talia: ah (.)] look (.)] this (.)] and after (.)] you do this
169. (.)
170. (.)
171. Matilda: avec le pinceau (je fais) cheveux
172. ((laughing))
173. Talia: yeah (.)] that’s it ((laughing))
174. Matilda: hahahaha ((laughing))

161. Maia: what is this↑
162. (.)
163. Matilda: [but wait! (.)] you’re going to see after!
164. Talia: [I don’t know what it is]
165. Matilda: because I see that at the museum
166. Talia: all is (different) (.)] like this
167. Matilda: it’s woman
168. Talia: ah (.)] look (.)] this (.)] and after (.)] you do this
169. (.)
170. (.)
171. Matilda: with the brush (I do) hair
172. ((laughing))
173. Talia: yeah (.)] that’s it ((laughing))
174. Matilda: hahahaha ((laughing))

In 161, Maia asks Matilda what she is drawing and, after a short pause (162), Matilda and Talia reply to her in overlapping turns. Matilda replies in French (163) and Talia in English (164). In the rest of the extract, Matilda keeps using French (165 and 167) while Talia uses either English (168 and 173) or both French and English within the same turn (166). However, the use of either language is not functional or repairable. No signalling devices are displayed to indicate that the use of one language or another is a problem. Since the use of English or French is not pointed at as being deviant, it indicates that the children orient to both as being part and parcel of the current medium, namely a French and English bilingual medium. More specifically, it is what Gafaranga and Torras (2001: 207) call the “halfway-between mode” of the bilingual medium since Matilda consistently uses one language, while Talia alternates languages between and within turns.
Another example of an English and French bilingual medium can be found in extract 20 below. This extract is taken from the same situation as extract 19, only a few minutes earlier.

**Extract 20:** (T2 S1 D7 V28 E1)

87. Maia: que es eso↑
88. (.)
89. Matilda: c’est une- (. ) robe
90. Talia: [c’est- that’s an Indian
91. (. )
92. Matilda: that’s a- (. ) une robe
93. (.2)
94. Matilda: tu connais↑
95. (.1)
96. Talia: but- we want (. ) an Indian (. ) [we-
97. Matilda: [yeah (. )
98. (.)
99. Talia: in- in the-
100. Matilda: oui (. ) je dessine après

87. Maia: what is this↑
88. (.)
89. Matilda: it is a- (. ) [dress
90. Talia: [it’s- that’s an Indian
91. (.)
92. Matilda: that’s a- (. ) a dress
93. (.2)
94. Matilda: do you know↑
95. (.1)
96. Talia: but- we want (. ) an Indian (. ) [we-
97. Matilda: [yeah (. )
98. (.)
99. Talia: in- in the-
100. Matilda: yes (. ) I draw after

At the start of the extract, Maia asks in Spanish what Matilda is drawing (87). Given that Matilda does not speak Spanish, her choice of Spanish suggests that she wants to interact with Talia. That is, by using Spanish, Maia selects the speaker who shares that language. However, in 89, Matilda self-selects and replies to Maia’s question using French. Although Matilda does not speak Spanish, she is able to guess what Matilda’s question is based on the rising intonation and perhaps on a gesture of pointing at her drawing. Talia, who was initially selected by Maia’s turn in Spanish, replies in a turn overlapping that of Matilda’s. She starts her reply in French, then interrupts herself, and recycles it in English (90). However, while
Matilda says that she is drawing a dress, Talia says Matilda’s drawing is an Indian. Faced with those two contradictory answers, Maia remains silent. Matilda resolves this problem by re-asserting that what she has drawn is a dress, thus completing the sequence (92). What is interesting here is that the sequence is complete without any conclusion to the negotiation of the medium. Maia uses Spanish (87), Matilda uses French (89), Talia uses English (90); and Matilda starts in English, but completes her utterance in French. Interestingly also, in 96, Talia says that they want to draw an Indian (and not a dress). From then on, Matilda and Talia discuss what Matilda should be drawing and Matilda explains that she will draw an Indian after having drawn a dress. They use both French and English across (99-100) and within turns (98), without orienting towards these language alternation acts as being functional or deviant. In other words, “talk goes on smoothly” (Gafaranga and Torras, 2001: 208) in two languages, indicating that speakers are orienting towards a bilingual medium. More specifically, Talia consistently uses English (96, 99) while Matilda uses both French (100) and French and English (97-98). This is another instance of what Gafaranga and Torras call the “halfway-between mode” of a bilingual medium, insofar as “while one participant consistently uses one language, the other participant consistently alternates between the two languages in his/her repertoire” (2001: 207).

6.2.5. A French and Spanish bilingual medium
A fifth pattern of language choice observed in the target induction classroom is a French and Spanish bilingual medium. An example of this pattern is provided in extract 21 below. Andrea and Cristina are engaged in a painting activity. For this activity, the teacher had brought together a few tables, around which the small number of children present at that time in the classroom could gather. Here, Andrea shows Cristina that one can create the shape of a butterfly by splashing a bulb of paint on a piece of paper then folding it in two.

**Extract 21:** (T2 S1 D7 V28 E4)

02. Andrea: Cristina tu has visto las pinturas (.) yo
03. la- yo las metí en un papel (.) y la
cerraba y después yo las hacía /mrm/(.) y de que las abría y me salía una mariposa
y ya me salía cualquier dibujo
07. Cristina: moi aussi je sais faire ça
08. Andrea: acaso que te pregunte!
09. Cristina: mais moi j’ai à la maison ça
10. Andrea: se (   ) te pregunte
11. (.)
12. Cristina: ça vient de Chine
13. (.)
14. Maia: (mas grande!)

As the transcript shows, here talk is conducted in both French and Spanish. Andrea consistently uses Spanish (02-06, 08, 10, 14) while Cristina consistently uses French (07, 09, 12). Despite these “unreciprocal language choices” (e.g. Zentella, 1997) talk goes on as if nothing takes place that is unusual or worthy of being repaired. More specifically, it is a case of what Gafaranga and Torras (2001) call a “parallel mode” of a bilingual medium, where “one speaker consistently uses language A while the other consistently uses language B without any orientation to the other party’s choice as divergent” (2001: 205). Another example of a French and Spanish bilingual medium is extract 22 below. All the children have to colour in red the clothes that the main character of the cartoon they are working on has left behind after being kidnapped. Here, Talia asks her peers to tell her again what she has to colour in.

Extract 22: (T2 S1 D2 V6 E13)
01. Talia: que tengo que dibujar↑
02. (.)
03. Leila: tene- tenemos que pintar todas las cosas
Here also, talk is conducted both in French and in Spanish. More specifically, Leila consistently uses Spanish (03-04, 13, 16), while Cristina and Talia use both Spanish and French. For instance, in 08, Talia asks a question in French, which is answered in French by Cristina in 09, but in 10, Talia’s question in French is answered in Spanish by Cristina. Nevertheless, talk goes smoothly and the participants’ language choice and alternation are not oriented to as being a problem or as needing repair. Indeed, Talia’s use of French in 08 is not preceded by any hesitation or delaying markers, which would have indicated that it is a dispreferred act. Furthermore, French is not translated back into Spanish, which shows that it belongs to the current medium in the same way as Spanish does. In this regard, the

67 South American term.
68 Here, a term from South American Spanish is used.
three children are using a French and Spanish bilingual medium. More precisely, they are using the “halfway-between mode” of a bilingual medium (Gafaranga and Torras, 2001: 207) insofar as Leila consistently uses Spanish, while Talia and Cristina use both Spanish and French. It should also be noted that Leila’s South American term ‘nenita’ (04) is repaired by Cristina, who provides the more common form ‘niña’ (06). This indicates that, although French and Spanish are both part of the medium of this classroom interactional episode, alternation to South-American Spanish is pointed at as being deviant.

To summarise the argument thus far, I have shown that, in the target classroom, talk can be conducted in five different mediums. These are a French monolingual medium, an English monolingual medium, a Spanish monolingual medium, a French and English bilingual medium, and a French and Spanish bilingual medium. Furthermore, I have shown that speakers can then switch from these mediums to interact in another medium (see, for instance, extracts 8 and 9) or depart temporarily from these mediums and alternate languages (see, for instance, extracts 6, 7, 14 and 18). In the second half of this chapter, I turn to the description of language alternation practices, that is, language alternation acts that occur frequently in the corpus under study.

6.3. Language alternation practices
Language alternation acts have already been touched upon in the section above. Indeed, I have described two patterns of language choice where language alternation itself is the medium. These were a French and English bilingual medium (§6.2.4.) and a French and Spanish bilingual medium (§6.2.5). In this section, I focus on cases in which language alternation is seen not as part of the medium, but rather as a deviance from it. A close observation of deviant language alternation acts reveal a salient practice; namely, the licensing of language alternation. In order to account for this specific language alternation practice, I had to respecify the existing broad categorisation of ‘deviant language alternation’ into two sub-
categories: licensed language alternation and its counterpart, unlicensed language alternation. I describe these two language alternation practices in what follows.

6.3.1. Unlicensed language alternation

Unlicensed language alternation refers to all language alternation acts that are not licensed by the teacher. Following Gafaranga’s (e.g. 2007a, 2007b, 2009; Gafaranga and Torras 2001) model, language alternation acts that are deviant are either functional (“medium suspension”) or a repairable matter (“medium repair”). Two instances of medium suspension have been mentioned earlier, in extracts 14 and 18. As we have seen, in extract 14, Matilda and Talia are interacting in an English monolingual medium in an interactional episode in which Talia accuses Matilda of having stolen her glue. While, after a short medium negotiation sequence, the whole of the interaction is conducted in English, we have seen that Talia momentarily switches to French (21) in order to emphasise the accusation she previously stated in English (19). This alternation is not oriented to as being a repairable matter, but is nevertheless charged with the symbolic function of emphasising the child’s claim. Similarly, as I have shown, in extract 18, Talia and Leila interact in a Spanish monolingual medium. However, Talia switches to French (66) to refer to the French text they are working on. This alternation is deviant from the medium, insofar as it is used for a specific function – namely that of referring to a text. In the same extract, I have also shown that Talia does what I proposed to call a ‘medium semi-suspension’ (68) where she suspended the Spanish lexicon to use a French lexicon, but still used a Spanish pronunciation and morphology. This lexical suspension is a functional deviance insofar as it is aimed at showing understanding of the formation of plurals in French. Research literature on bilingual talk refers to language alternation acts as “code-switching” (see mainly Gafaranga and Torras, 2001; Bonacina and Gafaranga, 2010). However, I will not dwell further on instances of language alternation acts that are deviant and functional – for the simple reason that they rarely occur in my data and are not, as a consequence, a practice of the target classroom.
Instances of “medium repair” (Gafaranga and Torras, 2001; Gafaranga, 2007a, 2007b, 2009) – that is, language alternation acts that are oriented to as deviant and repairable – are frequently observed in my data. Consider, for example, extract 23 below. Here, the teacher reads a storybook (Ross and Willis, 2001) to the whole class, asks the children to describe the image below (picture 7), in which the main character is presented as playing outside in a rubbish dump.

**Picture 7:** Playing outside.

---

**Extract 23:** (T2 S1 D3 V8 E2)

17. Miss Lo:  ouais elle aime jouer (. ) mais donc c’est
18. ?:  où! là (. ) c’est où? (. ) c’est pas à la
19. ? :  maison c’est où?
20. Miss Lo:  dans la poubelle!
21. ?:  non pas dans la poubelle
22. Piotr:  non c’est (. ) c’est une place spéciale
23. ?:  pour (. ) pour euh-
24. Karen:  junkyard (. ) junkyard!
25. Piotr:  c’est une place spéciale pour-
26. Matilda:  junkyard!
27. Piotr:  pour tous les-
28. Cristina:  ah pourquoi tu répètes
29. Miss Lo:  chut chut chut!
30. Leila:  pour tout le qu’on met dans la poubelle
31. Karen:  [euh en anglais on dit
32. Miss Lo:  [oui
33. Karen:  elle est dans le junkyard
34. Miss Lo:  oui mais en français on dit quoi↑
In the first pair part of this “label quest” (Heath, 1986), the teacher asks children where the little girl is sitting (18-19), in order to elicit the French label ‘dehors’ (i.e. ‘outside’). In 20, a child proposes an answer that is rejected by the teacher, as an inappropriate second pair part (21). Next, two children attempt to provide another second pair part for the teacher’s question. Piotr starts a paraphrase of the word he is lacking (22-23, 25, 27), while Karen switches to English and provides the English gloss of what she identifies as being the expected label (24). This gloss is repeated by another English speaking peer, Matilda (26). Since this suggestion does not receive any feedback from the teacher, Karen announces her switch (“en anglais on
dit”, 31) and reiterates it (33). This time, the teacher replies to Karen, but refuses to take into account her switch as an appropriate second pair part to her question on the basis that the label is provided in English (34). Following a one-second pause (35), the teacher then explicitly asks Karen to repair her English utterance by providing the French translation or a French paraphrase for it (36-37). In the end, the teacher reiterates the first pair part of the label quest by opening a ‘sentence completion’ (40-41). In a sentence completion, “the teacher prompts the word or phrase needed to complete her utterance, cueing this completion at times by vowel lengthening” (Arthur and Martin, 2006: 182). Once the children are given the opposite of the label they are searching for (‘à la maison’, 41), they are able to provide the second pair part ‘dehors’ (42, 43), which is followed by the teacher’s ratification (44) in a sequence-closing third. Of interest here is that language alternation (24, 26, and 33) has not been licensed by the teacher and is thus oriented to as deviant and repairable. English is deviant from the current medium, which therefore can be deduced to be French monolingual. This orientation to a French monolingual medium is shared by other children, such as Piotr, who does not switch to Polish in spite of not having the requested label (as shown by his numerous pauses, hesitations and false starts). Extract 24 is a similar example. In this extract, language alternation is deviant and repaired by the teacher. The teacher is showing a cartoon to the whole class and asks the children where the main character is portrayed.

**Extract 24: (T2 S1 D2 V6 E10)**

19. Miss Lo: voilà (. ) le détective il est
20. ( . )
21. ( . )
22. Leila: il est tout dans la (. ) dans la:: ( . )
23. oficina!
24. Miss Lo: dans son bureau
25. ( . )
26. Miss Lo: hein↑
27. ( . )
28. Miss Lo: il est dans son bureau ( . ) et puis […]

-------------------------------------------------------------

19. Miss Lo: that’s right (. ) the investigator where is
20. ( . )
21. ( . )
22. Leila: he is all in the (. ) in the:: ( . )
Here also, the teacher is conducting a “label quest” (Heath, 1986). In 19-20, the teacher elicits the label ‘bureau’ (i.e. office) by asking where the main character is sitting. After a short pause (21), Leila tries to provide a second pair part to the teacher’s elicitation. However, she lacks the expected label in French and switches to Spanish to give the Spanish label instead (23). Leila orients to this language alternation as an instance of deviance from the current medium – as signalled by her ‘deviant markers’ such as the pauses, a delaying device (the elongation of a vowel) and a recycle (22). This orientation is confirmed by the teacher, who repairs the Spanish label by providing the French equivalent. In short, although talk is conducted both in French and Spanish, the two languages do not have the same status. Speakers orient to French as the current medium of their interactional episode, while they orient to Spanish as an instance of deviance that needs repair. Yet, unlike in extract 23 where alternation was not acknowledged by the teacher, here it is acknowledged and repaired. Therefore, the label quest in extract 24 is accomplished bilingually. It is an example of what Martin – building on Heath (1986) – calls a “bilingual label quest” (1999, 2003; see also Arthur and Martin, 2006; Martin et al., 2006).

### 6.3.2. Licensed language alternation

A second type of language alternation act that I have frequently observed in my data is one that is licensed by the teacher. Since the existing category ‘deviant language alternation acts’ does not reflect the specificity of this practice, I propose the sub-category ‘licensed language alternation’. This pattern of language alternation has already been observed in two of the extracts above, namely extracts 6 and 7. To recall, in extract 6, Matilda is describing her weekend to the teacher in French but is lacking a word. However, she does not switch to English until she is allowed to do so by the teacher (87-88). The use of English is thus oriented to as
being deviant and a dispreferred choice, until it is licensed by the teacher. A similar example discussed earlier is extract 7. Here also, Matilda is conducting a word search as she is lacking a French word. In 54-56, the teacher licenses a switch to Matilda’s preferred language, namely English. However, Matilda does not depart from a French monolingual medium until the teacher herself suggests a word in English (61).

Two further examples can be given at this stage to show that licensing language alternation is a common practice in the target classroom. Firstly, consider extract 25 below. The teacher is introducing the use of object pronouns in French and asks children to reflect on the example “je lui donne un cadeau” (i.e. I give him/her a present) by comparing it with its translation in their first language(s). At the point at which we join this interactional episode, the teacher is asking Matilda to give the translation of the French example in Lithuanian.

Extract 25: (T2 S1 D3 V8 E1)

538. Miss Lo: donc comment tu vas dire en lithuanien↑ (.)
539. je lui donne un cadeau
540. Matilda: aš
541. Miss Lo: ouais
542. (.2)
543. Matilda: jam duodu dovana
544. Miss Lo: alors attend (.2) /jaʃ/ c’est je↑
545. (.2)
546. Miss Lo: c’est ça↑
547. Matilda: aš!
548. Miss Lo: aš c’est toi (.2) d’accord (.2) jam c’est
549. quoi↑ (.) c’est lui↑
550. Matilda: oui
551. Miss Lo: ah d’accord (.2) /daʃ/↑ (.) c’est donne↑
552. Matilda: dovana
553. (.)
554. Piotr: dovana
555. (.2)
556. Matilda: duodu c’est donne
557. Miss Lo: ouais (.2) duodu c’est donne (.2) et dovana
c’est un cadeau
558. Matilda: ouais
559. Miss Lo: t’as vu je suis forte en lithuanien hein
560. (.2) ça y est
561. (.2)
562. Matilda: hahaha ((laughing))
In 538-539, the teacher asks Matilda to translate the French sentence in Lithuanian, in order to later on conduct a contrastive analysis between French and the other languages provided by the inducted children. I propose to call this request a translation quest, building on Heath’s (1986) notion of “label quest”. The main difference between a label quest and a translation quest is that the former is opened by a “known information question” – that is, “one for which the teacher already knows the answer” (Heath, 1986: 148) – while the latter is opened by a genuine question, that is, one for which the teacher does not already know the answer. In the remainder of the extract, Matilda provides the Lithuanian translation and the teacher tries to identify the location of the subject, verb and complement. Of interest here is that this translation quest functions as a license to language alternation.

Lastly, it should be noted that, although language alternation is licensed in extracts 6 and 7 in the same way as it is in extract 25, it has a different status in each case. In fact, in extracts 6 and 7, language alternation is licensed to repair the medium speakers are orienting to. It is a variant of what Gafaranga (2007a, 2007b; Gafaranga and Torras, 2001) calls “medium repair”, since his model of language alternation does not account for licensing. I thus propose to call it a licensed medium repair. In extract 25, however, licensing is used to allow a functional
alternation to Lithuanian. Indeed, speakers are still interacting in a French monolingual medium but talk about Lithuanian lexical items. Here, language alternation is a variant of what Gafaranga (2007a, 2007b; Gafaranga and Torras, 2001) calls a “medium suspension”, which I propose to call a licensed medium suspension. A similar example to extract 25 is extract 26 below. Kenji is using his electronic dictionary to check the translation of a French word he does not understand. Here, the teacher wants to find a name for Kenji’s dictionary.

Extract 26: (T2 S1 D10 V38 E3)

213. Miss Lo: ordinateur en japonais c’est comment↑
214. Kenji: ordinateur (.) est (.) konpyuta
215. Miss Lo: computer (.) bon ben voilà (.) hein

213. Miss Lo: computer in Japanese how is it↑
214. Kenji: computer (.) is (.) computer
215. Miss Lo: computer (.) oh well that’s it (.) hu

In this extract, the teacher is also conducting what I have proposed to call a ‘translation quest’ (see extract above), eliciting in a first pair part the Japanese translation of ‘ordinateur’ (i.e. ‘computer’) to Kenji (213). In 214, Kenji provides the translation in a second pair part. It is accepted by the teacher, who repeats it in 215 as a sequence-closing third. Note, however, that the teacher mis-hears Kenji’s translation and repeats it with an English accent. Here also, the translation quest licenses language alternation to Japanese. Alternation to Japanese is not used to repair the medium but rather to translate a French item into a child’s first language. It is thus an instance of ‘licensed medium suspension’.

As we have seen in this section, language alternation practices that are licensed call for a re-specification of Gafaranga’s (2007a, 2007b, 2009; Gafaranga and Torras, 2001) model of language alternation. As discussed in Chapter Four (see section §4.3.3), Gafaranga’s model accounts for two types of language alternation: ‘language alternation as the medium’ and ‘language alternation as deviance’. In the corpus of classroom interaction under study, I observed that deviant language alternation acts can be either licensed or unlicensed. In order to account for these practices and to be able, subsequently, to identify the specific norms underlying
these practices, I have proposed to respecify the notion of ‘deviant act’ into ‘unlicensed acts’ and ‘licensed acts’. Consequently, to differentiate instances of ‘medium repair’ that are unlicensed from those that are licensed, I propose to call the former ‘unlicensed medium repair’ and the latter ‘licensed medium repair’. Building on Gafaranga (e.g. 2007b: 146), ‘licensed medium repair’ refers to a departure from the current medium that is licensed and that aims to solve an interactional difficulty. Likewise, to differentiate instances of ‘medium suspension’ that are unlicensed from those that are licensed, I propose to call the former ‘unlicensed medium suspension’ and the latter ‘licensed medium suspension’. Building on Gafaranga (e.g. 2007b: 146), I define a ‘licensed medium suspension’ as a momentary deviance from the medium which is licensed and not repaired. Examples of a licensed medium repair can be found in extracts 6 and 7 and examples of a licensed medium suspension can be found in extracts 25 and 26. An overview of language alternation acts identified in the target classroom is presented in table 10 below, which builds on Gafaranga’s (2007a: 306) model of language alternation (also reproduced in table 8 in Chapter Four). Licensed language alternation, being a salient and regular practice of the target classroom, will be accounted for in Chapter Eight.
6.4. Summary

In this chapter, I have presented the language choice and alternation practices observed in the target classroom. More specifically, I have identified five "mediums of classroom interaction" (Bonacina, 2005; Bonacina and Gafaranga, 2010):

- a French monolingual medium
- an English monolingual medium
- a Spanish monolingual medium
- a French and English bilingual medium
- a French and Spanish bilingual medium.

Two types of language alternation practices have been identified:

- unlicensed language alternation
- licensed language alternation.

To account for these language alternation practices observed in my data and, subsequently, to be able to identify their respective underlying norms, it was necessary to re-specify Gafaranga’s (2007a, 2007b; Gafaranga and Torras, 2001) model of language alternation. I proposed the terms ‘unlicensed medium suspension’ and ‘licensed medium suspension’, as well as ‘unlicensed medium repair’ and ‘licensed medium repair’. Earlier in the chapter, I also proposed new terms to account for the data at hand. These are:
- ‘Medium semi-suspension’: building on Gafaranga’s (e.g. 2007a, b) notion of “medium suspension”. It is used to refer to the fact that any aspect of a medium can be suspended for functional purposes (see extract 18).

- ‘Translation quest’: building on Heath’s (1986) notion of “label quest”. While the first turn of a label quest is a known information question (Heath, 1986: 148), the first turn of a translation quest is a question for which the teacher does not know the answer.

In Chapter Seven, I account for the norms speakers orient to when engaging in the language choice practices presented in this chapter. In Chapter Eight, I account for the norms speakers orient to when engaging in the most salient language alternation practices, namely licensed language alternation practices.
Chapter 7
Norms of language choice practices

7.1. Introduction

As I have shown in Chapter Six, five patterns of language choice have been identified in the target classroom (see §6.2). Talk can be conducted in a French monolingual medium, an English monolingual medium, a Spanish monolingual medium, a French and English bilingual medium or a French and Spanish bilingual medium. In Chapter Seven, I account for the norms underlying these language choice practices. As stated earlier (see §2.5.5), norms are to be understood from an Ethnomethodological/Conversation Analytic perspective; that is, as being what speakers use to make sense of each other’s language acts. In other words, norms are a reference point – or benchmark – speakers refer to in order to know whether a certain language act is normative or deviant. They are what Spolsky calls “the idea that members of the community have of appropriate behaviour” (Spolsky and Shohamy, 2000: 29). In brief, it is because a practiced language policy can be conceptualised in the Conversation Analytic terms of ‘a set of norms of language choice and alternation’ that I claim CA can be used to study practiced language policies (see also §4.2.4). The identification of the norms underlying language choice acts is therefore a central task in discovering the practiced language policy of the target classroom.

I make two claims in this chapter. Firstly, drawing on a categorisation and sequential analysis, I argue that language choice practices are activities bound to two categories, namely that of ‘teacher’ (what I propose to call ‘teacher-hood’) and that of ‘language preference’. More specifically, I show that the category ‘teacher-hood’ has more “procedural relevance” (Schegloff, 1992) than that of ‘language preference’, insofar as language choice is first and foremost an activity bound to ‘teacher-hood’. Secondly, I argue that the classroom participants use their implicit
knowledge of the co-selective relationships between categories and language choice practices as the norms\textsuperscript{69} against which they make sense of their language choice acts. In what follows, I first define in more detail the notions of ‘teacher-hood’ and ‘language preference’ (§7.2). I then turn to the set of norms that underlie language choice practices (§7.3 and §7.4), and finish by discussing examples of conflicting norms (§7.5).

7.2. Defining ‘language preference’ and ‘teacher-hood’

A first significant insight from Membership Categorisation Analysis (MCA) studies of bilingual talk is that language choice and language alternation are category-bound activities. More specifically, they are bound to the membership categorisation device of ‘language preference’ (Gafaranga, 2001, 2005; Torras and Gafaranga, 2002; Cashman, 2005). The notion of ‘language preference’ was introduced by Auer (1984, 1988, 1995, and 1998b) to refer to “preference-related switching” (1995: 125). Auer argues that speakers may switch to a language because they are more comfortable or competent in that language (‘competence-related preference’) or due to ideological factors (‘ideology-related preference’) (see also Gafaranga, 2001: 1916). As Torras and Gafaranga (2002) emphasise, language preference is “an interactional process […], not something set in stone. It consists of negotiated claims and attributes” (2002: 541). In this sense, participants ascribe each other to language preference categories in order to accomplish the activity of talking in two or more languages. For instance, it is because a speaker has been ascribed to the category ‘language preference in French’ that his interlocutors will use French when interacting with them.

The second significant finding of MCA studies of bilingual talk is that participants use their linguistic resources to resist and contest categories to which they have been ascribed. In this respect, language choice and alternation is

\textsuperscript{69} As has already been stated, the notion of ‘norm’ here is to be understood from an Ethnomethodological/Conversation Analytic perspective as “a point of reference or action template for interpretation” (Seedhouse, 2004: 10) (see also §2.5.5 and §4.2.4).
understood to contribute to participants’ construction of their social identities in talk-in-interaction (e.g. Talmy, 2009 and Higgins, 2009).

To a certain extent, these findings will find an echo in this chapter. I will also show how language choice practices in the target classroom (and possibly in other bilingual classroom contexts) are occasioned by certain categories. I will show how – as Gafaranga puts it – “the social structure ‘occasions’ the conversational structure” (2005: 294); that is, how categories occasion language choice practices. More specifically, I will show how ‘language preference’ is a membership categorisation device that is procedurally consequential in language choice practices in the target classroom. I will also demonstrate that the category of ‘teacher’ is more consequential than that of ‘language preference’. The idea that ‘doing being the teacher’ triggers certain types of category-bound activities has been developed elegantly by Richards (2006). He illustrates how “shifts in the orientation to different aspects of identity produce distinctively different interactional patterns” (2006: 52). Building on Richards, I argue that, in bilingual classroom talk, orientation to the category ‘teacher’ produces distinctively different language choice practices.

Before moving on to the data analysis, it is necessary to explain in more detail what is meant by the category ‘teacher’. An MCA perspective on classroom talk implies that the institutional roles of ‘teacher’ and ‘pupil’ are not simply labels but rather, and most importantly, a performance, a ‘doing being’ or a set of interactional practices that correspond to what it is to do ‘being the teacher’ or ‘being the pupil’. In this sense, the identities of ‘teacher’ and ‘pupil’ are “something that people do which is embedded in some other social activity, and not something that they ‘are’” (Widdicombe, 1998: 191). Therefore, I propose the term ‘teacher-hood’ to refer to what it is to do being a teacher and to differentiate this from the institutionally prescribed role of ‘teacher’. Insofar as ‘teacher-hood’ is a category, it is associated with certain activities. Such activities include assessing or correcting pupils’ answers (Kasper, 2009: 7; see also Lee, 2007; Rylander, 2009); controlling
the floor, asking questions, issuing instructions, and prompting (Richards, 2006: 61; He, 2004: 208). Another characteristic of the classroom is the “asymmetry of knowledge” between the teacher and the pupil (Richards, 2006: 63). Certain types of interactional sequences can also be bound to the “standardised relational pair” (Sacks, 1972a, b) of teacher/pupil. For instance, the Initiation-Response-Feedback sequence (IRF) – identified by Bellack et al (1966) and Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) – is often said to be the “default” pattern of interaction between teacher and pupils (Cazden, 1986: 53). McHoul (1978) also described in detail the organisation of turn-taking in classroom contexts. In this vein, I argue that, in my data, choosing the “medium of classroom interaction” (Bonacina and Gafaranga, 2010) is an activity bound to the category of teacher-hood.

7.3. When someone is doing being a language teacher

As I described in Chapter Three (§3.4.3.3), induction classrooms are both language and subject content classes; although emphasis is given on the teaching of the French language (see also MEN, 2002b: 12). In this section, I argue that, in my data, language choice is primarily an activity bound to the category ‘teacher-hood’ and, more specifically, to whoever is ‘doing being a language teacher’. The classroom participants use the relationship between teacher-hood and language choice as a norm to make sense of their language choice acts. In fact, a first norm of language choice that emerges from the data is as follows:

*When someone is ‘doing being the teacher of language X’, that language is adopted as the medium of classroom interaction.*

This norm is oriented to by classroom participants whether it is the adult or a child who is ‘doing being the language teacher’.

As we might expect, the adult who has been entrusted by the school to be the teacher is the classroom participant that is most often seen to be ‘doing being the language teacher’ in the corpus. If we take a look back at the extracts discussed in Chapter Six, it is clear that Miss Lo is the one who children call ‘maîtresse’ (i.e.
teacher) (see extract 9, line 01, and extract 12, line 19), the one who gives instructions (see extract 16, line 01-02), who prompts children to talk (extract 6) and asks known information questions (for example when initiating a label quest; see extracts 23 and 24). When Miss Lo is ‘doing being the teacher of French’, French is adopted as the medium of classroom interaction. Examples of Miss Lo ‘doing being the teacher of French’ in a French monolingual medium can be found in previous extracts analysed in Chapter Six. In extracts 23 and 24, for instance, Miss Lo is conducting a “label quest” (Heath, 1986) and thus introduces new French lexical items. In asking a ‘known information question’, she is indeed ‘doing being the teacher’. Furthermore, instances of language alternation to English (extract 23) and Spanish (extract 24) are oriented to by speakers as deviant. This indicates that, in this classroom interactional episode in which Miss Lo is ‘doing being the teacher of French’, French is adopted as a monolingual medium. Another example is extract 27 below. Miss Lo is teaching pupils how to tell stories in French and is asking Kenji to tell her the story of Little Red Riding Hood.

Extract 27: (T2 S1 D1 V1 E3)

01. Miss Lo: Kenji
02. Kenji: mm
03. Miss Lo: est-ce que tu arriverais (.1) puisqu’on va terminer sur l’histoire du Petit Chaperon Rouge (.). aujourd’hui (.). et un petit peu demain (.). est-ce que tu arriverais à me raconter (.). l’histoire du Petit Chaperon Rouge
04. Kenji: euh
05. (.)
06. Cristina: moi maîtresse! (.). moi je sais
07. Kenji: euh:
08. Cristina: ( )
09. Talia: en japonais
10. Leila: [il était [une fois
11. Miss Lo: [non c’est Kenji c’est Kenji (.). oui
12. Kenji: japonais↑
13. Miss Lo: ah non pas en japonais parce que je ne vais pas trop comprendre
14. ((children laughing))
15. Kenji: ah
16. Miss Lo: mais (.). en français
17. (.)
18. Kenji: oui et-
19. Talia: après en japonais
In 01, Miss Lo selects Kenji and, in 03 to 08, she asks him to tell her the story of Little Red Riding Hood, on which they have been working for the past few days. Since Kenji seems to hesitate – as the ‘euh’ (09) and the pause (10) indicate – other children self-select to reply to Miss Lo’s summons (11, 13, and 15). However, in 16-17, Miss Lo reiterates her choice of speaker and insists on selecting Kenji. Meanwhile, in 14, Talia carries out a “medium request” (Gafaranga, 2010) and asks that Kenji tells the story in Japanese. This is picked up by Kenji himself, who asks Miss Lo whether he should be telling the story in Japanese (18). To this Miss Lo replies in 19-20 that he cannot use Japanese, as she would not be able to understand, and that he should use French instead (23). Here, Miss Lo is ‘doing being the teacher’. This is evidenced by the fact that it is her who selects the next speaker (01) (see McHoul, 1978 for a discussion of turn-taking in classroom talk), who controls the floor (16-17) and who gives instructions (06-08). Furthermore, Cristina is “labeling” (Antaki and Widdicombe, 1998b) Miss Lo as ‘maîtresse’ (i.e. teacher) (11). As the transcript shows, only French is used in this interactional episode. Interestingly, Talia’s request for a Japanese medium triggers laughter (21). That is,
it is seen as deviant. Clearly, this indicates that, in this interactional episode in which Miss Lo is ‘doing being the teacher of French’, the classroom participants are orienting to a French monolingual medium.

This first norm of language choice is also oriented to in small-group interaction. When Miss Lo is away from the small group, one or more of the children are seen to be ‘doing being the language teacher’. This echoes previous studies of classroom talk where children are found to imitate the teacher. For instance, in her study of standard 1 and 4 classrooms in Kenyan schools, Bunyi (2005) reports that children are found to “play the game” of ‘doing being the teacher’. She writes:

“Before Mrs Wambaa entered the classroom in the morning, or even when she was in class but busy with something else at her table, the children could be heard imitating the Gikuyu reading lessons by chanting the letters and syllables. Sometimes, one self-appointed child would take the role of the teacher by taking Mrs Wambaa’s stick and pointing to the syllables on the charts on the walls while she/he (and sometimes with the others joining in role) played the reading game” (2005: 137).

In a similar manner, in the classroom I have observed, the children can be seen ‘doing being the teacher’ by performing acts bound to the category ‘teacher-hood’ such as giving instructions, evaluations, introducing new information and conducting drills. These category-bound acts include language choice. More specifically, when a child is ‘doing being a language teacher’, that language is adopted as the medium of classroom interaction. As a first example, consider extract 28 below. Talia, Leila, Kenji and Piotr are working in a small group, and Maia, who is also a Spanish-speaker, is sitting nearby. We join the talk at the point at which Talia states that Kenji was born to be Spanish (and not Japanese).

Extract 28: (T2 S1 D1 V2 E1)

219. Talia: nació- (.). nació para ser español
220. Leila: pero es japonés
221. Kenji: yo vengo japonés ((imitating Leila))
222. ((girls laughing))
223. Leila: yo vengo japonés↑
224. ((girls laughing))
225. Maia: yo vengo japonés ((imitating Kenji))
226. (.).
227. Leila: yo vengo de Japón!
This extract can be divided into three sequences. First, in 219 and 220, Talia and Leila talk in a side sequence in Spanish about Kenji, discussing whether or not he was born to be Spanish instead of Japanese. In 221, Kenji states in Spanish that he is Japanese. In asserting his identity in Spanish, he opens the side sequence and signals that he understands what is being talked about. In so doing, he rejects Talia and Leila’s “ascription of incompetence” (Auer, 1984: 18) in Spanish. However, his Spanish sentence is not grammatically correct and this is picked up by his Spanish-speaking peers. From then on, a second sequence starts, wherein the three Spanish-speaking children Talia, Leila and Maia make membership to the category ‘teacherhood’ and correct Kenji’s Spanish utterance. Rather than commenting on Kenji’s identity claim, they position themselves as language teachers and open a repair sequence. In 223, Leila starts by repeating Kenji’s Spanish utterance to initiate
repair; she “withholds other-correction” (Schegloff et al., 1977: 378-9) in order to leave space for Kenji to self-repair. Withholding of other-correction is a feature of repair organisation that is typical of classroom talk (McHoul, 1990: 364). It therefore shows that Leila is making membership to ‘teacher-hood’. However, since Kenji does not self-repair, Leila provides the correct utterance (227), which is followed by Kenji’s ratification (228). In short, a teacher-pupil categorisation is constructed through the turn organisation of this repair trajectory. This construction of teacher-hood is reinforced by the fact that the children ‘doing being the language teacher’ are native speakers of Spanish – the experts – while Kenji is a learner of Spanish – in other words, a novice. This expert/novice relationship is also typical of the “asymmetry of knowledge” that characterises teacher-learner talk (Richards, 2006: 63). After the repair sequence, a third sequence starts, in which Talia conducts a drill, also typical of teacher-learner talk. By responding to Talia’s elicitations (in 230 and 235), Kenji makes membership to the category ‘pupil’. Of particular interest in this extract is that, although not all children are speakers of Spanish, talk is conducted in Spanish. I suggest that this language choice can be accounted for by the fact that Talia, Maia and Leila are ‘doing being the teacher of Spanish’.

A similar example can be found in extract 29 below, which is taken from the same small-group interaction as the above extract 28.

Extract 29: (T2 S1 D1 V2 E1)
252. Maia:  Kenji como se dice español↑
253.         ((pointing to an eraser))
254. (.2)
255. Leila:  comment s’appelle ça en espagnol
256.         ((pointing to an eraser))
257. Kenji:  /ɡoˈma:/
258. Talia:  goma
259. (.)
260. Leila:  goma
261. Miss Lo: ça y est c’est fini↑

Extract 29: (T2 S1 D1 V2 E1)
252. Maia:  Kenji how do you say in Spanish↑
253.         ((pointing to an eraser))
254. (.2)
255. Leila:  what is it called this in Spanish
256.         ((pointing to an eraser))
Maia, Leila and Talia are still ‘doing being the teacher of Spanish’ and, in 252, Maia asks Kenji how to say ‘rubber’ in Spanish. The two-second pause (254) indicates that Kenji is encountering a problem with the question asked. Therefore, Leila reiterates the question using French this time (255). This alternation to French is functional, and is an instance of what Gafaranga calls a “medium suspension” (e.g. 2007a, b). In 257, Kenji provides the lexical item in Spanish but is corrected by Talia (258). As Kenji does not seem to ratify the correction, Leila repeats the correct Spanish word (260). In brief, the Spanish-speaking children Maia, Leila and Talia are still ‘doing being the teacher of Spanish’, as they initiate a “label quest” (Heath, 1986) in Spanish and correct Kenji’s output. Similarly, by engaging in the label quest and attempting to provide a second pair part to Maia’s summons, Kenji is ‘doing being the pupil’. Here also, I suggest that Spanish is adopted as the medium because the children who are ‘doing being the language teacher’ are teaching Spanish.

As a last example of the classroom participants orienting to this first norm of language choice, consider extract 30 below. This extract presents a deviant case; that is, a case where someone is ‘doing being a language teacher’ but does not adopt that language as the medium. More specifically, a child (Talia) is ‘doing being the teacher of French’ and interacts with Cristina in Spanish. Interestingly, this language choice is difficult to maintain and speakers switch back to a French monolingual medium. Cristina has to complete sentences of a text that relates the story of a chocolate hen who hides from children. Talia is ‘doing being the teacher’ and helping her completing the sentence ‘elle se cache derrière la porte pour que…’ (i.e. ‘she [the hen] is hiding behind the door so that…’).

Extract 30: (T2 S1 D11 V45 E3)
02. Cristina: ‘elle (.) se cache derrière la porte’
03. Talia: porque
04. (.2)
05. Talia: para que la- para que los niños no la
06. encuentran (.1) ( . ) (.1) escribe (.3)
07. parce que (.1) les enfants ne trouvent pas elle
08. (.14)
09. ((children in other groups are talking with the teacher))
10. Cristina: parce que
11. Talia: non
12. (.3)
13. Cristina: como se hace (.2) parce que
14. Talia: qui c’est ‘elle’ (.1)
15. (.1)
16. Cristina: oui
17. Talia: que fait-elle (.1)
18. (.1)
19. Cristina: mm
20. Talia: que hace (.3)
21. Cristina: se esconde
22. (.3)
23. Talia: elle se (.3) elle (.2) elle se
24. Cristina: cache derrière la porte
25. Talia: de
26. Cristina: de (.1) nichoir
27. Talia: de nichoir (.1) pourquoi (.1)
28. (.2)
29. Cristina: parce que les enfants la trouvent=
30. Talia: =parce que les enfants la trouvent pas!
-----------------------------------------------
02. Cristina: ‘she (.1) is hiding behind the door’
03. Talia: why (.1)
04. (.2)
05. Talia: so that the- so that the children do not
06. find her (.1) ( . ) (.1) write (.3) so
07. that (.1) the children do not find her
08. (.14)
09. ((children in other groups are talking with the teacher))
10. Cristina: so that (.1)
11. Talia: no
12. (.3)
13. Cristina: how does it go (.2) so that (.1)
14. Talia: who is it ‘her’ (.1)
15. (.1)
16. Cristina: yes
17. Talia: what is she doing (.1)
18. (.1)
19. Cristina: mm
20. Talia: what is she doing (.1)
21. Cristina: she is hiding
22. (.3)
23. Talia: she is (.3) she (.2) she is (.1)
24. Cristina: hiding behind the door
25. Talia: of (.1)
26. Cristina: of (.1) nest box
This extract can be divided into two parts. In the first part, from 02 to 07, Talia and Cristina are interacting in Spanish, but French is used to refer to the text Cristina is working on. Talia is ‘doing being the teacher of French’ by helping her peer to complete the French sentence. This is evidenced by the fact that she does not give the answer directly to Cristina – as a peer would usually do with another peer. Instead, she tries to elicit the answer from her (03). Furthermore, since Cristina is not able to complete her sentence (as the two-second pause shows in 04), Talia gives the answer in Spanish, instructing Cristina to write its translation under her dictation (05-07). Then, a fourteen-second pause follows, during which Cristina and Talia work individually (08). In the second part of this extract, Cristina still encounters difficulties completing that same sentence and asks Talia to repeat the answer she gave her earlier (10 and 13). In doing so, Cristina still orients to a Spanish monolingual medium. However, Talia operates a switch of medium and uses French to pursue ‘doing being the teacher of French’. She provides “clueing” (17, 20, 23, 25, and 27), a practice in which “teachers attempt to lead students to correct answers by small steps” (McHoul, 1990: 355). For instance, in 17, Talia is trying to elicit from Cristina the verb of the sentence she has to write. However, the one-second pause (18) and the hesitation marker (mm, in 19) indicate that Cristina does not know the answer. As a result, Talia reiterates her question in Spanish (20) and Cristina provides an answer using Spanish too (21). Of particular interest is that Cristina waited for Talia to initiate a switch in Spanish to alternate language. This shows that she orients to the use of Spanish as deviant and to French as being the current medium. The speaker’s orientation to a French monolingual medium is further demonstrated by Talia’s asking for Cristina’s answer in Spanish to be repaired and translated into French (23). In withholding other-repair, Talia also shows that she is ‘doing being the teacher’ (see McHoul, 1990). Clearly, as Talia is ‘doing being the teacher of French’, the initial choice of Spanish as a medium is difficult to maintain, and French is soon adopted. This last example thus confirms
the relevance of the first norm of language choice, namely that when someone is ‘doing being the teacher of language X’, that language is adopted as the medium of classroom interaction.

7.4. When no-one is ‘doing being a language teacher’

When no-one is ‘doing being a language teacher’, the classroom participants seem to orient to their “language preference” (Auer, 1984, 1988, 1995, and 1998b) to interpret each other’s language choice acts. More specifically, it is because children categorise themselves to the same “language preference categorisation device” (Gafaranga, 2001, 2005) that talk can be conducted in their shared preferred language. In fact, two main situations emerge: either speakers share a preferred language, or they do not. In light of this dichotomy, I first account for instances of language choice practices in interactional episodes in which no-one is ‘doing being the language teacher’ and there is a shared preferred language (§7.4.1), and then turn to interactional episodes in which no-one is ‘doing being the language teacher’ and there is no shared preferred language (§7.4.2).

7.4.1. And there is a shared preferred language

In my data, I observe a second norm of language choice, which can be stated as follows:

_When no-one is ‘doing being a language teacher’ and there is a shared preferred language, that language is adopted as the medium of classroom interaction._

This norm is oriented to by the classroom participants in two cases, namely, when someone is ‘doing being a content teacher’ and when no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’.
7.4.1.1. Interactional episodes in which someone is ‘doing being a content teacher’

In my data, examples of interactional episodes in which someone is ‘doing being a content teacher’ and speakers share a preferred language are found in child-child talk. Consider, for instance, extract 31 below. Leila is ‘doing being the teacher of Maths’ and explaining fractions to her Spanish-speaking peer Talia.

Extract 31: (T2 S1 D5 V15 E5)

01. Leila: buen (.) empecemos
02. Talia: a ver
03. (.)
04. Leila: eso es una fracción!
05. (.1)
06. Leila: mira (.) aquí tenés (.) una torta no↑
07. (.2)
08. Leila: tenés dividido en cuatro=
09. Talia: =cuatro (.) por eso (.) por eso son (.) y
10. como están rallados
11. Leila: un cuarto! (.) bueno entonces te voy a hacer fracciones y ahora me las vas a hacer
12. Talia: ay pero hacélos bien Leila!
13. ((laughing))
14. Leila: oye Talia!
15. (.3)
16. Leila: no soy dibujadora profesional (.) no me salen los círculos
17. (.4)
18. Leila: hazme fracción
19. (.5)
20. Talia: son (.) cuatro octavos
21. (.6)
22. Leila: okay (.) bueno bueno

01. Leila: so (.) let’s start
02. Talia: let’s see
03. (.)
04. Leila: this is a fraction!
05. (.1)
06. Leila: look (.) here you have (.) a pie right↑
07. (.2)
08. Leila: you have to divide it in four=
09. Talia: =four (.) that’s why (.) that’s why they are- (.) and as if they were stripy
10. Leila: a quarter! (.) okay so I’m going to give you some fractions and you’re going to do them for me
11. Talia: ah but do them well Leila!
12. ((laughing))
13. Leila: oye Talia!
14. (.3)
In this extract, Leila is ‘doing being the teacher of Maths’. This is evidenced by various facts: she controls the floor and opens the interaction (01), introduces new information about fractions (04, 11), and gives explanations (06, 08), instructions (22) and evaluation (25). The last few turns presented in the extract are, in this regard, quite explicit. In 22, Leila gives an instruction to Talia. After a nine-second pause (23), during which Talia is assumed to be thinking of her answer – which McHoul (1978) calls time for “due consideration” – she responds to Leila (24); and in 25, Leila gives her feedback. These three turns correspond to the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) sequence (Bellack et al., 1966; Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975) that has frequently been observed in classroom talk between teacher and pupils (e.g. Allwright and Bailey, 1991; Mehan, 1979b; Mercer, 1995). Therefore, in following an IRF sequence, both Talia and Leila demonstrate that they orient to teacher-learner categories. I suggest that Talia and Leila are orienting to the second norm of language choice, namely, that when no-one is ‘doing being a language teacher’ and there is a shared preferred language, that language is adopted as the medium. In short, I suggest that it is because Leila is ‘doing being the teacher of Maths’ (and not of French) that Spanish, the preferred language shared with Talia, is adopted as the medium.

7.4.1.2. Interactional episodes in which no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’

Some even more salient examples of the classroom participants’ orientation to the second norm of language choice can be found in interactional episodes in which no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’.

In the corpus under study, teacher-hood is not always enacted. There are classroom interactional episodes in which no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’.
These types of episode are found exclusively in child-child talk. As we have seen, among the twelve children who attended the target induction classroom during the period of data collection, only English, Spanish and Peul were shared between two or more children (see table 3 and 4). More specifically, five children spoke Spanish (Talia, Leila, Maia, Cristina, and Andrea), four spoke English (Karen, Talia, Maia, and Matilda) and two spoke Peul (Amkoulel and Samba). As a result, when interacting among themselves, these children are seen to make membership to their preferred language category. However, it should be noted from the outset that no instances of child-child talk were found to be conducted in Peul. This is confirmed by my observations of classroom interaction. Indeed, I never witnessed Amkoulel and Samba talking to each other in Peul in the classroom. Therefore, any child-child talk that takes place when no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’ is conducted either in an English monolingual medium, a Spanish monolingual medium, a French and English bilingual medium or a French and Spanish bilingual medium. This is illustrated by the examples hereafter.

The second norm of language choice accounts for the choice of an English monolingual medium where no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’ and English is the children’s preferred language. Examples of such talk have already been discussed in Chapter Six (see §6.2.2). Extracts 13 and 14 gave an example of two children (Matilda and Talia) who first negotiated the medium, then converged on one of the children’s (Talia) choice of medium, namely English. Extract 12 showed the same two children interacting in a side sequence in an English monolingual medium, while the teacher was addressing the whole class. A similar case is extract 32 below, which is the continuation of the talk presented in extract 6. Miss Lo is helping Matilda find the French translation of the title of the movie that she saw at the weekend, and is asking another English speaking peer for her translation expertise. Meanwhile, Matilda and Talia open a side sequence in English.

---

70 In fact, Amkoulel and Samba were in general very quiet and thus do not appear to talk very often in the corpus. I hypothesise that they never used Peul in the classroom because they perceived their language to be less prestigious than Spanish, English or Japanese. Further research would be needed to confirm this hypothesis.
In 99, Matilda gives the English title of the movie she saw over the weekend, so that one of her English-speaking peers can provide the French translation. Matilda’s reference to an English movie title triggers a side sequence between her and Talia in English. In 99-100 and 102-103, the two children leave the teacher-led interactional episode and interact in a side sequence, in which no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’. As a consequence, they orient to the second norm of language choice and adopt their preferred language as the medium.

When Spanish-speaking children interact together and none of them is ‘doing being the teacher’, they orient to their preferred category ‘Spanish-speaker’ and use a Spanish monolingual medium. Some examples of a Spanish monolingual medium have been discussed in Chapter Six (see section §6.2.3). To recall, extracts 15 and 16 showed Talia and Leila interacting in Spanish in a side sequence to a teacher-led interactional episode. A similar example is extract 33 below. Miss Lo is introducing the notion of ‘fairy tales’, asking children if they have fairy tales in their home country in order to check their understanding of the notion. Here, she turns to Kenji and asks him if there are fairy tales in Japan.
In 659, Leila deviates from the French monolingual medium of the teacher-led interaction to give an example of a fairy tale that she knows in Spanish. It is uttered in a loud voice and is thus addressed to the teacher. This language alternation is an instance of what Gafaranga (e.g. 2007a, 2007b) calls a “medium suspension”, insofar as it is a temporary departure from the medium that serves the function of signalling understanding to Miss Lo. Interestingly, in 661, Talia proposes to interpret Leila’s switch into Spanish as the opening of a side sequence, and
responds to it in Spanish. From 661 to 664, Talia and Leila are talking to each other in a side sequence, while Miss Lo is interacting with Kenji and the rest of the class. Since, in this side sequence, no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’ and there is a shared preferred language, the children can orient to the second norm of language choice and adopt Spanish as the medium. Talia’s alternation to English (664) is a functional deviance (i.e. a “medium suspension” in Gafaranga’s model) from the Spanish monolingual medium they are orienting to.

A Spanish monolingual medium is also found in small-group interaction, in which children orient to their preferred language category ‘Spanish-speaker’. This is illustrated in extracts 17 and 18 (discussed in Chapter Six), in which Talia and Leila are talking in Spanish. Extract 34 below gives a further example of speakers orienting to the second norm of language choice. Talia and Leila have to complete the story of Little Red Riding Hood by giving the gerundive form of verbs provided in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 34: (T2 S1 D1 V1 E10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01. Leila: Talia levanta la mano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02. Talia: por qué</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03. Leila: porque no entiendo (.) levanta de la mano (.) si no se me [acalambra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05. Talia: sería (.) ‘le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06. Leila: loup part’ (.) ‘en’ cou[rir↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07. Leila: eso no sé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09. Talia: ‘vers la maison de la grand-mère’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the transcript shows, Talia and Leila use Spanish to talk about their exercise. French (06 and 09) is a temporary departure from a Spanish medium to refer to the exercise they are working on (which Gafaranga calls a “medium suspension”; e.g.
The children’s choice of a Spanish monolingual medium can be accounted for with reference to the second norm of language choice, namely the fact that no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’ and that the children share Spanish as a preferred language.

Thus far, I have shown that, when no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’ (which is found in child-child talk in my data) and there is a shared preferred language among speakers, they make membership to this category and use that language as the medium of their classroom interactional episode. At times, each child is found to be using their preferred language in the same interactional episode, without it being oriented to as a problem to be repaired. In Chapter Six, I demonstrated that these language choice acts are instances of bilingual mediums (see section §6.2.4 and §6.2.5). More specifically, I identified instances of the “parallel mode” (Gafaranga and Torras, 2001) of a French and Spanish bilingual medium (e.g. extract 21), the “halfway-between mode” (Gafaranga and Torras, 2001) of a French and English bilingual medium (e.g. extract 19) and a French and Spanish bilingual medium (e.g. extract 22). These choices of bilingual mediums can be accounted for by reference to the fact that children categorise themselves and each other as “doing being bilinguals” (Gafaranga, 2001: 1922). Another example of the children ‘doing being bilingual’ is extract 35 below. Matilda and Talia are next to each other, engaged in a drawing activity.

**Extract 35: (T2 S1 D9 V37 E1)**

168. Talia: j’ai fini!
169. Matilda: ah bon! (.) t’as huit pages!
170. Talia: this (.) hey (.) that’s not easy (.)
171. no
172. (.3)
173. Talia: it’s [so so-
174. Matilda: [if I think ehm:
175. Talia: it’s so so- (.) oh! Matilda:
176. Matilda: quoi↑ (.) qu’est-ce que j’ai fait↑
177. Talia: t’as fait ça

168. Talia: I’ve finished!
169. Matilda: oh really! (.) you have eight pages!
170. Talia: this (.) hey (.) that’s not easy (.)
171. no
Here, Talia and Matilda are interacting both in French and English, without it being functional or oriented to as a repairable matter. More specifically, Talia uses French in 168 and 177, but uses English in 170-1, 173, 175, and Matilda uses French in 169 and 176, but uses English in 174. In Gafaranga’s (e.g. 2007a, b) model, this extract presents an instance of the “mixed mode” of a bilingual medium as both speakers are seen to alternate languages. In short, since no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’ in this interactional episode, Matilda and Talia are orienting to their preferred language category ‘French and English bilingual speaker’, and are thus using a French and English bilingual medium.

### 7.4.2. And there is no shared preferred language

The second norm of language choice discussed earlier accounts for language choice acts in interactional episodes in which no-one is ‘doing being the language teacher’ (for instance, when someone is ‘doing being the content teacher’ or when no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’) and there is a shared preferred language among speakers. However, it does not account for instances of interactional episodes in which no-one is ‘doing being the language teacher’ and there is no shared preferred language among speakers. In this case, I have observed that the following norm is oriented to:

**When no-one is ‘doing being the language teacher’ and there is no shared preferred language, the language common to all speakers (namely, French) is adopted as the medium.**

This third norm of language choice is oriented to by the classroom participants when no-one is ‘doing being the language teacher’: for example when someone is ‘doing being a content teacher’, or when no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’.
7.4.2.1. Interactional episodes in which someone is ‘doing being a content teacher’

A first example of an interactional episode in which this third norm of language choice is oriented to by the classroom participants is when someone is ‘doing being a content teacher’ and there is no shared preferred language. In my data, this type of situation is often found in adult-child talk, since Miss Lo does not share a preferred language with any of her pupils and is seen at times to teach subjects other than language, such as Maths. By way of illustration, consider extract 36 below. Miss Lo is checking Leila’s Maths exercise and realises that Leila gave the wrong answer.

Extract 36: (T2 S1 D9 V36 E3)
01. Miss Lo:  ‘combien de sandwiches différents fait-elle’ (.1) ‘elle fait trente sandwiches’
02. (. ) non (. ) haha! (. ) ‘différents’
03. (.2)
04. Miss Lo:  elle en fait pas trente différents
05. (.2)
06. Miss Lo:  elle fait des sandwiches d’un certain
07. style et des sandwiches d’un autre style
08. (. )
09. (.2)
10. Leila:  ha! (. ) soixante dix-huit!
11. (.2)
12. Kenji:  quoi (.1) trente euh (. ) plus grand
13. (.4)
14. Leila:  je sais pas maîtresse c’est trop difficile!
15. Miss Lo:  elle fait des sandwiches (. ) elle fait des
16. sandwiches qu’elle appelle (.1)
17. ‘petits sacs de santé’
18. Talia:  bueno (. ) regarde (. ) [ça
19. Leila:  [ça fait (. ) dix-
20. huit!
21. Talia:  [ça (. ) et ça
22. (.3)
23. Miss Lo:  non
24. Piotr:  [non!
25. Talia:  [non!

-----------------------------
01. Miss Lo:  ‘how many different sandwiches does she make’ (.1) ‘she makes thirty sandwiches’
02. (. ) no (. ) haha! (. ) ‘different’
03. (.2)
04. Miss Lo:  she doesn’t make thirty sandwiches
05. (.2)
06. Miss Lo:  she makes sandwiches of a certain style
07. and sandwiches from another style
08. (. )
09. (.2)
10. Leila:  ha! (. ) seventy-eight!
11. (.2)
Miss Lo is ‘doing being the teacher of Maths’ as evidenced by the facts that she reads Leila’s answer (02), evaluates it (03, 05 and 23) and provides explanations on how to count the number of different types of sandwiches (07-8). Leila is ‘doing being the pupil’ as evidenced by the fact that she orients to Miss Lo’s negative feedback, tries to provide another answer (10) and is “labeling” (Antaki and Widdicombe, 1998b) Miss Lo as ‘maîtresse’ (14). As the transcript shows, talk is conducted in French. I suggest that this choice of a French monolingual medium can be accounted for with reference to the third norm of language choice, that is, with reference to the facts that no-one is ‘doing being the language teacher’ (but, instead, someone is ‘doing being the content teacher’) and that there is no shared preferred language between the speaker ‘doing being the teacher’ and the speaker ‘doing being the pupil’.

7.4.2.2. Interactional episodes in which no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’

Orientation to this third norm of language choice is further illustrated by examples of interactional episodes in which no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’. In my data, this type of situation is usually found in child-child talk. When children from the same group do not share a preferred language, French – the language common to all the classroom participants – is adopted as the medium. An example of child-child talk, in which no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’ and there is no shared preferred language is extract 11 discussed in Chapter Six (see section §6.2.1). Another
example is extract 37 below. Kenji, Leila and Talia are working together on a written exercise. Kenji does not understand the word ‘route’ (i.e. road).

Extract 37: (T2 S1 D1 V2 E1)

60. Kenji: c’est quoi ça↑
61. Leila: regarde Kenji
62. Talia: regarde Kenji
63. (.)
64. Kenji: une ['route'↑
65. Talia: [ici c’est [en rouge
66. Leila: [oui c’est-
67. Talia: [regarde c’est en rouge
68. Kenji: ['route' (.). c’est quoi ‘route’↑
69. Talia: ça ((pointing to the drawing))
70. Kenji: attends ((Sh opens his digital dictionary))
[...]
76. Kenji: route!
77. Talia: oui
78. Leila: hahaha
79. Talia: hahaha
80. Kenji: d’accord d’accord d’accord (.). ‘marcher
81. une route’

60. Kenji: what is this↑
61. Leila: look Kenji
62. Talia: look Kenji
63. (.)
64. Kenji: a ['road'↑
65. Talia: [here it’s [in red
66. Leila: [yes it’s-
67. Talia: [look it’s in red
68. Kenji: ['road' (.). what is ‘road’↑
69. Talia: ça ((pointing to the drawing))
70. Kenji: wait ((Kenji opens his digital dictionary))
[...]
76. Kenji: road!
77. Talia: yes
78. Leila: hahaha
79. Talia: hahaha
80. Kenji: alright alright alright (.). ‘walking a
81. road’

Kenji asks twice for help from his peers (60 and 64) but the explanations he is given do not help. He therefore asks a third time (68). In 69, Talia points to a drawing of what a ‘road’ looks like. However, Kenji does not show understanding, turning instead to his electronic dictionary to look for the Japanese translation (70). In 76, he repeats the French word ‘route’ to show that he has now understood its meaning. The sequence is closed in 80-81, when Kenji uses the agreement token ‘d’accord’
and repeats the sentence in the exercise in which the word ‘route’ was used. Here, no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’ and the children are categorising each other and themselves as ‘peers’. This is mainly evidenced by the facts that they jointly accomplish the task at hand and help each other to understand the exercise (64-65) without evaluating each other’s responses. Although Kenji does not understand a specific French word, no alternation to another language is possible to solve the problem. We recall that Talia and Leila share Spanish as a preferred language, but the three children talking in this extract do not have a shared preferred language. As a result, and since no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’, talk is conducted in French throughout, the language common to the three children.

As a final example consider extract 38 below, in which both the second and the third norm are illustrated. Talia, Piotr, Leila, and Kenji are working together on a written exercise. The aim of this exercise is to match a profession with the place in which people doing that profession are found. The four children are doing the exercise aloud, moving from one sentence to the next together. Here, they are arguing as to whether they should be matching ‘hospital’ with ‘doctor’ or ‘nurse’.

Extract 38: (T2 S1 D6 V20 E3)

126. (.6)
127. Talia:  c’est ‘infirmière’ qui travaille dans le
128. hôpital
129. (.)
130. Piotr:  c’est ‘docteur’ aussi!
131. Leila:  el doctor también
132. Talia:  c’est ‘infirmière’=
133. Kenji:  =‘docteur’
134. Piotr:  ‘docteur’ aussi!
135. Leila:  Talia dónde trabaja (el doctor) (.) en el
136. hospital también
137. Kenji:  c’est quoi ça (.) ‘docteur’-
138. Talia:  oui je sais
139. ((a whole segment is inaudible))

Extract 38: (T2 S1 D6 V20 E3)

126. (.6)
127. Talia:  its ‘nurse’ that works in a
128. hospital
129. (.)
130. Piotr:  it’s ‘doctor’ too!
131. Leila:  the doctor too
132. Talia:  it’s ‘nurse’=
133. Kenji:  =‘doctor’
In 127-8, Talia moves to a new sentence in the exercise and suggests matching the profession of ‘nursing’ with ‘hospital’. After a short pause (129), Piotr gives another possible answer, saying that doctors also work in hospitals (130). This answer is supported by Leila, who reiterates it using Spanish (131). However, Talia maintains her answer to be correct and repeats that it is nurses who work in hospitals (132). In a latching turn, Kenji joins in, and supports the assertion that the correct answer should be ‘doctor’ (133). In 134, Piotr reasserts his position in French. In 135-6, Leila explains to Talia in Spanish that doctors also work in hospitals. In 137, Kenji attempts to justify his position using French, but is interrupted by Talia, who uses French, in 138, to say that she knows that doctors also work in hospitals. At first, in keeping with previous talk, Talia uses French. This choice can be accounted for by the fact that it is the language common to all four members of the small group and that no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’. As a result, it can be accounted for by reference to the third norm of language choice. Kenji and Piotr also orient to this third norm and use French. However, Leila uses Spanish (131 and 135-6) as she is addressing Talia. In doing so, Leila opens a side sequence that runs in parallel with the interaction Piotr and Kenji are having with Talia. Since Leila’s turn is in Spanish, it is specifically designed to be addressed to Talia – the only other Spanish-speaking child of the small group. In this regard, Leila orients to the second norm of language choice. Since she shares a preferred language with Talia and no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’, she chooses to use this language as the medium to talk with her peer. Nevertheless, both of interactions that run parallel to each other aim at convincing Talia that doctors also work in hospitals; they are topically related. In 138, Talia finally replies to all the counter-arguments to her answer and uses French. In doing so, she orients to the group interaction. By using the language common to all speakers engaged in the interactional episode, she responds to all three children, including Leila. Talia thus
orients to the third norm of language choice, that is, to the fact that, when there is no shared preferred language among speakers and no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’, the language common to all is used as the medium.

To summarise the argument thus far, in §7.4, I showed that when no-one is ‘doing being a language teacher’ (that is, for instance, someone is ‘doing being a content teacher’ or ‘no-one is doing being the teacher’), two norms account for language choice practices. The first norm is that when there is a shared preferred language, it is adopted as the medium. The second is that, when there is no shared preferred language, the language common to all speakers is adopted as the medium. In the next section, I will turn to cases in which the classroom participants orient to different norms in the same classroom interactional episode.

### 7.5. Cases of conflicting norms

In the extracts discussed earlier, the classroom participants clearly orient to the same norms of language choice. In contrast, in the extracts discussed in this section, speakers orient to different norms.

#### 7.5.1. Case One

The first case of conflicting norms observed in the corpus is one in which some classroom participants orient to the first norm of language choice, while others orient to the second. Indeed, situations are observed in which, although someone is ‘doing being the language teacher’ – and that, as a consequence, the first norm of language choice is oriented to – some speakers open a dyadic talk to solve a problem in their shared preferred language. These speakers orient to the second norm of language choice. These medium switches are pointed to by the person ‘doing being the language teacher’ as being inappropriate as they represent a “schism” (Sacks et al., 1974) from the teacher-led interactional episode. Extracts 8 and 9 (discussed in Chapter Six) are examples of cases of conflicting norms (see section §6.2.1). For instance, let us consider extract 8 again, reproduced as extract
39 below for convenience. Maia is telling Miss Lo what she did over the weekend, but she is lacking the French word for ‘cinema’.

During Maia’s word search, Miss Lo and the other children in the class are trying to conduct other-repair by suggesting some French words (05-08). Since none of the suggested words seem to be the one that Maia is lacking, she opens a side sequence with Talia, in which both children orient to the second norm of language choice and use Spanish, their preferred language (09). At this point, Miss Lo interrupts Maia in
an overlapping turn and asks explicitly for no translation (10-11). Interestingly, Maia moves from one interactional episode (teacher-led) to the next (peer-led) and orients to different norms of language choice without signalling it as being a problem. However, Miss Lo sees Maia’s orientation to the second norm of language choice as inappropriate because she perceives Maia as still interacting in a teacher-led episode. In other words, Miss Lo interprets Maia’s talk with Talia as an insertion and not as a side sequence – and thus expects orientation to the first norm of language choice. This indicates that Miss Lo sees categorisation to the relational pair ‘teacher/pupil’ as prevailing against a child’s categorisation to a ‘learner/learner’ relationship. To put it differently, Miss Lo sees categorisation to the “team” (Sacks, 1972b) of ‘teacher-pupil’ as prevailing against a child’s categorisation to the “togethering” (Ryave and Schenkein, 1974) of ‘learner/learner’. By implication, she sees orientation to the first norm of language choice as prevailing against orientation to the second norm of language choice. This point is further illustrated by extract 40 below. Miss Lo is reprimanding Maia for chatting too much, and asks her to leave the class and work in the corridor.

Extract 40: (T2 S1 D7 V26 E2)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06.</td>
<td>Miss Lo:</td>
<td>ç’a suffit (.) je rigole pas hein (.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.</td>
<td>(.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Talia:</td>
<td>j’ex-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Miss Lo:</td>
<td>comme ç’a tu vas pouvoir euh:: parler avec le mur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>(.):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>(.):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Maia:</td>
<td>no entiendo nada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Talia:</td>
<td>que te- (.) que te vayas allá donde está-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Miss Lo:</td>
<td>elle a compris! euh:: Talia elle sait très bien (.) ç’a fait trois fois que je lui dis de se taire et:: elle arrête pas de discuter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Talia:</td>
<td>elle a dit qu’elle comprend pas qu’est-ce que tu veux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Miss Lo:</td>
<td>elle a très bien compris (.) la preuve elle s’est levée avec son livre de Maths et son stylo (.) hein† (.) alors ç’a va</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Miss Lo:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Miss Lo:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Miss Lo:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.</td>
<td>Miss Lo:</td>
<td>enough! (.) I’m not joking uh (.) you go over there (.) you sit down (.) you go and work in the hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.</td>
<td>(.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Talia: I ex-
11. Miss Lo: like this you can erm: talk with
12. the wall
13. (.)
14. Maia: I don’t understand a thing
15. Talia: that you- (. ) you have to go over there
16. where there is-
17. Miss Lo: she understood! erm:: Talia she knows
18. very well (. ) I’ve asked her three times
19. to be quiet and: she keeps chatting
20. Talia: she said she doesn’t understand
21. what you want
22. Miss Lo: she understood perfectly fine (. ) the
23. proof is that she got up with her Maths
24. book and her pen (. ) uh↑ (. ) so it’s fine

From 06 to 12, Miss Lo asks Maia to leave the classroom. The two pauses in 09 and 13 are interpreted by Talia as a sign that Maia does not understand what Miss Lo is telling her. Consequently, she offers to explain to Maia what Miss Lo is telling her (10) but she is interrupted by Miss Lo (11). In 14, Maia turns to her Spanish-speaking peer Talia and tells her in Spanish that she does not understand what is happening. Next, in 15, Talia translates to Maia in Spanish what Miss Lo was just saying. However, she is interrupted by Miss Lo, in 17, who claims that Maia did understand. Therefore, this extract is another example of a child (Maia) who orients to the second norm of language choice as she turns to one of her peers, while she was previously interacting with the adult ‘doing being the teacher’ and orienting to the first norm of language choice. This switch of medium is perceived as inappropriate by Miss Lo because she perceives Talia and Maia’s talk as an insertion to a teacher-led episode, while Talia and Maia seem to perceive their talk as a side sequence in which orientation to the second norm of language choice is possible.

7.5.2. Case Two

The second case in which I have observed that the classroom participants orient to different norms is in small-group interactions in which no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’ and when at least two children share a preferred language. In that case, the speakers who do not have a shared preferred language with another member of the group orient to the third norm of language choice – that is, to the use of a language
common to all members of the group as the medium. In contrast, the speakers who do share a preferred language tend to orient to the second norm of language choice and use that language as their medium. This has already been observed in extract 38 (discussed above), in which Piotr and Kenji address Talia in French, while Leila addresses her in Spanish. These diverging medium choices are not seen as a problem, insofar as both parallel interactions are topic-related, on-task, and contribute on the whole to create a group interaction. However, diverging medium choices can be seen as a problem when they lead to a “schism” (Sacks et al., 1974) of the group interaction, that is, when speakers no longer interact as a small group but instead with speakers with whom they share a preferred language. “Schismick talk” (Sacks et al., 1974) refers to interactional sequences that split off from the main talk within an event. An example of such a situation can be found in extract 11 (discussed in Chapter Six). As we saw, Talia and Leila were talking in Spanish about what animal they looked like and were therefore off-task. Kenji, who is not a Spanish-speaker, called for a return to both a focus on-task and a French monolingual medium. A similar situation is found in extract 41 below. Andrea, Matilda and Maia are engaged in a drawing activity and are seated next to each other. Andrea and Maia are interacting with each other in Spanish (03-04) – their shared preferred language – until Matilda interrupts them and asks them to ‘draw in French’ (05).

**Extract 41: (T2 S1 D7 V28 E2)**

03. Andrea:  ah yo se como dibujar
04. Maia:  coloreo:: un::-
05. Matilda:  dessine en française!
06. (.3)
07. Maia:  (  ) frances=
08. Matilda:  =fr::ances!
09. (.2)
10. Maia:  pas cool
11. (.3)
12. Matilda:  je sais pas comment on dessine!
13. Andrea:  moi je suis forte et ça marche pas
14. (.19)

==============================================================================================

03. Andrea:  ah I don’t know how to draw
04. Maia:  I’m drawing:: a::-
05. Matilda:  draw in French!
06. (.3)
Here, no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’. In 03 and 04, Andrea and Maia are talking to each other in Spanish and thus orient to the second norm of language choice. However, in 05, Matilda asks her peers to conduct the drawing activity in French. After a three-second pause (06), Maia resumes her conversation in Spanish (07). However, her turn is latched by Matilda, who imitates the Spanish word for ‘French’ to repeat her call for talk to be conducted in French (08). In asking her peers to speak French (05 and 08), Matilda shows that she orients to the third norm of language choice, according to which when no-one is ‘doing being the language teacher’ and there is no shared preferred language, the language common to all speakers of the group is adopted as the medium. She thus sees Andrea’s and Maia’s categorisation as ‘Spanish-speaker’, and their subsequent choice of a Spanish monolingual medium as inappropriate. Furthermore, Matilda’s orientation to the third norm of language choice indicates that she orients to the group interaction, and sees talk in a medium other than the one shared by all members of the group as being a “schism” (Sacks et al., 1974) from group interaction. By contrast, in choosing to talk in their shared preferred language, Maia and Andrea indicate that their affiliation to their preferred language category is stronger than their affiliation to the category ‘members of a small group’. By implication, they signal that the second norm of language choice prevails against the third norm. In the last turns of the extract, talk is conducted in French. In this sense, the conflict is solved as all speakers orient to the small-group interaction and therefore to the third norm of language choice.

Many other examples of the second norm of language choice conflicting with the third norm are found in my data. An indication of these conflicting norms is children’s use of mimicry. Consider extract 42 below. Talia, Leila, Kenji and
Piotr are supposed to be working together on a Maths exercise. However, Talia and Leila interact in Spanish, their shared preferred language, which is not understood by Kenji and Piotr.

In this extract, no-one is ‘doing being the language teacher’. More specifically, Talia is ‘doing being the content teacher’ and explaining a Maths exercise to her peer Leila. This is evidenced by the fact that she gives an instruction to Leila (81-2). Of interest here is that Talia and Leila orient to the second norm of language choice and interact in Spanish, as it is their shared preferred language. However, Piotr and Kenji mimic Spanish to indicate that its use is inappropriate in a small group in which Spanish is not shared by all members. In 83 and 86, Piotr produces a series of trills that he regards as being typical of Spanish talk, and, in 87, Kenji uses the small amount of Spanish he knows to mimic his peers. Mimicry is here a marker of deviance, and demonstrates that Kenji and Piotr are orienting to the third norm of language choice and thus to group interaction. In the end, all four children laugh together (88), which shows that the schism to dyadic talk is overcome and the group membership re-established. A last and even more interesting example is extract 43 below. Piotr and Kenji mimic Spanish words to ask Leila and Talia to orient to a French monolingual medium.
In 158-159, Piotr is seen to orient to the third norm of language choice, trying to accomplish the assigned task in French. However, the transcript shows that Leila and Talia are orienting to the second norm of language choice, using Spanish in a parallel conversation about their impending entry to college (160-163). Therefore, Piotr and Kenji mimic Leila and Talia talking in Spanish to indicate that the use of Spanish is inappropriate in small-group interaction in which Spanish is not shared by all speakers. More specifically, Piotr starts mimicking Leila speaking in Spanish by repeating and transforming in a playful manner her injunction ‘cállate’ into ‘/kæjætæ tæ/’ (165). Next, Kenji joins in the mimicry by imitating what he perceives to be a Spanish intonation and pronunciation in uttering a long stretch of non-lexical vocalisation (167-168). As a response, Talia pretends to identify this mimicry as an imitation of Italian and not Spanish (169); joining, in this sense, the playful tone of this reprimand. By refusing to acknowledge that the mimicry is addressed to the language they are using – namely, Spanish – Talia avoids
acknowledging that the reprimand is directed towards her and her Spanish-speaking peer. In the end, joking and laughter reunite the four children in a joint interactional activity and to group membership.

7.6. Summary

In this chapter, I have accounted for the norms underlying the language choice practices described in Chapter Six. I have demonstrated that, in order to make sense of each other’s language choice acts, the classroom participants use as a reference point the co-selective relationship between categories and language choice practices. The category that has the most procedural relevance is that of ‘teacher-hood’. More specifically, a first norm of language choice that is oriented to by the classroom participants is as follows:

1. When someone is ‘doing being the teacher of language X’, that language is adopted as the medium of classroom interaction.

When no-one is ‘doing being the language teacher’, two situations can emerge: either someone is ‘doing being the content teacher’ or no-one is ‘doing being the teacher’. In both cases, speakers’ language preference becomes relevant. Two norms of language choice are oriented to. These can be stated as follows:

2. When no-one is ‘doing being the language teacher’ and there is a shared preferred language, that language is adopted as the medium.
3. When no-one is ‘doing being the language teacher’ and there is no shared preferred language, the language common to all speakers (namely, French) is adopted as the medium.

Based on a sequential and categorisation analysis of sixteen extracts, I argue that these three norms account for all language choice practices identified in my data.

Lastly, I have presented two cases of conflicting norms. The first is that, when the adult is ‘doing being the language teacher’, some children may temporarily make membership to the “togethering” (Ryave and Schenkein, 1974) ‘learner/learner’ and use their shared preferred language as the medium. In contrast, the adult ‘doing being the teacher’ expects all children to make membership solely
to the “team” (Sacks, 1972b) ‘teacher/pupil’ and thus orient to the first norm of language choice. The second is that, in small-group talk, some children may orient to the second norm of language choice and make membership to a preferred language category they share with another member of the group, while other members of the group orient to the third norm of language choice whereby the language common to all members is used as the medium.

In brief, I argue that these norms of language choice are part of the practiced language-in-education policy of the target induction classroom. It is because CA can be used to identify such norms that I have claimed that it can be used to study practiced language policies.
8.1. Introduction

In this last chapter on data analysis, I account for the norms of language alternation practices presented in Chapter Six (§6.3). We recall that two types of language alternation practices were identified. These are what I have termed ‘unlicensed language alternation’ and ‘licensed language alternation’. The focus of this chapter is on licensed language alternation practices as they are the most frequent and regular in the target classroom. Moreover, it is a practice that has not been reported in previous studies of classroom or mundane talk.

In the data, the licensing of language alternation is observed exclusively in adult-child talk when the adult is ‘doing being the teacher’. In accordance with the first norm of language choice described in Chapter 7, since the adult is ‘doing being the teacher’ of French, French is the medium of classroom interaction adopted in all episodes that will be analysed in this chapter. It is also the adult who licenses language alternation (see extracts 25 and 26). It is precisely this practice of licensing that I will account for in more detail in the present chapter. As I will demonstrate in this chapter, one norm accounts for all instances of licensed language alternation:

When there is a problem, language alternation may be licensed by way of attending to it.

In what follows, I begin by summarising aspects of the sequence organisation of talk as stated by Schegloff (mainly 2007a), as this is central to my account of licensed language alternation (§8.2). I then show three types of interactional sequences where the norm of licensed language alternation is oriented to. These are word searches (§8.3), “meaning quests” (Heath, 1986) (§8.4), and what I propose to
call ‘multilingual label quests’ based on Heath’s (1986) notion of “label quests” (§8.5).

8.2. **Sequence organisation in talk-in-interaction**

Interactional sequences in classroom talk, such as the ones discussed in this chapter (namely word searches, meaning quests and label quests), are usually analysed using the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) framework (Bellack et al., 1966; Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; see also Mehan, 1979a who proposes the term ‘Evaluation’ instead of Feedback). This is the case, for instance, of Martin (1999) who writes that the label quests he observes in a primary classroom in Brunei Darussalam follow the IRF sequence. Although the IRF sequence has undoubtedly been useful in previous studies of classroom talk, it is limited for the purpose at hand because it accounts only for interactional sequences that are accomplished over three turns. However, in my data, when problems arise, interactional sequences such as word searches, label quests and meaning quests can be accomplished over a large number of turns. Therefore, as an alternative, I have turned to Schegloff’s (mainly 2007a) framework of sequence organisation in interaction, which follows a CA approach to talk-in-interaction.

At the core of Schegloff’s framework is the notion of “adjacency pair”, which he says is “the unit for sequence construction” (2007a: 13). The main features of an adjacency pair is that it is composed of two turns that are adjacently placed and uttered by different speakers (2007a: 13). The first turn is called a “first pair part” and the second turn a “second pair part” (ibid.). This structure echoes that of Initiation and Response in the IRF framework. As for the Evaluation move, it echoes what Schegloff calls the “sequence-closing third” or “minimal post-expansion” (2007a: 118). Minimal post-expansions refer to the addition of a turn to a sequence after its second pair part. As Schegloff puts it, “the turn which is added is designed not to project any further within-sequence talk beyond itself” (2007a: 118). Types of sequence-closing thirds include “oh”, “okay” and assessments or
repeats; the latter two being used frequently by those ‘doing being the teacher’ in classroom talk.

Of interest here, Schegloff’s (2007a) framework further accounts for expansions of the adjacency pair, namely “pre-expansions”, “insert expansions”, and “non-minimal post-expansions”. Pre-expansions expand the base sequence of an adjacency pair before its first pair part and are there to “project the contingent possibility” that a first pair part will be produced (Schegloff, 2007a: 28). Pre-sequences are often found as preliminaries to invitations, offers, requests and announcements.

Insert-expansions take the form of insertion sequences and expand the base sequence of an adjacency pair between its first and second pair part. It is initiated by the “recipient” of the preceding first pair part (Schegloff, 2007a: 97). Two types of insert-expansions are identified. These are “post-first insert expansions” (ibid: 100) and “pre-second insert expansions” (ibid: 106). Post-first insert expansions are repair sequences that target a problem in hearing or understanding what has been uttered in the first pair part. While post-first insertions “look backward”, pre-second insert expansions “look forward” as they are aimed at getting the information needed to implement a second pair part (ibid: 106).

Similarly to minimal post-expansions, non-minimal post-expansions occur after an adjacency pair and still belong to the same sequence. However, while minimal post-expansions are aimed at closing the sequence in a single turn, non-minimal post-expansions “are different in that the turn following that second pair part is itself a first pair part” which thus calls for a second pair part (Schegloff, 2007a: 149). Such non-minimal post-expansion sequences can be reworkings of the first pair part, disagreements with the second pair parts, other-initiated repair etc. (see Schegloff, 2007a: 149-168 for a full discussion).

In short, Schegloff’s framework presents itself as a useful framework to account for the sequence organisation of complex sequences.
8.3. The example of word searches

Word searches are interactional sequences where a speaker is lacking a *mot juste*. McHoul (1990: 353) observed in his data of classroom talk that word searches usually follow the pattern of repair organisation of ‘self-initiation self-repair’; that is, the classroom participant who is lacking a *mot juste* is the one who initiates repair as well as the one who provides a solution for their problem. In this respect, word searches are thus conducted within one single turn or turn constructional unit. A clear example is extract 44 below. Kenji is saying that, according to him, Japanese is not taught in French primary schools because not many people speak Japanese in France.

To signal that he is lacking a *mot juste*, Kenji stretches two vowels, pauses and thus initiates repair. He is then able to self-repair and provides the searched item, namely the word ‘personne’ (i.e. people). In bilingual classroom talk, it has often been observed that word searches may involve language alternation. In this case, the repair is organised as follows:

1. The first pair part is the initiation of repair where language alternation occurs,
2. The second pair part is the repair (i.e. translation)
3. The sequence-closing third is a ratification.

As an example, consider the following extract from Bonacina and Gafaranga (2010: 8).

**Extract 44:** (T2 S1 D1 V1 E2)

167. Kenji:  il n’y a pas de:: (.3) euh:: (..) personne

167. Kenji:  there is not many:: (.3) ehm:: (..) people

**Extract 45:**

06. Colin:  c’est du peinture qui est- (..) qui est
07. très:: (..) euh:: (..) **liquid**

 [...] 10. Teacher:  liquide
11. Colin:  liquide

06. Colin:  it is a paint that is- (..) that is very:::
As Colin is lacking the *mot juste* in French and cannot self-repair, he alternates to English to name the word he is lacking (07). The initiation of repair is thus the first pair part of the word search, where language alternation occurs without being licensed (what I propose to call ‘unlicensed medium repair’). In 10, Teacher provides the second pair part of the word search and gives the French translation and, in 11, Colin repeats the French word he was lacking, in what is a sequence-closing third of the word search. This example shows a typical organisation of a word search in bilingual classroom talk.

In my data, I have observed that when a child is lacking a *mot juste*, they initiate repair using “trouble markers” (Gafaranga, 2000b) such as the sound stretches observed in extracts 44 and 45, but do not usually switch to their preferred language as in extract 45. As a consequence, a problem arises. On the one hand, the child cannot self-repair, but on the other hand, the other classroom participants cannot conduct other-repair as they do not know what word the child is lacking. As a result, Miss Lo is repeatedly found to license language alternation in the child’s preferred language.

Word searches where language alternation is licensed have already been discussed in Chapter Six (extracts 6 and 7). Another example is extract 46 below (which is the full sequence of which parts have already been included in extracts 6 and 32). Matilda is describing her weekend to Miss Lo and is lacking the French title for the movie she watched.

**Extract 46**: (T2 S1 D5 V15 E3)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>Matilda: samedi on (.2) samedi on voit (.1) euh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>(.3) on voit un film à la maison je- je</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 97. | sais pas comment on dit en français (.)
| 98. | j’ai oublié comment on dit (.). moi je |
| 99. | sais comment on dit en anglais |
| 100. | Miss Lo: mais quoi↑ (.). on dit quoi↑ le titre↑ |
| 101. | Matilda: oui |
Miss Lo: c’est quoi alors?
Matilda: euh (.) je- je sais pas comment on dit en 
français
Miss Lo: ben dis-le en anglais moi ça ne me pose 
pas de problème Ma- Matilda
Matilda: c’est comme euh (.) comme euh (. .) comment 
on dit::
Miss Lo: c’est quoi (.) ah ben tiens Karen tu vas 
nous traduire le titre là parce que::
Matilda: lord of the ring!
Talia: ouh::! I love
Miss Lo: le sei[gneur
Matilda: [you know]
Talia: yeah::! I’ve seen it
Karen: mm
Miss Lo: ring c’est quoi
Karen: [ring c’est::
Leila: [rey león]
Karen: c’est::
Talia: el rey león
Miss Lo: chut! attendez attendez!
Leila: le roi de les- de (.) ça ((showing a ring 
on her finger))
Miss Lo: ah! (.) le seigneur des anneaux!
Leila: [oui c’est ça
Matilda: [oui!
Piotr: oui
Miss Lo: d’accord (. .) le seigneur des anneaux

Miss Lo: but what↑ (. .) to say what↑ the title↑
Matilda: yes
Miss Lo: what is it then↑
Matilda: ehm (. .) I– I don’t know how to say it 
in French
Miss Lo: well say it in English it’s not a 
problem with me Ma- Matilda
Matilda: hahaha ((laughing)) (. .) lord of the ring 
(. .)
Matilda: it’s like ehm (. .) like ehm (. .) like 
how do we say::
Miss Lo: it’s what (. .) ah there Karen you’re going 
to translate us the title here because::
Matilda: lord of the ring!
Talia: ouh::! I love
Miss Lo: the [lord
Matilda: [you know↑
Talia: yeah::! I’ve seen it
Karen: mm
Miss Lo: ring what is it↑
Here, Matilda is lacking the French title of the movie she saw over the weekend. She signals that she is encountering a difficulty by using two long pauses (77), by recycling her utterance (‘on voit’ is repeated twice, in 77 and 78), and then by stating the nature of the trouble, namely that she is lacking a word in French (79) or, more precisely, that she forgot it (80). Thus, the problem here is that Matilda is unable to self-repair. Furthermore, she is unable to initiate repair in a way that would allow other classroom participants to conduct other-repair since the source of her difficulty (that is, the word that she is lacking) is unknown to them. Even after the negotiation of the object of the problem, Miss Lo is unable to help, and, therefore, licenses language alternation in 87-88. This is followed by Matilda’s laughter, which indicates that English is a dispreferred choice, and by her switch to English (89). In the remainder of the extract, participants work towards repairing this use of English. In 109, Miss Lo is then able (or pretends to then be able) to translate the English title and gives the French title. The translation is ratified by Leila, Talia and Piotr (110-112). Lastly, in 113, Miss Lo repeats the translation, which closes the word search. Extract 46 is thus an example of what I have proposed to term ‘licensed medium repair’ (see Chapter Six section §6.3.2) since Matilda’s language alternation is both licensed and a repairable matter. Clearly, language alternation is licensed as an attempt to overcome the fact that the speaker initiating repair cannot self-repair and the other classroom participants cannot conduct other-repair.

Another example of licensed language alternation in word searches is extract 47 below. Anika is telling Miss Lo what she ate the night before. In the turns
preceding this extract, she said that she had meat with green beans. We join the conversation when Anika is looking for a word in French to describe what else she had with meat and green beans.

Extract 47: (T2 S1 D5 V18 E1)
35. Anika: quelque chose comme euh::
36. (.3)
37. Miss Lo: ben dis et les autres ils vont pouvoir t’aider peut-être (.) dis qu’est-ce que tu cherches↑
38. .
39. Anika: je sais pas comment ça-
40. (.)
41. Miss Lo: mais c’est quoi↑
42. (.3)
43. Matilda: c’est un raclette euh↑
44. (.6)
45. Anika: euh:: (. en français je sais pas-
46. Miss Lo: mais c’est de la nourriture↑
47. Anika: oui
48. Miss Lo: c’est de la nourriture↑
49. Anika: mm
50. Miss Lo: ah non mais c’est quoi alors↑
51. (.6)
52. Miss Lo: en roumain c’est comment alors (.) dis-moi en roumain
53. Anika: euh:. usturoi et c’est (. en roumain
54. Miss Lo: comment c’est en roumain↑
55. Anika: usturoi
56. (.)
57. Miss Lo: usturoi (. et usturoi ça se mange↑
58. Anika: euh (. ouais
59. Miss Lo: ah
60. Anika: et c’est (. c’est comme ça ((gets up from her chair to draw on the blackboard))
61. Miss Lo: ah ben voilà! (. tu nous fais un dessin
62. (. usturoi ça vous dit quelque chose
63. les autres non↑ (. usturoi non↑
64. (.8)
65. ((Anika draws on the blackboard))
66. Miss Lo: ah! (.2 c’est des oignons↑
67. (.2)
68. Anika: non::
69. Miss Lo: c’est un légume↑
70. Anika: oui
71. Miss Lo: ah (. je vais te montrer alors attends
72. ((T goes and look for a picture book))
73. Anika: c’est (. avec des tomates!
74. (.6)
75. Miss Lo: est-ce que c’est (. est-ce que c’est:
76. (. est-ce que c’est
77. (.18)
78. ((children chatting in the background))
Miss Lo: alors (. ) quarante et un (. ) quarante quatre (. ) quarante cinq (. 2) voilà (. )
alors attendez (. ) non non non restez assis restez assis! (. ) est-ce que c’est ça (. )

(. 2)

Anika: euh:: oui

Miss Lo: c’est ça (. ) des oignons

(. 2)

((pointing to the picture book))

Anika: euh:: oui

Miss Lo: c’est ça hein (. )

(. 2)

Miss Lo: et quand on coupe qu- (. ) on pleure

Anika: non c’est ça! (. ) c’est ça ((pointing to another picture on the book))

Miss Lo: ah! (. ) de l’ail! (. ) de l’ail!

Anika: de l’ail

Miss Lo: d’accord c’est de l’ail (. ) avec des tomates (. )

Anika: ouais

-----------------------------

Anika: something like ehm::.:

(. 3)

Miss Lo: well say and the others will be able to help you maybe (. ) say what you’re looking for (. )

Anika: I don’t know how it-

(. )

Miss Lo: but what is it (. )

(. 3)

Matilda: is it a raclette ehm (. )

(. 6)

Anika: ehm:: (. ) in French I don’t know-

Miss Lo: but is it food (. )

Anika: yes

Miss Lo: is it food (. )

Anika: mm

Miss Lo: ah no but what is it then (. )

(. 6)

Miss Lo: in Romanian how is it then (. ) tell me in Romanian

Anika: ehm: ( . ) usturoi and it’s (. )

Miss Lo: how is it in Romanian (. )

Anika: usturoi usturoi (. ) and can you eat usturoi (. )

Anika: ehm (. ) yeah

Miss Lo: ah

Anika: and it’s (. ) it’s like this ((gets up from to draw on the blackboard))

Miss Lo: ah there you go! (. ) you’re drawing for us (. ) usturoi does it ring a bell to anybody no (. )

(. 8)

((Anika draws on the blackboard))
Miss Lo:  ah! (.) are they onions↑
(.2)
Anika:  no::
Miss Lo:  is it a vegetable↑
Anika:  yes
Miss Lo:  ah (.) I’m going to show you then wait
((Miss Lo goes and look for a picture book))
Anika:  it’s (.) with tomatoes!
(.6)
Miss Lo:  what is it (.) is it:: (.) is it
it
((child chatting in the background))
Miss Lo:  so (.) forty one (.) forty four (.)
forty five (.2) there you go (.) so
wait (.) no no no you all
stay sitting stay sitting! (.) is
it this↑
(.2)
Anika:  ehm :: yes
Miss Lo:  it’s this↑ (.) onions
(.2)
Miss Lo:  it’s this huh↑
((pointing to the picture book))
(.2)
Miss Lo:  and you cut wh- (.) you cry
Anika:  no it’s this! (.) it’s this ((pointing to
another picture on the book))
Miss Lo:  ah! (.) garlic! (.) garlic!
Anika:  garlic
Miss Lo:  okay it’s garlic (.) with
tomatoes↑
Anika:  yeah

Similarly to extract 46, this word search follows the structural organisation of repair trajectories. The initiation of repair takes place from 35 to 58, other-repair is accomplished from 59 to 97 by Miss Lo since Anika does not share a common preferred language with another peer in the classroom, and in 98, Anika ratifies the teacher-led other-repair by repeating the French word. From 99 onwards, the sequence is closed and the conversation resumed. This extract thus shows a ‘licensed medium repair’ that is conducted over many turns. The point to be emphasised is that Anika seems unable to self-repair. Miss Lo asks her to explain what she is lacking so that the other classroom participants can help her (37-39); that is, she orients to “teacher-initiated peer-repair” (Seedhouse, 2004: 147). In 42, she asks about the nature of the trouble source and, in 44, Matilda offers a candidate to repair Anika’s problem. However, the numerous and long pauses (in 36, 43 and
45) indicate that Anika is still encountering a problem. Nevertheless, Miss Lo pursues the identification of the nature of the trouble from 47 to 51. After a six-second pause (52), she realises that Anika will not be able to give more precise information regarding the nature of the trouble source and thus licenses language alternation in Romanian, Anika’s first language (53-54). Clearly, language alternation is licensed to overcome the fact that, on the one hand, Anika cannot self-repair, and, on the other hand, the classroom participants cannot identify the nature of the trouble and provide other-repair.

The structure of word searches observed in these two examples differs from the repair organisation of ‘self-initiation self-repair’ (as illustrated in extract 44), which was said to be typical of word searches in classroom talk (McHoul, 1990: 353). It also differs from the repair organisation of word searches observed in bilingual classroom talk (see extract 45). In the corpus of interaction collected in the target classroom, this three-step structure is expanded; that is, another turn is added between the first and the second pair part. Between the initiation of repair and the repair of the trouble source, a pre-second insertion sequence (Schegloff, 2007a) is added where (1), in a first pair part, Miss Lo licenses language alternation and (2), in a second pair part, the child alternates language. This pre-second insertion sequence occurs because there is a problem; namely, the speaker lacking a word cannot self-repair and Miss Lo cannot identify the nature of the trouble source. In brief, the examples of word searches discussed here have illustrated an orientation to the norm of licensed language alternation, namely that when there is a problem, language alternation may be licensed.

8.4. The example of meaning quests

In this section, I present a second example of an interactional sequence in which language alternation is licensed, namely meaning quests. The notion of “meaning quest” comes from Heath (1986), who uses it to refer to sequences where “adults either infer for the young child what he or she means, interpret their own behaviour
or that of others, or ask for explanations of what is meant or intended” (Heath, 1986: 168, my emphasis). I suggest extending Heath’s original definition to encompass instances of interactional sequences observed in my data where meaning is also elicited by a child and not solely by the adult. Structurally speaking, meaning quests are typically organised in three turns:

1. The first pair part consists of speaker A asking for the meaning of a lexical item,
2. The second pair part consists of speaker B giving explanations, and
3. The sequence-closing third consists of speaker A ratifying the explanations.

This typical structure can be found, for instance, in extract 48 below. Miss Lo is reading a story to the whole class and stops from time to time to check whether everyone has understood. Here, she asks for the meaning of the French expression ‘dormir à la belle étoile’ (i.e. to sleep out).

Extract 48: (T2 S1 D4 V12 E1)

73. Miss Lo: elle dit qu'elle va dormir à la belle étoile (.) ça veut dire quoi dormir à la belle étoile?
74. Cristina: elle veut dormir::
75. Leila: qu'elle va dormir à la plaine
76. Talia: elle va dormir seule
77. ( )
78. ((many children talking at the same time))
79. Leila: dehors
80. Miss Lo: dehors (.) voilà (.) à la belle étoile
81. Talia: c’est (.) [dehors
82. Cristina: [dehors
83. Kenji: oui je vois
84.-------------------------------------------------------------
85. Miss Lo: she says that she is going to sleep out (.) what does it mean sleeping out?
86. Cristina: she wants to sleep::
87. Leila: that she will sleep in the field
88. Talia: she is going to sleep alone
89. ( )
90. ((many children talking at the same time))
91. Leila: outside
92. Miss Lo: outside (.) that’s it (.) to sleep out
93. Cristina: [outside
94. Kenji: yes I get it
In 74-5, Miss Lo produces the first pair part of a meaning quest. From 76 to 82, the children propose second pair parts to the teacher’s first pair part; none of which are acceptable except for Leila’s one (81). In 82, Miss Lo acknowledges Leila’s second pair part as being the appropriate one and ratifies it (‘voilà’). She then checks understanding with the rest of the children.

In the data, meaning quests elicited by children are not always as straightforward as those elicited by the teacher. In fact, it is frequent that a problem occurs at the level of the second pair part when a child does not show understanding of the meaning they have requested. As a consequence, language alternation is licensed to encourage peers to provide explanation in the child’s preferred language. By way of an example, consider extract 49 below. Matilda is asking Miss Lo the meaning of the French ‘le bal’ (i.e. the ball).

**Extract 49: (T2 S1 D8 V29 E2)**

05. Matilda: c’est quoi le bal↑
06. Miss Lo: le bal c’est quand on danse (.) la la la
07. la la ((singing and imitating someone
dancing)) (.) on danse à plusieurs (.) il
08. y a plusieurs personnes et puis on
09. danse
10. (.1)
11. (.2)
12. Miss Lo : c’est comme une fête mais euh:: mm
13. (.6)
14. Miss Lo: c’est une fête où les gens dansent
15. (.6)
16. Miss Lo: Matil- et comment on dit bal en anglais
17. euh:: Karen↑
18. Karen: a (.) ball
19. Miss Lo: ah (.2) oui tu connais↑ (.2) ok

05. Matilda: what is the ball↑
06. Miss Lo: the ball it’s when we dance (.) la la la
07. la la ((singing and imitating someone
dancing)) (.) a lot of people dance
08. together (.) there is a lot of people and
09. they’re dancing
10. (.1)
11. (.2)
12. Miss Lo: it’s like a party but ehm:: mm
13. (.6)
14. Miss Lo: it’s a party where people dance
15. (.6)
16. Miss Lo: Matil- and how do you say ball in English

---
In 05, Matilda produces the first pair part of a meaning quest by asking for the meaning of the French word ‘le bal’. In a second pair part, Miss Lo provides a definition, sings and imitates people dancing (a functional switch to a non-verbal medium) (06-10). However, a one-second pause occurs in the third position (11). This silence is interpreted by Miss Lo as being an other-initiation of repair; that is, as being an indication that Matilda has not understood the explanation she gave in the second pair part. Therefore, in 12, Miss Lo provides repair and reformulates her explanation. However, a two-second pause occurs (13), which is interpreted as an other-initiation of repair. Therefore, Miss Lo reformulates again her explanation in 14, providing repair. This repair is again followed by a six-second pause (15), which is also interpreted by Miss Lo as a sign that Matilda has not understood; that is, as an other-initiation of repair. As the problem is not solved in the current medium, Miss Lo changes strategy and licenses language alternation as a last resource. To resume, following the initiation of repair (15), Miss Lo opens a side sequence where she licenses language alternation and draws on the expertise of another peer. In 16, she conducts a translation quest and asks Karen to translate the French word in Matilda’s preferred language, namely English. Karen’s switch to English in 18 is then acknowledged by Miss Lo in 19 (‘ah’). Then, Miss Lo turns back to Matilda and checks her understanding (‘oui tu connais’, 19). Although Matilda is not heard to verbally ratify Karen’s translation, her ratification is assumed since Miss Lo closes the meaning quest (‘ok’). Clearly, language alternation is licensed because Matilda did not ratify Miss Lo’s explanations.

Another example of a meaning quest where language alternation is licensed is extract 50 below. Maia asks Miss Lo the meaning of the French verb ‘mimer’ (i.e. to mime) (04).

Extract 50: (T2 S1 D8 V29 E1)
01. Miss Lo: quels sont les mots que vous avez pas
compris dans la lecture (. après on va
revenir dessus mais là je voudrais savoir
Maia: mimer
Miss Lo: hein↑
Maia: ça
Miss Lo: ah oui (. elle (. Zoé mime une statue
vous savez ce que c’est qu’une statue (. voilà une
statue (pointing at the book) (. Zoé
mime une statue (. elle fait comme ça
((Miss Lo imitates the character in the book))
zoé (. hein↑ (. Alex et Zoé (. Zoé là
elle mime (. elle imite (. mime
Miss Lo: d’accord↑
Miss Lo: je mime par exemple si je veux mimer euh:: (. un éléphant (.3) ((Miss Lo imitates an elephant)) mimer c’est imiter (. elle fait comme si elle était une statue
((pointing at the book)) (. Zoé mimes a
statue (.) elle fait comme ça ((Miss Lo imitates the character in the book))
Miss Lo: Zoé (. hein↑ (. Alex et Zoé (. Zoé
elle mime (. elle imite (. mime
Miss Lo: d’accord↑ (. ok↑ (.1) alors (. voilà
une salle avec des statues
Miss Lo: what are the words that you did not understand
in the reading (. after we will come back
to it but now I would like to know
Maia: to mime
Miss Lo: huh↑
Maia: this
Miss Lo: ah yes (. she (. Zoé mimes a statue
it’s like this (. there is a statue (. you know what a statue is (. here is a
statue (.2) huh (. here is a statue
(pointing at the book) (. Zoé mimes a
statue (. she does like that ((Miss Lo imitates the character in the book))
Zoé (. huh↑ (. Alex and Zoé (. Zoé
there she mimes (. she imitates (. mime
Miss Lo: alright↑
In 04, Maia produces the first pair part of a meaning quest. From 05 to 07, a “post-first insert expansion” (Schegloff, 2007a) occurs where Miss Lo initiates repair with the “open class repair initiator” (Drew, 1997) ‘hein’ and asks for the object of the meaning quest to be repeated. Next, Miss Lo produces a second pair part to Maia’s first pair part and tries explaining the verb ‘mime’ (i.e. ‘to mime’) to Maia (07-13). This is followed by a four-second pause (14), which is interpreted by Miss Lo as an other-initiation of repair; that is, as Maia not understanding the explanations she provided. Following this first pair part of a repair sequence, Miss Lo produces a second pair part and reformulates her explanations; which are still met by a silence (17). Miss Lo thus pursues giving explanations. Following another pause in 24, Miss Lo realises that the problem cannot be solved in the current medium. The pause in 24 functions as an initiation of repair. It is followed by an insertion sequence, where Miss Lo turns to a peer who shares Maia’s preferred language (Spanish) and licenses language alternation. More specifically, Miss Lo produces the first pair part of a translation quest and asks Leila to translate the French verb (25). She thus licenses language alternation. In 28-30, Spanish speaking children jointly provide second pair parts to Miss Lo’s first pair part and, in 31, Miss Lo acknowledges the switch to Spanish in a sequence-closing third ‘d’accord’. Then, in the same turn, Miss Lo restates her second pair part of the meaning quest. Lastly, a closing sequence occurs, where Miss Lo checks understanding with Maia (32, 34). Although Maia is not heard to show understanding, her ratification is assumed as
Miss Lo moves to a different topic with the marker ‘alors’ (34). Clearly, language alternation is licensed as the child who initiated the meaning quest does not understand the explanations given to her.

I have shown in this section that the classroom participants orient to the norm of licensed language alternation when there is a problem in meaning quests. More specifically, when the speaker who initiated a meaning quest does not acknowledge receipt of new information, a third speaker is drawn into the interaction and language alternation is licensed. The licensing of language alternation thus takes place in an expanded version of the initial three-partite structure of meaning quests.

8.5. The example of multilingual label quests

In this section, I turn to a third and final example of interactional sequences in which the classroom participants are seen to orient to the norm of licensed language alternation; namely, what I propose to call multilingual label quests building on Heath’s (1986) notion of “label quests”. The notion of “label quest” refers to interactional sequences where “adults either name items or ask for their names” (Heath, 1986: 168).\(^{71}\)

As Heath argues, label quests are typical classroom “language activities” or in other words, typical of the school’s “ways of using language” (1986: 158). They have since been observed in a variety of educational contexts such as in the United States (Zecker et al., 2001), Burundi (Ndayipfukamiye, 1993), and Botswana (Arthur, 1996). Martin has also observed that label quests can be conducted bilingually; what he calls “bilingual label quests” (1999, 2003; see also Arthur and Martin, 2006; Creese and Blackledge, 2010; Martin et al., 2006). In my data, I have observed that label quests are a recurrent interactional practice (see extracts 15, 23, 24 and 29). Furthermore, I have observed that speakers can draw on the languages co-available in the classroom to accomplish a label quest multilingually. Therefore,

\(^{71}\) Note that the notion of ‘label’ is used here to refer to simple vocabulary items to be learned by children.
building on Heath’s (1986) notion of “label quest” and Martin’s (1999) notion of “bilingual label quest”, I propose the notion of multilingual label quest to refer to label quests that are accomplished multilingually (see also Bonacina, 2010 reproduced in Appendix 7). More specifically, I have identified two types of multilingual label quests: Type 1 refers to label quests where language alternation is licensed because children do not know the requested label; Type 2 refers to label quests where language alternation is licensed because children do not show understanding of the new label. In both cases, language alternation is licensed as a problem occurs in the accomplishment of the label quest.

8.5.1. The structural organisation of label quests

Before moving to the two types of multilingual label quests where language alternation is licensed, it is necessary to describe the typical structural organisation of label quests. Martin (1999: 134) has already touched upon the interactional accomplishment of label quests, describing it within an Initiation-Response-Feedback sequence (IRF; Bellack et al., 1966; Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975). In this respect, label quests are said to be typically organised as follows: the teacher asks for a label in what corresponds to the Initiation move, pupil(s) provide the expected label in what corresponds to the Response move, and the teacher ratifies the response in what corresponds to the Feedback move, also called the Evaluation move (Mehan, 1979a). While this framework accounts for label quests that are realised in three turns, it does not account for more complex ones such as the multilingual label quests observed in my data. For this reason, I account for the structural organisation of multilingual label quests using Schegloff’s (2007a) framework described above, which allows for the description of expanded sequences. Using Schegloff’s (2007a) framework, the sequence organisation of a typical label quest can be described again as follows:

(1) The teacher elicits a label in a first pair part
(2) The pupil(s) provides the elicited label in a second pair part
(3) The teacher ratifies the child’s answer in a sequence-closing third.
As an example, consider extract 23 discussed above, that I reproduce as extract 51 below for convenience. Miss Lo is reading a storybook to the whole class and is asking the children to describe where the main character is sitting (see picture 7 in Chapter 6). In this extract, Miss Lo is eliciting the label ‘dehors’ (i.e. outside).

**Extract 51: (T2 S1 D3 V8 E2)**

40. Miss Lo: écoutez ce que je dis (.) elle n’aime pas
41. jouer à la maison (.) elle aime jouer↑
42. Karen: dehors!
43. Leila: dehors
44. Miss Lo: dehors

In 41, Miss Lo produces the first pair part of a label quest by starting a sentence and expecting children to complete it with the requested label. In 42 and 43, both Karen and Leila provide a second pair part to Miss Lo’s first pair part, which are ratified in 44 by Miss Lo in what is a sequence-closing third. It should be added that, frequently, the second pair part is followed by a post-expansion where Miss Lo repeats a first time the correct label in order to give positive feedback, the rest of the class acknowledge receipt of new information, and Miss Lo repeats the new label. An example is 52 below. Miss Lo is eliciting the label ‘gueule’ (i.e. maw).

**Extract 52: (T2 S1 D2 V5 E4)**

08. Miss Lo: il a une grande bouche (.) vous savez
09. comment on dit la bouche pour un animal↑
10. (.1)
11. Talia: ah euh (.) en espagnol c’est hocico
12. Miss Lo: et en français c’est la gueule!
13. Class: gueule!
14. Miss Lo: la gueule du loup

08. Miss Lo: he has a big mouth (.) do you know how to
09. say the mouth for an animal↑
10. (.1)
11. Talia: ah ehm (.) in Spanish it’s maw
12. Miss Lo: and in French it’s maw!
13. Class: maw!
14. Miss Lo: the wolf’s maw
Of interest here is that in 12, Miss Lo repairs the Spanish item and gives the French label. Then, the whole group repeats the label to show understanding and to acknowledge receipt of new information, and in 14, Miss Lo repeats the new label. In the following two sections, I show that when a problem occurs, the typical structural organisation of label quests is expanded.

### 8.5.2. Multilingual label quests of Type 1

In my data, when a problem occurs in the interactional accomplishment of a label quest, language alternation is licensed in multiple languages. In multilingual label quests of Type 1, language alternation is licensed in post-expansions as a way of attending to the fact that the children do not know the requested French label. An example is extract 53 below. To highlight the structural organisation of this extract, I divide it into five extracts (the totality of the multilingual label quest can be accessed in the Appendix 9 in T2 S1 D1 V6 E9). In extract 53a, Miss Lo initiates a label quest and asks the whole class for the French name of the type of book she is holding (‘une bande dessinée’; i.e. a cartoon).

**Extract 53a**: (T2 S1 D1 V6 E9)

13. Miss Lo: [... ] avec des petites
14. flèches qui partent de la bouche des
15. personnages (. ) ça s’appelle comment↑
16. Talia: ah! (. ) es un historieta!
17. Leila: que (. ) com[me (. ) qui parle
18. Karen: [en anglais on dit [comics
19. Miss Lo: [voilà
20. Leila: [que les personnages parlent-
21. Miss Lo: [voilà (. ) en anglais on dit↑
22. Karen: comics
23. Miss Lo: comics
24. Leila: car on fait comme ça (. ) le cercle c’est
25. pour qu’ils parlent (. ) quand on fait
26. comme (. ) euh (. ) tout comme ça ((drawing
27. in the air)) c’est comme qu’elles pensent
28. Miss Lo: [voilà (. ) en anglais elle dit Karen (. )
29. Miss Lo: [ah en anglais on dit comics
-------------------------------------------------------------
13. Miss Lo: it’s written here (. ) with little
14. arrows that come out of the characters’
15. mouth (. ) what is it called↑
16. Talia: ah! (. ) it’s a cartoon!
In 15, Miss Lo produces the first pair part of a label quest by eliciting the label ‘bande dessinée’ in French (i.e. cartoon). However, the children do not seem to know the requested label in French and thus deviate from the current French monolingual medium to name the label in their respective preferred language. Second pair parts are thus conducted by Talia, Leila and Karen (in 16-18). In 16, Talia gives the label in Spanish; in 17, Leila tries to provide a definition in French and in 18, Karen gives the label in English. These instances of alternation are deviant and unlicensed (what I have proposed to call ‘unlicensed medium suspension’). Miss Lo acknowledges these alternations in a minimal post-expansion (‘voilà’; in 19 and 21). In 21, Miss Lo then opens a non-minimal post-expansion and produces the first pair part of a translation quest asking for the English label. The English label is provided by Karen in 22. Then, Miss Lo repeats the English label in a sequence-closing third (23). It is also repeated in 28-9 to the whole class. In brief, the translation quest in the non-minimal post-expansion of the label quest functions as a license to language alternation and takes place because children have not provided the French label. It is the first of a series of translation quests where language alternation is licensed. In extract 53b, Miss Lo turns to Kenji and asks him the Japanese label (45-6), which Kenji gives in 47.
This second translation quest consists of a first pair part (i.e. Miss Lo’s request for a translation, 45-6), a second pair part (i.e. Kenji’s answer, 47), and a sequence-closing third (i.e. Miss Lo’s ratification, 51). In extract 53c, Miss Lo turns to Samba and asks him for the Peul label (63, 65-6, 74-76). More specifically, she asks him whether the type of books she is holding exists in Senegal (63). The three-second pause in 64 indicates that Samba does not know the label in Peul. In the end, the translation quest fails since Samba does not give the requested label in his language. However, noteworthy is that Peul was licensed.

**Extract 53c:**

63. Miss Lo: au Sénégal il y a des choses comme ça
64. (...)  
65. Miss Lo: est-ce que ya des journaux (...) moi [je
66. sais qu’il y en a  
67. Kenji: [non
68. Miss Lo: il y a des petits journaux avec des  
69. petites histoires avec des images et des  
70. (...) [(side-sequence)]
74. Miss Lo: [comme euh (...) comment ça s’appelle (...)  
75. tu connais samba le nom des journaux pour  
76. les enfants avec des histoires  
77. Talia: [écris ici!  
78. Kenji: [non  
79. Miss Lo: non t’as jamais vu  
[(side-sequence)]
84. Miss Lo: d’accord (...) chut!

63. Miss Lo: in Senegal are there things like that
64. (...)  
65. Miss Lo: are there newspapers (...) me [I
66. know there are some  
67. Kenji: [no
68. Miss Lo: there are little newspapers with little  
69. stories with pictures and some  
70. (...)
In extract 53d, Miss Lo continues the series of translation quests and turns to Matilda. In 85-86, she asks her for the Lithuanian label. In 89, Matilda says that this type of books does not exist in Lithuania. Even though Matilda does not give the Lithuanian label, what is interesting is that Lithuanian was licensed.

Extract 53d:

85. Miss Lo: Matilda (.) est-ce que en Lituanie vous avez des histoires comme ça là↑
86. Kenji: Sénégal
87. Talia: comics
88. Matilda: non

Extract 53e:

94. Miss Lo: et en français donc personne sait comment ça s’appelle en français ça↑
95. (.)
96. Karen: /komik/
97. Miss Lo: non (.). comment ça s’appelle [en français]
98. Leila: [/istɔriʃtæ/↑
99. Miss Lo: non
100. Cristina: des phrases↑
101. Miss Lo: non!
102. Talia: non::
103. Miss Lo: comment ça s’appelle en français les livres [comme ça avec les-]
104. Kenji: [/istɔriʃtæ/]
105. Cristina: des bulles!
This time, the children have exhausted their multilingual resources and do not repeat the switches conducted in the translation quests mentioned earlier. As a consequence, they perform what I have proposed to term ‘semi-medium suspension’. Here, they keep the pronunciation of French but use the lexical repertoire from their first language. More specifically, in 97, Karen suggests the label /komik/, which is the English label ‘comic’ with a French pronunciation. Likewise, in 100, Leila suggests the label /ıstoıt/, which is the Spanish label ‘historieta’ with a French pronunciation and a deletion of the final vowel. As none of these second pair parts contain the requested label, Miss Lo finally gives the expected French label ‘bandes dessinées’ (112) in a sequence-closing third. Lastly, in a closing sequence, the classroom participants repeat the new label (113) and Miss Lo ratifies it (115).
Structurally speaking, this multilingual label quest is an expanded sequence comprising four sequences; namely (i) a three-part sequence where a French label is elicited, (ii) a series of non-minimal post-expansions where the same label is elicited in four languages (translation quests), (iii) a repetition of the first sequence where the French label is elicited again and finally given by Miss Lo, and (iv) a closing sequence. In short, in multilingual label quests of Type 1, language alternation is licensed as a way of attending to problems which have emerged at the level of the second pair part, that is, when the requested label has not been provided (in the right medium).

### 8.5.3. Multilingual label quests of Type 2

In multilingual label quests of Type 2, language alternation is licensed once the French label has been given, as a way of attending to children who signal having problems of understanding the new label. As has been said earlier (section §8.5.1), once a new French label is given, the teacher expects the rest of the children to show understanding (see extract 52). When receipt of new information is not given by the rest of the children (even non-verbally as in extract 52), the teacher opens a series of non-minimal post-expansions to check children’s understanding. More specifically, each non-minimal post-expansion is a translation quest, which functions as a license to children’s first language(s). As a first example, consider extract 54 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 54: (T2 S1 D1 V6 E8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 03. Miss Lo: comment on dit quand quelqu’un est perdu (.)
04. quand quelqu’un est enlevé
05. (.1)
06. Miss Lo: kidnappé
07. (.)
08. Miss Lo: ça existe en anglais ça kidnappé†
09. Karen: oui (.) kidnap
10. Miss Lo: ah ben voilà
-------------------------------------------------------------
| 03. Miss Lo: how do you say when someone is lost (.)
04. when someone is taken
05. (.1)
06. Miss Lo: kidnapped
07. (.)
08. Miss Lo: does it exist in English kidnapped†

Karen: yes (.)

Miss Lo: ah well there you go

In 04, Miss Lo produces the first pair part of a label quest. The ensuing one-second pause at the level of the second pair part (05) indicates that children do not know the request label. As a result, Miss Lo gives the French label in 06 and expects children to show understanding and receipt of new information. However, the pause in 07 indicates that children may not have understood the new label. Therefore, Miss Lo produces the first pair part of a translation quest, which functions as a license to language alternation. In 09, Karen gives the English label and, in 10, Miss Lo acknowledges the switch. Clearly, in this extract, language alternation is licensed to encourage children to work out the meaning of the new label and show understanding.

In extract 55 below, the label quest of Type 2 is multilingual as many languages are licensed in recursive translation quests. Miss Lo has been trying to elicit the French label ‘fée’ (i.e. fairy) for quite a few turns before the extract (for the full sequence see T2 S1 D1 V1 E2 in Appendix 9).

Extract 55: (T2 S1 D1 V1 E2)

600. Miss Lo: la marraine et la marraine c’est une
601. (.)
602. Miss Lo: une
603. (.1)
604. Miss Lo: une fée:
605. (.2)
606. Miss Lo: une fée
607. (.)
608. Miss Lo: comment on dit fée en anglais euh: (.)
609. (.4)
610. Karen:
611. [.]
636. Karen: en anglais fairy
637. Miss Lo: alors Samba ça (. ) tu as déjà entendu parler de choses comme ça
638. (.)
639. (.)
640. Miss Lo: vous dites comment en espagnol
641. Talia: hada madrina
642. Leila: hada madrina
643. Miss Lo: d’accord
644. Kenji: /læpædoni/
645. ((children laughing))
In 600, Miss Lo reiterates the first pair part of the label quest. The second pair part consists of a pause (601), which indicates that the children do not know the French label. In 602, Miss Lo repeats the first pair part, which is equally followed by a pause (603) in a second pair part. Therefore, in 604, Miss Lo provides the French label in a minimal post-expansion. However, this new label is followed by a two-second pause (605), which is interpreted by Miss Lo as a sign that the children have not understood the new label. She thus repeats the new label in 606, but still does not get evidence that children have understood. Because of this problem, she
initiates a translation quest in the first pair part of a non-minimal post-expansion (608). More precisely, she asks Karen to provide the English equivalent of the new French label. In doing so, she licenses language alternation. The ensuing four-second pause (610) shows that Karen is not able to provide the translation for ‘fée’ in English. In the omitted talk, Miss Lo provides further explanation and in 636, Karen gives the English gloss. In 637, Miss Lo turns then to Samba and asks him if he has heard of fairies in Senegal. Since Samba does know the answer, Miss Lo turns to the Spanish-speaking children and produces the first pair part of a translation quest, by asking for the Spanish gloss (640). In 641 and 642, Talia and Leila give the Spanish gloss, conducting a second pair part of the translation quest. In 643, Miss Lo shows acknowledgement and closes this translation quest. In 644, Kenji utters a stretch of talk that does not seem to pertain to any known lexical repertoire, but Miss Lo interprets it as his attempt to orient to the series of translation quests. She thus turns to him in 646, and asks him if the label fairy also exists in Japanese. Then, Miss Lo moves on to another sequence and asks if fairies exist (698). Clearly, in this extract, language alternation is licensed in a series of translation quests with a view of attending to children who signal having problems of understanding the new label.

As a last example, consider extract 56 below. Miss Lo is eliciting the label ‘shampoing’ (i.e. shampoo).

Extract 56: (T2 S1 D5 V18 E4)

11. Miss Lo: oui (.,) elle lui frotte la tête (.,) avec
12. qui comme- est-ce que c’est du savon
13. qu’elle lui met sur la tête↑
14. ?: non!
15. Miss Lo: du↑
16. Julia: shampoing
17. Miss Lo: du↑
18. Julia: shampoing
19. Miss Lo: du shampoing: (.,) du shampoing
20. (.1)
21. Miss Lo: comment on dit shampoing en espagnol
22. Maia↑
23. Maia: sha(        )
24. Miss Lo: ah ben d’accord et: (.,) en- en
25. lituanien↑
26. Matilda:  (shampounes)
27. Miss Lo:  shampounes (. ) et en espagnol shampoo (. )
28. et en: polonais↑
29. Julia:  shampol
30. Miss Lo:  shampol! (. ) ah ben dis-donc c’est rigolo
31. ça!
32. Anika:  et en roumanie shampoo ((laughing))
33. Miss Lo:  shampol! ah ben (. ) et en: en anglais↑
34. Matilda:  japonais (. ) non:: pas japonais (. )
35. japonais
36. Miss Lo:  en japonais↑ (. ) tu sais dire shampoing
37. en japonais Amelia↑
38. Amelia:  mm
39. (.2)
40. Miss Lo:  non (. ) mais en tous cas ce qui est rigolo
41. c’est que- alors on redit (. ) en roumain
42. Anika:  shampoo
43. Miss Lo:  shampoo (. ) en: lituanien↑
44. Matilda:  shampounes
45. Miss Lo:  shampounes (. ) en anglais↑
46. Matilda:  euh (. ) shampoo
47. Miss Lo:  oui (. ) en espagnol↑
48. Maia:  shampoo
49. Miss Lo:  et en: polonais
50. Julia:  shampoo
51. Miss Lo:  ah ben dis-donc! (. ) c’est rigolo hein↑
52. (. ) et en français shampoing! (. ) alors
53. ça ressemble alors quand même hein↑ (. )
54. shampoing!
55. Class:  shampoing!
-------------------------------------------------------------
11. Miss Lo:  yeah (. ) she rubs her head (. ) with
12. what as- is it soap that she is putting
13. on her head↑
14. ?:  no!
15. Miss Lo:  some↑
16. Julia:  shampoo
17. Miss Lo:  some↑
18. Julia:  shampoo
19. Miss Lo:  some shampoo:: (. ) some shampoo
20. (.1)
21. Miss Lo:  how do you say shampoo in Spanish
22. Maia↑
23. Maia:  sha(        )
24. Miss Lo:  ah okay then and: (. ) in- in
25. Lithuanian↑
26. Matilda:  (shampoo)
27. Miss Lo:  shampoo (. ) and in Spanish shampoo (. )
28. and in: Polish↑
29. Julia:  shampoo
30. Miss Lo:  shampoo! (. ) ah really it’s funny
31. that!
32. Anika:  and in Romania shampoo ((laughing))
33. Miss Lo:  shampoo! ah well (. ) and in: in English↑
34. Matilda:  Japanese (. ) no:: not Japanese (. )
Unlike extract 55, in this extract the requested French label is given by a child (Julia in 16). In 17, Miss Lo does not ratify Julia’s answer. Instead, she repeats the first pair part of the label quest (first uttered in 15) to give a chance to other pupils to self-select and provide the requested label too. However, in 18, Julia self-selects again and nobody else does. This works as a first signal to Miss Lo that other children may be having problems. Therefore, she ratifies Julia’s answer (19) in a minimal post-expansion. In the same turn, she repeats the new label to the rest of the group to check understanding. The ensuing pause in 20 indicates that the rest of the children do not show a sign of understanding or acknowledgment of receipt of new information. As a result, Miss Lo opens a series of translation quests where the new French label is translated into five languages. Clearly, the series of translation quests functions as a license to language alternation and takes place to check children’s understanding.

8.6. Summary

In this chapter, I have identified the norm that the classroom participants orient to in their licensed language alternation acts. This is:

35. Japanese
36. Miss Lo: in Japanese (. ) you know how to say
37. shampoo in Japanese Amelia
38. Amelia: mm
39. (.2)
40. Miss Lo: no (. ) but in any case the funny thing is
41. that- so let’s say it again (. ) in Romanian
42. Anika: shampoo
43. Miss Lo: shampoo (. ) in: Lithuanian
44. Matilda: shampoo
45. Miss Lo: shampoo (. ) in English
46. Matilda: ehm (. ) shampoo
47. Miss Lo: yeah (. ) in Spanish
48. Maia: shampoo
49. Miss Lo: and in: Polish
50. Julia: shampoo
51. Miss Lo: god! (. ) it’s funny huh
52. (. ) and in French shampoo! (. ) so it’s
53. similar isn’t it huh (. )
54. shampoo!
55. Class: shampoo!
When there is a problem, language alternation may be licensed by way of attending to it.

More specifically, I have shown three interactional sequences where the classroom participants orient to this norm. These were word searches, meaning quests and what I have proposed to call ‘multilingual label quests’ (of Type 1 and Type 2). In the case of word searches, language alternation is licensed when there is evidence that a child is having problem finding the *mot juste* for what they are trying to say. In this case, they are encouraged to say it in their preferred language. In meaning quests, the teacher licenses language alternation after a child has failed to reveal understanding of a meaning they have just requested. In this case, language alternation is licensed to encourage peers to provide explanation in the child’s preferred language. In the case of multilingual label quests, Type 1 is launched when the children have failed to answer appropriately to a label quest initiated by Miss Lo. In this case, children are encouraged to draw on their preferred language in working towards the requested label. Once understanding of the concept is confirmed through the use of the children’s languages, Miss Lo then gives the target label. Type 2 is launched when children have failed to acknowledge a label correctly given after Miss Lo’s quest. In this case, children are encouraged to work out the meaning of the already given label drawing on their languages. Thus, it is because licensed language alternation is not random – that is, it is rule-governed – that one can speak of a policy at this level.
9.1. Introduction

In this final chapter, I summarise the main claim of this thesis and review the central findings of the case study. I then discuss the significance and implications of the thesis. Finally, I point to its limitations and suggest further avenues for future research.

9.2. Summary of claims, methods and findings

The motivation for this thesis lies in the identification of a methodological gap in the research literature on language policy (LP). Traditionally, scholars have conceptualised LP as text and as discourse (see Ball, 1993) and have adopted approaches that reflect this view. When conceptualising LP as text – that is, when adopting the view that what influences language choice and alternation acts is an authoritative statement, either verbal or written, about what should be done – its study involved mainly textual analysis (see for instance studies conducted within the traditional approach to LP research reviewed in section §2.2). When conceptualising LP as discourse – that is, when adopting the view that what influences language choice and alternation acts is a set of beliefs and ideologies about what should be done – scholars used Critical Discourse Analysis (see for instance studies conducted within the critical approach to LP research reviewed in section §2.3). The third and most recent addition to these two conceptualisations of LP – an addition we owe to Spolsky (e.g. 2004, 2007, 2008a) – is policy as practice; that is, the view that what influences language choice and alternation acts is the implicit knowledge of what is usually done. I have proposed to call Spolsky’s (2004) conceptualisation of policy as practice a ‘practiced language policy’.
Although Spolsky’s claim that there is a policy within practices represents a decisive development in the field of LP research, I have said that it remains essentially theoretical, since no indication is given as to how practiced language policies may be investigated. With a view to addressing this methodological gap, I have claimed that Conversation Analysis (CA) can be used to investigate practiced language policies.

This claim is based on the observation that some of Spolsky’s statements seem to point to a CA mentality. Most importantly of all, he states that language practices form “sets of patterns” (Spolsky and Shohamy, 2000: 29), what Conversation Analysts call ‘conversational practices’, that is, patterns of a sequence of acts that happen repeatedly in a given context. Furthermore, Spolsky states that these sets of patterns are underlined by “deducible and implicit rules” (ibid: 2). This notion echoes that of ‘interactional norms’ (Hymes, 1972), which CA researchers define as a “point of reference or action template for interpretation” (Seedhouse, 2004: 10). In this respect, I have claimed that a CA approach to practiced language policies involves the identification of the norms underlying conversational practices. In order to support this claim, I have conducted a case study and investigated the practiced language-in-education policy of an induction classroom for newly-arrived immigrant children in France.

Building on Holmes and Stubbe’s (2003) model of data collection in the workplace, the methodology I have designed for the purpose at hand involved the following five stages:

i. gaining access to an induction classroom in France
ii. conducting semi-participant preliminary observation
iii. conducting semi-participant observation and audio-recording
iv. collecting additional information
v. giving feedback to the researched community.

Since I have adopted CA as a theoretical framework, my analysis has borne only on the corpus of audio-recordings of classroom talk. Nevertheless, other information
has been used to gain a fuller understanding of the induction classroom. In the analysis of the corpus of classroom interaction, I have adopted a broad view of CA, incorporating both sequential and categorisation analysis (Membership Categorisation Analysis, MCA). Furthermore, given that the corpus included bilingual classroom interaction, I have used the CA approach to code-switching and classroom code-switching, as developed over the past few years by researchers such as Auer (1984), Li Wei (2002), Gafaranga (2009), and Bonacina and Gafaranga (2010).

The first stage of analysis has consisted of identifying the language choice and alternation practices in the target classroom. I have shown that the following five “mediums of classroom interaction” (Bonacina and Gafaranga, 2010) are available to classroom participants:

i. a French monolingual medium
ii. an English monolingual medium
iii. a Spanish monolingual medium
iv. a French and English bilingual medium
v. and a French and Spanish bilingual medium.

I have then shown that, once the classroom participants have adopted one of these five mediums, they may switch from it – what Gafaranga (2007a, b) calls “medium switching” – or depart temporarily from it and alternate languages. I have identified the following two types of language alternation act:

i. unlicensed language alternation
ii. licensed language alternation.

Lastly, I have said that licensed language alternation is the most salient language alternation practice in the target classroom.

In the second stage of the analysis, I sought to identify the sets of norms (i.e. the practiced policy) underlying these language choice and alternation practices. Focusing first on language choice practices, I have shown that, when someone is ‘doing being the language teacher’, that language is adopted as the medium of...
classroom interaction. When no-one is ‘doing being the language teacher’ and there is a shared preferred language, that language is adopted as the medium of classroom interaction. Finally, when no-one is ‘doing being the language teacher’ and there is no shared preferred language, the language common to all (namely, French) is adopted. In brief, the classroom participants use their understanding of the relationships between language acts and the categories of ‘teacher-hood’ and ‘language preference’ as norms to interpret each other’s language choice activities. The description of these norms constitutes the first part of the practiced language-in-education policy of the target classroom.

I then sought to identify the norm(s) that the classroom participants orient to in their licensed language alternation acts and observed that, when there is a problem, language alternation may be licensed. I have shown how this norm is oriented to in three types of interactional sequences, namely word searches, meaning quests and what I have proposed calling ‘multilingual label quests’. More specifically, I have shown that, in word searches, problems arise when the speaker who is lacking a word cannot self-repair and the other classroom participants cannot identify the trouble source. In this case, language alternation may be licensed to encourage the child saying the word they are lacking in their preferred language. In meaning quests, problems arise when a child fails to reveal understanding of a meaning they have just requested. In this case, language alternation is licensed to encourage peers to provide explanation in the child’s preferred language. In multilingual label quests, problems arise either when the teacher initiates a label that the children do not know in French (multilingual label quests of Type 1) or when the children do not show understanding of a label correctly given (multilingual label quests of Type 2). In the case of Type 1, language alternation is licensed in order to encourage the children to draw on their preferred language in working towards the requested label. In the case of Type 2, language alternation is licensed in order to encourage the children to draw on their preferred language in working out the meaning of the already given label.
In brief, I have argued that the sets of norms of language choice and alternation practices form part of the practiced language-in-education policy of the target classroom, that is, the “implicit and deducible rules” (Spolsky and Shohamy, 2000: 2) that capture “the idea that members of the community have of appropriate behaviour” (ibid: 29). This case study has therefore shown that a CA approach to practiced language policies consists of stating the norms of interaction that speakers orient to while talking.

9.3. Significance of the study

In this section, I suggest that this research contributes to study in three key areas, namely, language policy, language policy in France, and bilingual classroom talk.

9.3.1. Implications for the study of language policy

This thesis is primarily a contribution to the field of LP research. It addresses a methodological gap in the third and most recent conceptualisation of language policy, namely language policy as practice (mainly Spolsky, 2004) or what I have proposed to call ‘practiced language policy’. More specifically, it proposes an approach to the study of practiced language policies. I have claimed that – and shown how – a broad Conversation Analytic approach, incorporating both sequential and categorisation analysis, can be used to discover a practiced language policy. More specifically, I have shown that the CA notions of ‘practice’ and ‘norm’ are central to the investigation of a practiced language policy. In this respect, I have argued that a CA approach to the study of practiced language policy consists of identifying the set of norms that speakers orient to in their language choice and alternation activities. The case study also suggests that the CA approach to code-switching and classroom code-switching can be used to investigate a practiced language-in-education policy in a multilingual classroom context.

In addition to addressing a methodological gap, the proposed approach has theoretical implications in the study of language policy. These are twofold. First, a Conversation Analytic approach to language policy provides a different perspective
to research on policy and practice. It allows to show that language choice practices are being organised vis-à-vis not only a policy prescribed by a language manager but also vis-à-vis a set of norms that speakers orient to in interaction (see also §9.3.3).

The second theoretical implication is that acknowledging a language policy within language practices enables the analyst to see speakers as agent in the policy process; in other words, to see speakers as policy makers. More specifically, in analysing language choice and alternation acts with reference to a practiced language policy implies that language acts are organised with reference to a set of norms that speakers deduct based on observing repeated patterns (what Conversation Analysts call ‘practices’) and not only with reference to external influences such as a prescribed language policy. In this respect, Conversation Analysis enables the analyst to identify the policy that is made on the ground, in practice.

Lastly, the question arises as to how a practiced language policy can be articulated with policies found at the level of what Spolsky calls ‘language management’ and ‘language beliefs’. As I have explained throughout this thesis, according to Spolsky’s model of language policy (see mainly 2004), language choice and alternation acts are understood to be influenced by a language policy found at three different levels: (1) at the level of language management (that is, speakers choose a language of interaction according to what is said to be appropriate by an authoritative figure), (2) at the level of language beliefs (that is, speakers choose a language of interaction according to what they believe is appropriate), (3) at the level of practices (that is, speakers choose a language of interaction according to their implicit understanding of what is appropriate; what Conversation Analysts call ‘norm of interactions’). Furthermore, the policy found at these three levels may not match and the practiced language policy is likely to have the strongest influence on speakers’ language choice and alternation acts. As Spolsky puts it: “the real language policy of a community is more likely to be found in its practices than its management” (2004: 222). Nevertheless, I suggest that all three levels of language policy constantly interact with, and influence, each other.
For instance, a practiced language policy may influence speakers’ beliefs of what language is appropriate as well as an official decision about what language(s) should be used in a given context. However, further research would be needed to investigate the extent to which these three levels of language policy interact with each other and subsequently shape each other.”

9.3.2. Implications for the study of language policy in France

This study also has implications, albeit indirectly, for the study of language policy in the specific context of France and France’s state educational system. Although, as has been stated in Chapter One (§1.4), the aim of the case study was not to provide a full account of the language-in-education policy in France’s induction classrooms or in the target classroom, the findings can contribute to a better understanding of language policy in this context. I have shown in Chapter Three that language policy in France is decidedly monolingual, both at the level of texts and discourses. Similarly, I have shown that, in France’s state educational system, a monolingual language policy also prevails both in texts and discourses. Interestingly, however, I have shown that the practiced language policy observed in the induction classroom under study is multilingual. Three languages are used as mediums of classroom interaction, depending on whether someone is ‘doing being a language teacher’ or, alternatively, on whether it is the speakers’ preferred language. Furthermore, all eight languages available can potentially be licensed if problems arise in certain interactional sequences. Although this multilingual practiced language policy cannot be said to be representative of all induction classrooms in France – we recall indeed that I have observed induction classrooms where the practiced language policy appeared to be monolingual (see section §5.2.1) – it gives an idea of what is possible in the context of induction classrooms. In other words, the present study shows that despite a monolingual policy at the level of texts and discourses, a multilingual practiced language policy is possible in induction classrooms. In this regard, further analysis would be needed to understand how the observed practiced language policy fits with the language policy at the level of the classroom participants’ beliefs and ideologies. Nevertheless, it is likely that, in the
target classroom, the language-in-education policy at the level of text, discourse and practice differ. As Spolsky notes, “language practices, beliefs and management are not necessarily congruent, [each] may reveal a different language policy” (2004: 217).

9.3.3. Implications for the study of bilingual classroom talk

Lastly, the study also has implications, albeit again indirectly, to the study of bilingual classroom talk. Firstly, it contributes to the exploration of the ongoing relationship between classroom code-switching (CS) studies and language policy issues. I have shown in Chapter Four (see section §4.4.3) that, when language choice and alternation phenomena in bilingual classroom interaction are analysed from “an overall order perspective” (Bonacina and Gafaranga, 2010), it is assumed that the language of instruction prescribed by the school language policy is systematically the language of classroom interaction (see for instance Heller 1996). In this sense, the use of other languages is seen as deviance. However, Bonacina and Gafaranga (2010) have demonstrated that not all cases of language choice and alternation phenomena in bilingual classroom talk can be interpreted with regard to the language of instruction, and that the notion of “medium of classroom interaction” is a better “scheme” (Garfinkel, 1967) of interpretation. The case study of multilingual classroom talk in the target classroom has confirmed this later development, since talk was seen to be conducted in French, the language of instruction, but also in four other mediums. In this respect, the case study shows that bilingual classroom practices can be interpreted not only with regard to a policy prescribed by the school (policy as text) or the policy perceived by the school staff (policy as discourse) but also – and most importantly – with regard to a policy within practices themselves (policy as practice).

Secondly, the analysis of interaction in the target classroom has led to the extension of Gafaranga’s (e.g. 2009) CA model of language alternation. More specifically, I have observed that language alternation acts that are deviant from the current medium of classroom interaction can be either licensed or unlicensed. To
account for this possibility, I have suggested that what Gafaranga calls “medium repair” and “medium suspension” (e.g. 2007a: 306) can be re-specified as ‘licensed medium repair’ and ‘unlicensed medium repair’, ‘licensed medium suspension’ and ‘unlicensed medium suspension’.

Thirdly, I have proposed two new notions to name interactional sequences observed in the target classroom. These are ‘multilingual label quest’ and ‘translation quest’. The notion of ‘multilingual label quest’ is built on Heath’s (1986) notion of “label quest” and Martin’s (1999) notion of “bilingual label quest” and refers, in this thesis, to label quests that are accomplished multilingually. The notion of ‘translation quests’ is also built on Heath’s (1986) notion of “label quest”. It is used to refer to interactional sequences where a translation is elicited. The main difference between a label quest and a translation quest is that the former is opened by a “known information question”, that is, “one for which the teacher already knows the answer” (Heath, 1986: 148), while the latter is opened by a genuine question, that is, one for which the teacher does not already know the answer.

Last, but not least, I have said that there have been very few, if any, studies of bilingual classroom talk which combine both sequential and categorisation analysis (see Chapter Four, section §4.5.3). More specifically, I have shown that Gafaranga (2001, 2005) has paved the way towards approaching language choice as a category-bound activity and especially as an activity bound to the category ‘language preference’72. In this sense, speakers can be understood to choose to talk in language X because they want to categorise themselves as belonging to the category ‘speaker of language X’. Similarly, it is because speakers categorise themselves as ‘bilingual speakers’ that they speak in more than one language. This idea has been developed by other researchers, such as Cashman (2005), Torras and Gafaranga (2002), and Kasper (2009). I have also shown that scholars have used an

---

72 To recall, the notion of ‘language preference’ in the study of bilingual talk was introduced by Auer (e.g. 1984) to refer to ‘preference-related code-switching’; that is, to language alternation acts that could be accountable for with reference to the language in which speakers felt most comfortable or competent in (see also §7.2, for a detailed discussion).
MCA approach to classroom talk, with a view to demonstrating the relevance of the institutional roles of teacher and pupil in the management of classroom talk (e.g. Richards, 2006; He, 2004). In this respect, the present research contributes to the study of bilingual classroom talk, as it combines a sequential and categorisation analysis of language choice and alternation phenomena in classroom interaction. Indeed, I have shown that language choice acts in the target classroom were bound to two categories: namely, that of ‘teacher-hood’ and that of ‘language preference’. To recall, I have proposed the notion ‘teacher-hood’ to differentiate the institutional role of the ‘teacher’ from the practical social identity of ‘doing being the teacher’. Furthermore, I have shown that the category ‘teacher-hood’ was more procedurally consequential than that of ‘language preference’, since the classroom participants oriented to the norms associated with language preference only if no-one was ‘doing being the language teacher’.

9.4. Can practiced language policies be approached from a CA perspective? Limitations and directions for future research.

In lieu of a conclusion, I suggest going back to the claim made at the start of this thesis and seeing the extent to which the case study conducted in this research project supports it. To recall, the question at the origin of this thesis was: how should we approach a practiced language policy? As an answer to this question, I have built on pointers found in Spolsky (2004, 2007, 2008a; Spolsky and Shohamy, 2000), and claimed that Conversation Analysis is an efficient approach to the study of practiced language policies. To what extent does the case study of the practiced language-in-education policy in the target classroom support this claim?

I would like to argue that CA has enabled the conceptualisation of the policy within practices in terms of interactional norms. In this sense, a broad CA approach to the investigation of the practiced language-in-education policy in the target classroom has led to the identification of the set of norms that the classroom participants orient to in their language choice and alternation activities. I have
argued that the statement of this set of norms is the description of the practiced language-in-education policy of the target classroom. Based on this case study, I argue that CA has been a useful approach to investigate the practiced language-in-education policy in the target classroom.

Aware of the difficulties of generalising from a case study (e.g. Lin, 2005: 43), I can only suggest that the proposed CA approach may be useful for the study of practiced language-in-education policies in other multilingual educational contexts. Other studies of practiced language-in-education policies would need to be carried out in order to confirm this. Furthermore, since the case study was carried out in an educational context and, what is more, a multilingual educational context, the approach adopted has drawn specifically on CA (and MCA) approaches to bilingual talk and bilingual classroom talk, which may or may not be relevant to monolingual contexts and non-institutional contexts. Here again, further investigation of other types of practiced language policies would be needed. In this sense, this case study is a first step towards supporting the more general claim made in this thesis that practiced language policies can be approached from a CA perspective.

Thus, in order to assert the argument made in this thesis – that CA is a possible approach to the study of practiced language policies – further studies would be needed in other institutional and non-institutional contexts, as well as in different sociolinguistic contexts. Additional research could also take up the specific findings of the case study, investigating, for instance, the extent to which the practiced language policy in an educational context (such as the UK), where newly-arrived immigrant children attend mainstream classrooms upon arrival, differs from the one observed in the target induction classroom. It would also be interesting to see which categories are relevant in language choice and alternation practices in other institutional contexts or in non-institutional contexts. Furthermore, it would be interesting to find out whether the licensing of language alternation acts is also observed in other contexts, and, if so, whether it is observed in interactional
sequences that are similar to the ones described in my corpus. Lastly, if a CA approach to practiced language policies is found to be useful in future research, the next step could consist of studying language policy at the three levels mentioned in Spolsky’s model, namely, at all of the levels of language management, language beliefs, and language practices.
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These transcription conventions are based to a large extent on Jefferson (2004) and McHoul (1978).
Each line rather than each turn is numbered on the left.
Speakers are indicated at the start of each turn.

Class
The word Class at the start of a turn indicates that either all pupils or a large amount of pupils are talking at once.

? A question mark at the start of a turn indicates that the identity of the speaker is not ascertainable (i.e. it is not a grammatical marker).

--00:00-- Double-dashed digital timing indicates the time in the audio-recording of the beginning and the end of an extract.

(03:33) Digital timing in parentheses indicates the time in the audio-recording when the stretch of talk that follows was uttered.

' ' Quotation markers bracketing a stretch of talk indicate that it is being read at loud.

(.) A dot in parentheses indicates a short pause (around a tenth of a second) within turn or between turns.

(.1) A dot and a number in parentheses indicate a pause in seconds within or between turns.

(word) Parenthesised words indicate transcriber’s doubt.

(      ) Empty parentheses indicate that the transcriber was unable to hear a stretch of talk. The length of the parentheses reflects roughly the length of the unheard stretch of talk.

- A single dash indicates an abrupt cut-off.

= A pair of equal signs (one at the end of a turn and one at the start of a turn) indicates a latching between turns, i.e. no break or gap between turns.
Colons indicate the prolongation of the immediately prior sound. Multiple colons indicate a more prolonged sound.

A left square bracket indicates a start of overlapping talk.

Left/right carats bracketing a stretch of talk indicate the beginning and the end of a translation within the original transcription.

Dashes indicate the end of the original transcription and the start of a free translation into English.

An arrow pointing upwards indicates a rising intonation.

An arrow pointing downwards indicates a falling intonation.

An exclamation mark indicates that the preceding talk was uttered loudly compared to its surrounding speech (i.e. it is not a grammatical marker).

Degree signs bracketing a stretch of talk indicate that talk was uttered quietly compared to its surrounding speech.

Double parentheses contain transcriber’s descriptions and comments. Descriptions are written in English.

A horizontal arrow is used to draw the reader’s attention to particular aspects of talk.

Black font indicates a stretch of talk uttered in French.

Red font indicates a stretch of talk uttered in Spanish.

Blue font indicates a stretch of talk uttered in Japanese. Note that Japanese talk is transcribed using the Roman alphabet.

Green font indicates a stretch of talk uttered in English.

Yellow font indicates a stretch of talk uttered in Polish.

Light blue font indicates a stretch of talk uttered in Lithuanian.

Brown font indicates a stretch of talk uttered in Peul.
Violet

*Violet font* indicates a stretch of talk uttered in Arabic. Note that Arabic is transcribed using the Roman alphabet.

Pink

*Pink font* indicates a stretch of talk uttered in Romanian.

/IPA symbol/

*IPA symbols bracketed by a single left oblique* indicate a stretch of talk that does not belong to any lexicon. It is at times used in conjunction with a colour code to signal the language it is intended to be in.
# Appendix 2

## Table of audio-recordings of classroom interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Trips</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Recordings</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>Trip 1</td>
<td>Testing audio-recording equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trip 2</td>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>Voice 1</td>
<td>01:15:27</td>
<td>T2 S1 D1 V1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 2</td>
<td>01:03:42</td>
<td>T2 S1 D1 V2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 3</td>
<td>09:33</td>
<td>T2 S1 D1 V3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 4</td>
<td>10:23</td>
<td>T2 S1 D1 V4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 5</td>
<td>43:33</td>
<td>T2 S1 D1 V5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>Voice 6</td>
<td>01:15:27</td>
<td>T2 S1 D2 V6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 7</td>
<td>58:19</td>
<td>T2 S1 D2 V7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>Voice 8</td>
<td>01:15:27</td>
<td>T2 S1 D3 V8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 9</td>
<td>43:40</td>
<td>T2 S1 D3 V9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 10</td>
<td>38:18</td>
<td>T2 S1 D3 V10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 11</td>
<td>25:26</td>
<td>T2 S1 D3 V11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>Voice 12</td>
<td>01:15:27</td>
<td>T2 S1 D4 V12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 13</td>
<td>29:02</td>
<td>T2 S1 D4 V13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 14</td>
<td>43:54</td>
<td>T2 S1 D4 V14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 5</td>
<td>Voice 15</td>
<td>01:15:27</td>
<td>T2 S1 D5 V15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 16</td>
<td>50:50</td>
<td>T2 S1 D5 V16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 17</td>
<td>05:43</td>
<td>T2 S1 D5 V17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 18</td>
<td>46:43</td>
<td>T2 S1 D5 V18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 6</td>
<td>Voice 19</td>
<td>20:34</td>
<td>T2 S1 D6 V19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 20</td>
<td>50:24</td>
<td>T2 S1 D6 V20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 21</td>
<td>40:09</td>
<td>T2 S1 D6 V21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 22</td>
<td>20:01</td>
<td>T2 S1 D6 V22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 23</td>
<td>19:01</td>
<td>T2 S1 D6 V23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 24</td>
<td>43:09</td>
<td>T2 S1 D6 V24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 7</td>
<td>Voice 25</td>
<td>01:16:32</td>
<td>T2 S1 D7 V25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 26</td>
<td>43:24</td>
<td>T2 S1 D7 V26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 27</td>
<td>40:40</td>
<td>T2 S1 D7 V27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 28</td>
<td>30:15</td>
<td>T2 S1 D7 V28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 8</td>
<td>Voice 29</td>
<td>23:44</td>
<td>T2 S1 D8 V29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 30</td>
<td>46:20</td>
<td>T2 S1 D8 V30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 31</td>
<td>24:28</td>
<td>T2 S1 D8 V31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 32</td>
<td>07:28</td>
<td>T2 S1 D8 V32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 9</td>
<td>Voice 33</td>
<td>01:19:21</td>
<td>T2 S1 D9 V33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 34</td>
<td>50:47</td>
<td>T2 S1 D9 V34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 35</td>
<td>20:17</td>
<td>T2 S1 D9 V35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 36</td>
<td>29:43</td>
<td>T2 S1 D9 V36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 37</td>
<td>37:43</td>
<td>T2 S1 D9 V37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 10</td>
<td>Voice 38</td>
<td>01:00:10</td>
<td>T2 S1 D10 V38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 39</td>
<td>18:59</td>
<td>T2 S1 D10 V39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 40</td>
<td>03:31</td>
<td>T2 S1 D10 V40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 41</td>
<td>28:21</td>
<td>T2 S1 D10 V41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 11</td>
<td>Voice 42</td>
<td>31:31</td>
<td>T2 S1 D11 V42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 43</td>
<td>30:28</td>
<td>T2 S1 D11 V43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 44</td>
<td>45:31</td>
<td>T2 S1 D11 V44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 45</td>
<td>29:34</td>
<td>T2 S1 D11 V45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice 46</td>
<td>51:21</td>
<td>T2 S1 D11 V46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trip 3</td>
<td>Day 12</td>
<td>33:22</td>
<td>T3 S1 D12 V47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 13</td>
<td>25:15</td>
<td>T3 S1 D13 V49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 14</td>
<td>30:51</td>
<td>T3 S1 D14 V51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 15</td>
<td>37:53</td>
<td>T3 S1 D15 V52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 3

## Calendar of visits to the target induction classroom

- Days spent in the induction classroom
- Days when audio-recordings were conducted

### Stage 2 - Preliminary semi-participant observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Stage 3 - Audio-recording and semi-participant observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>07.01.08</td>
<td>08.01.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.01.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.01.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>14.01.08</td>
<td>15.01.08</td>
<td>17.01.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.01.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>21.01.08</td>
<td>22.01.08</td>
<td>24.01.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.01.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 4 - Collecting additional information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>07.01.08</td>
<td>08.01.08</td>
<td>10.01.08</td>
<td>11.01.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## - Appendix 4 -

### Set of cards used for interviewing the children

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mâcher un chewing-gum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Manger et boire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jouer au ballon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chew a bubble-gum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eating and drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Play football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lever le doigt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>En arabe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>En japonais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Putting one’s hand up</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>En espagnol</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>En polonais</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>En lituanien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Polish</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Lithuanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>En anglais</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>En peul</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>En français</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In English</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Peul</td>
<td></td>
<td>In French</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cher parent ou tuteur,

Je m'appelle Florence Bonacina et je suis étudiante en thèse à l'université d'Édimbourg au Royaume-Uni. Je travaille sur le bilinguisme des enfants en CLIN et je souhaiterais observer votre enfant dans la CLIN de Madame **********.

Pourriez-vous s'il vous plaît me donner l'autorisation d'observer votre enfant, d'enregistrer ses conversations avec sa maîtresse et ses camarades et de lui poser quelques questions ?

Les informations sur votre enfant et sur l'école resteront complètement anonymes et seront utilisées uniquement pour ma thèse et les publications associées.

Merci d'avance !

Florence.

florence@ling.ed.ac.uk
01 46 26 ** **

□ Oui, j'accepte que mon enfant ------------------------ participe au projet de recherche de Florence Bonacina.

□ Non, je refuse que mon enfant ------------------------ participe au projet de recherche de Florence Bonacina.

Date : Signature :

1. Introduction.
The issue of access, also aptly referred to as the “problem of access” (Delany, 1960; Prewitt, 1984), is a well-known aspect of ethnographic enquiries in both institutional and non-institutional settings. It is tackled in most textbooks devoted to ethnography (e.g. Silverman, 2000; Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007; Gobo, 2008) and has been addressed in studies conducted in fields as various as health care units (Bruni, 2006), refugee communities (Miller, 2004), courtrooms (Blank, 1987), and - of interest in this paper - schools (e.g. Beynon, 1983; Burgess, 1991; Klaas, 2006; Troman, 1996; Wanat, 2008). Missing, however, is an account of the issue of access in the specific case of multilingual school ethnography, by which I mean studies that focus on multilingualism in schools and that rely on ethnographic enquiry. Despite the vast array of ethnographic research conducted in multilingual schools, to date no account has been given of the process of gaining access to multilingual educational settings. Creese et al.’s (2009) reflection on team research in the process of access in linguistically and culturally diverse schools represents an exception in a field where the issue of access remains otherwise unaccounted for. Admittedly, in multilingual school ethnography the process of access is similar to the process of access to schools where multilingualism is not salient, insofar as the ethnographer has to deal, in both cases, with a highly institutionalised setting. Nevertheless, the process of access in multilingual school ethnography is distinctive insofar as multilingualism is a phenomenon that is still often disregarded or negatively perceived by those in charge of granting access. Such a mismatch, or “conflict of interest” (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 52), between the researcher’s object of enquiry and the researched’s perceptions of such enquiry is, thus, most likely to impede the process of access. Therefore, this contribution aims to offer a personal account of my own attempts to gain access to multilingual practices in France’s induction classrooms for newly-arrived migrant children; access that has been complicated primarily by monolingual ideologies held in the French educational system.

Across the different accounts of the issue of access in ethnographic research, there is a clear consensus that access is a negotiating process and that successful access negotiations depend on the relationship between the researcher and the researched (gatekeepers and/or participants). For instance, Wanat reports gaining access to different educational sites by developing “empathetic relationships” with gatekeepers (2008: 200). Similarly, Beynon reports “weaving” his way into a school by finding common interests, or “bridges”, with the researched (1983: 40). A relationship of trust between the researcher and the researched is perceived as the key to be granted access to a research site (e.g. Woods, 1986; Heller, 2008). In turn, this paper adopts the stance that access negotiations are “a relational process” (Feldman et al., 2003: vii) where identities are negotiated between the researcher and the researched. With a view to address the issue of access in multilingual school ethnography, this paper focuses on the research relationship, and more specifically on identity negotiations, at play in the process of access. In this regard, access negotiations are reflected upon in light of Harrington’s (2003) social psychological framework of access grounded in the symbolic interactionist tradition, and, more precisely, in the social identity (Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Hogg and Abrams, 1990) and self-presentation theories (Goffman, 1959). Harrington explains how these theories can be used to explain access negotiations:
“Social identity focuses on the categorization process and objectives of participants in identity negotiations, while the self-presentation literature calls attention to the call-and-response mechanisms through which identities are negotiated. In other words, social identity theory addresses the ‘why’ of identity negotiation, while self-presentation theory looks at the ‘how’ of these interactions” (2003: 604).

In this paper, I will thus examine the ‘how’ and ‘why’ of the ethnographer’s identity negotiations with gatekeepers and induction teachers in the process of access, looking in turn at the way in which the ethnographer presented herself and the way in which the researched interpreted the ethnographer’s identity claims and research topic. Furthermore, I will show the way in which the ‘how’ and ‘why’ of access negotiations in multilingual school ethnography are embedded in macro-contextual ideologies – and in this study, in monolingual ideologies.

The structure of this contribution follows the “route of access” (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007) I experienced in my fieldwork whilst conducting PhD research in induction classrooms for newly-arrived migrant children in France. To begin with, I briefly present the background of the study, specifying the context of France’s induction classrooms, the aim and methods of the research project and my preconceptions of the field based on the research literature. I then relate the ‘how’ and ‘why’ of identity negotiations in the process of access, first with gatekeepers, and second with induction teachers. I then report an alternative route of access, which led me to discover induction teachers who hold positive ideologies towards multilingualism, and which ultimately enabled me to access multilingual classroom practices. Lastly, I discuss how the research relationship at hand in these access negotiations was rooted in - and hindered by - ideological considerations.

2. Background of the study.

To integrate newly-arrived migrant children in its educational system, France operates a withdrawal (or pull-out) policy. According to this policy, newly-arrived migrant children are withdrawn from mainstream classrooms upon arrival and taught French as an additional language in induction classrooms for twelve months (see Miras, 2002 and Goi, 2005 for detailed accounts of France’s induction classrooms). Induction classrooms differ from mainstream classrooms insofar as they gather in one single class children aged between six and eleven who are all learners of French as an additional language. Although no statistics are available on the languages spoken by inducted children, a recent survey conducted in the educational district of Paris shows that, in the school year 2006-2007, ninety-four nationalities were represented across sixty-three induction classrooms, with the majority of children coming from China, Algeria, Portugal, Korea, Romania and the Chechen Republic (CASNAV, 2007). Thus, induction classrooms are multilingual educational contexts. Consequently, this linguistic heterogeneity raises language policy issues such as: what language(s) should be used as a medium of instruction and what place should be given to children’s first languages. However, such language policy issues are not addressed in policy documents regulating induction classrooms (MEN, 2002). Therefore, the question arises as to whether induction classrooms follow the French monolingual language policy in place in mainstream education (Code de l’Education, Article L 121-3: I, 2009).

My PhD project addressed this question and aimed to uncover the language policy of induction classrooms by investigating classroom participants’ beliefs about language and language practices (see Spolsky, 2004 and Shohamy, 2006). I planned to investigate language-in-education policy at the micro-level of one induction classroom in a French primary school; conducting interviews, participant observations and audio-recordings of classroom interactions. However, given France’s longstanding history of monolingual ideology in its educational system, as well as in its society at large (for an extensive discussion of France’s monolingual policy see Ager, 1999), I had anticipated negative attitudes on the part of educational representatives and practitioners towards my research focus on multilingualism. Previous studies conducted in France’s induction classrooms report that newcomers’ multilingualism is perceived negatively (e.g. Varro, 1990; Abdallah-Preceille, 1992; Auger, 2008a, 2008b). Varro’s (1990) interviews with Parisian induction teachers show that the notion of ‘bilingualism’ is used only to refer to the linguistic repertoire of children speaking elite
languages, such as French and German, whilst migrant children’s bilingualism is perceived as a “non-lingualism”. Negative attitudes are also found in interviews conducted with mainstream teachers, where migrant learners are said to speak a “hybrid language” that is neither French nor their home language (Mazurkiewicz and Varro, 2001: 45). Similarly, and more recently, Auger (2008a) reports that newly-arrived migrant children’s bi/multilingualism is perceived as a handicap rather than an asset to the extent that children speaking a post-colonial language do not consider themselves as being bilingual (2008b: 201). Based on these previous reports of negative ideologies held in the French educational system towards newcomers’ bi/multilingualism, the question arose as to how I would obtain permission to enter schools and to access multilingual classroom practices if those same practices were to be denied or negatively perceived by gatekeepers and teachers.

3. Access negotiations with gatekeepers.

During preliminary observations in a French primary school, I learnt that inspectors grant permission to enter schools provided that prior informal consent has been given by both the head teacher and teachers. However, informal consent can only be gained if either the head teacher or teachers have a guarantee of the researcher’s trustworthiness. Unfortunately, I did not have informal contacts in schools that had an induction classroom. Therefore, in order to be directed to primary schools that run an induction programme and to be introduced to the school staff on an informal basis, I contacted the academic centre named CASNAV (Centre Académique pour la Scolarisation des Nouveaux Arrivants et des enfants du Voyage) which provides teacher training and teaching material for induction teachers. Although the CASNAV is attached to the French Ministry of Education, its representatives do not evaluate induction teachers’ performance and it is, consequently, a more neutral body to be introduced by than inspectors. In this sense, the CASNAV represents an “intermediate gatekeeper” (Wanat, 2008: 199) in the hierarchy of the French educational system, insofar as it occupies formal authority positions but has also informal relationships with induction teachers. Establishing a positive research relationship with CASNAV representatives was thus crucial because they would be able to facilitate access to induction classrooms by acting as “intermediaries” and “guarantors” (Gobo, 2008: 121).

Presentation of the researcher-self

In access negotiations with CASNAV representatives, I tried to build positive relationships that would eventually allow me to access induction classrooms. My aim was to foreground within my “portfolio of identities” certain social categories that were identifiable, salient and shared by gatekeepers (Harrington, 2003: 607-609). I thus highlighted three aspects of my identity, that of being French, that of having been a teacher, and that of being a researcher. I emphasised the fact that I had previously graduated as a teacher of French as a foreign language in France, and gave evidence of my status as a researcher. In my initial letter to the CASNAV, I provided official proof of my student status at the University of Edinburgh, a reference letter from my supervisor and head of department, as well as evidence of funding from the Economic and Social Research Council in the United Kingdom. The “psychological objectives” (Harrington, 2003: 610) – or the ‘why’ – underlying my self-categorisation as a teacher were to draw similarity between my concerns and those of CASNAV representatives for learners of French as an additional language, and to create common ground in addition to the mere fact that I was French. Those underlying my self-categorisation as a researcher were to reassure my interlocutors about the academic value of my investigation.

I also had to decide in what terms I was going to present my research interest in multilingual classroom practices. Based on the research literature aforementioned, I was aware of potential negative attitudes held in the French educational system towards newly-arrived migrant children’s multilingualism. I was thus concerned that disclosing my research focus would jeopardise access to induction classrooms. During my initial meetings with CASNAV representatives, I observed that my attempts to address the issue of multilingualism were avoided or not taken further by my interlocutors. I concluded that my research focus was tapping into a ‘taboo area’ that was best avoided in order to maintain positive relationships in access negotiations. Consequently, I decided to expose my research topic in broad terms, saying that I intended to investigate “classroom
interactions in induction classrooms – teacher-led interactions as well as peer-led interactions”. Using the generic term ‘classroom interactions’, rather than the more specific term ‘multilingual classroom interactions’, raised the ethical issue as to whether I had given enough information for CASNAV representatives to give me a fully informed consent to my access query, as required by codes of research practices in France (Baude, 2006) and the United-Kingdom (BAAL, 2006). Although ethically debatable, defining a research topic in generic terms is a strategy that appears in previous accounts of access. Scholars report for instance that informed consent from the start of the research is “neither possible nor desirable” (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 57) and that, during access negotiations, they used “neutral topics” (Beynon, 1983: 39), “toned down” the language of their research proposal (Klaas, 2006), or were “truthful, but vague and imprecise” (Taylor and Bogdan, 1998: 33). In fact, for the researcher to be able to disclose the specificity of a research topic to gatekeepers, both the researcher and gatekeepers would need to share a set of theoretical and political orientations; which is unlikely to be the case and thus an unrealistic criterion to meet. Therefore, rather than it being a matter of being ‘vague and imprecise’, the issue is more that being specific might not offer greater clarity if gatekeepers do not participate in the same discursive and theoretical universe as the researcher.

Gatekeepers’ interpretation of the researcher-self

My identity claims of being French, a researcher and a colleague were all challenged by gatekeepers. Firstly, CASNAV representatives did not acknowledge my ‘French-ness’ and seemed to categorise me as an ‘outsider’ due to my affiliation to a British university. One of my interlocutors argued that, insofar as multiculturalism and multilingualism are not dealt with in the same way in the British and French educational systems, I could not study France’s educational programmes for newly-arrived children with a “British mindset”. He then stressed that, in France, integration is mediated by the French language and that, consequently, in induction classrooms, French ought to be the sole language of instruction and the sole language of classroom interaction. Secondly, CASNAV representatives questioned my actual intentions as a researcher and the real motives behind the fact that a British institution would sponsor a research project in France. Gatekeepers seemed to be concerned that I would report and subsequently criticise their models of educational provision for newly-arrived migrant children to my British funding body. Along with Burgess (1991), I thus wondered to what extent my sponsor had influenced research access since it seemed that rather than identifying me as a researcher, gatekeepers identified me as an evaluator. Thirdly, CASNAV representatives did not recognise me as one of their colleagues, a teacher, on the basis that my training as a teacher of French as a foreign language was irrelevant to the purview of teaching French as a language of instruction.

This first account illustrates the bilateral process of self-presentation (see mainly Goffman, 1959) at hand in access negotiations, whereby the ethnographer’s identity claims must be recognised and approved by gatekeepers in order to be granted access. As Harrington points out, participants, and in my case gatekeepers, have ‘power’ since they are not “passive recipients of a researcher’s impression management strategies, but are active in accepting, rejecting, or modifying the researcher’s identity claims” (2003: 617). Most importantly, gatekeepers’ interpretations of my identity claims were embedded in political considerations and macro-contextual ideologies. Predominantly, gatekeepers seemed to have interpreted the local discursive process of our access negotiations in the wider dialectic of France’s and Britain’s societal models of integration. It looked as if my dual identity of being French but working in the United-Kingdom had been interpreted as a double alliance that cast doubts over my research intentions. Finally, gatekeepers interpreted my research topic and my self-categorisation as one of their colleagues against the background of their monolingual ideologies of language teaching and learning. As suspected in initial meetings, these CASNAV representatives held negative attitudes towards the use of NAM children’s first language(s) in induction classrooms. In summary, access negotiations with gatekeepers were an interactional space where all participants negotiated both the identity of the other and their own identity. However, by repositioning me as an outsider, gatekeepers were not refusing to grant access. They redefined their identity, and what it is to be part of the French state educational system – namely, to adhere to certain ideologies on integration, and language teaching and learning. That is,
they asserted definitional control over all definitions of identity and co-membership, including over how I fitted in. Subsequently, they granted me access to two induction classrooms.

The CASNAV introduced me to two induction teachers in two different primary schools. Induction teachers accepted informally to be observed for a short while before deciding to contribute to a longer ethnographic study. On the strength of this informal consent, and of the support from the CASNAV, I obtained official permission from the respective inspectors to carry out two weeks of participant-observations in each induction classroom and to audio-record classroom interactions. Although I was granted entry to these induction classrooms, I had yet to gain access to their potential multilingual practices since teachers might monitor their behaviour so as to present themselves as following monolingual norms. In this regard, induction teachers are gatekeepers of their classroom insofar as it is up to them to display their classroom practices. The interpersonal aspect of access negotiations with induction teachers can also be discussed in terms of self-presentation and social identity.

Presentation of the research topic
In both induction classrooms, I presented myself in the same way as with the CASNAV, that is, as being French, a teacher and a researcher. However, I adopted two different strategies regarding the presentation of my research topic. In the first induction classroom, I presented my research topic in broad terms, saying that I wanted to observe how teacher and pupils interact in an induction classroom. During the two week observations, classroom interactions were conducted in French as well as in children's first languages. At the end of these preliminary observations, I expressed to the induction teacher my interest in conducting a longer study in her classroom to observe more closely her use of French alongside newly-arrived migrant children’s first languages. Following our agreement, I returned to her classroom a few months later. However, despite a two month observation period, I noted a conspicuous lack of any use of children’s first languages to the extent that interactions were strictly monolingual in French. I thus concluded that, although I had secured entry to this induction classroom for a few months, the induction teacher prevented me from accessing multilingual practices.

Based on this first episode, I decided to adopt a different strategy with the second induction classroom and stated from the start my interest in “the way activities are conducted in the midst of the eight languages available in this classroom”. During the two weeks of preliminary observations, the induction teacher did a 'demonstration class' and talked me through the different classroom activities where she would ask children to rely on their first languages. Regularly, she suspended interactions and explained why a switch to another language occurred. In brief, her awareness of the exact focus of my project had affected the naturalness of classroom talk and invalidated data collection processes. In the end, the induction teacher stated she had shown me everything she could and refused to participate in a longer period of investigation.

To sum up, access negotiations with gatekeepers gave me entry to two induction classrooms, but access negotiations with induction teachers did not give me access to multilingual classroom practices. Along with a distinction between access and cooperation (Wanat, 2008), these two episodes call for a distinction between access and entry (Harrington, 2003; Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007), whereby access is not only a matter of gaining entry into a community or institution but also a matter of being in a situation where data collection is effective.

Induction teachers’ negative attitudes towards the research topic
One way of making sense of these two access negotiations with induction teachers is to posit that induction teachers held negative attitudes towards the use of newcomers’ first languages in classroom interactions and therefore perceived my research topic negatively. Indeed, once the first induction teacher heard about the actual focus of the project, she stopped allowing children to switch to their respective first language(s). In this regard, it is likely that this induction teacher realised her own teaching practices when being observed by the ethnographer and decided to readjust her practices in line with her monolingual ideology of language teaching and learning. This interpretation is all the more plausible since, during informal conversations, this induction teacher
exposed a monolingual understanding of language teaching and learning. In this way, it is also possible to make sense of access negotiations with the second induction teacher. She may have held negative attitudes towards the use of newly-arrived children’s first language(s) but, nevertheless, staged multilingual practices in order to please the ethnographer. Her refusal to contribute to a long term ethnographic study may reflect the fact that during unstaged classroom practices, interactions would tend to be monolingual.

**Induction teachers’ perception of the researcher as an evaluator**

A second way of making sense of those two access negotiations is by positing that both induction teachers categorised the ethnographer not just as a teacher and a researcher, but first and foremost, as an evaluator closely associated with the CASNAV. Although the CASNAV does not formally assess teachers’ performances, it provides teacher training and support for induction teachers. Its ideologies about language teaching and learning represent therefore a model of good practice that induction teachers aspire to follow. In this sense, the first induction teacher’s switch from multilingual to monolingual teaching practices can be interpreted as a fear of being evaluated as not conforming to the CASNAV’s ideologies. Likewise, it is likely that the second induction teacher refused to collaborate in a long term ethnographic study because she was reluctant to display unstaged classroom practices in front of the ethnographer-evaluator.

Perceiving the ethnographer as an evaluator is not an unusual phenomenon and has been reported in previous school ethnographies (see for instance Woods, 1986). Nevertheless, the interesting point here is that induction teachers’ reactions towards an ‘ethnographer-evaluator’ confirm the more or less covert monolingual norms and ideologies held in the CASNAV. Furthermore, they indicate that relying on gatekeepers to introduce me to induction teachers situated access negotiations within monolingual ideologies of language teaching and learning held in the French educational system and prevented me from accessing “de facto” multilingual language policies.

**5. An alternative route of access.**

Following these unsuccessful access negotiations with induction teachers, I decided to adopt an alternative route of access, and to approach induction teachers without the mediation of gatekeepers. CASNAV representatives introduced me to a CASNAV from a different educational district, where representatives let me contact induction teachers directly, via an internal electronic mailing list. Mails sent via this list were read only by induction teachers and communication was therefore beyond the influence of CASNAV representatives. I thus adopted a “bottom-up” approach to access (Silverman, 2000) by sending a call for participation to all induction teachers of this new educational district. In this way, I was able to introduce myself as someone with internal access to the educational system while dissociating myself from gatekeepers.

In the call for participation sent to induction teachers, I stated clearly the focus of my research project in the hope that teachers who held negative views regarding the use of children’s first languages would naturally opt out from the study. This call for participation triggered multiple and various replies, and most importantly, some enthusiastic replies from a few induction teachers who held an ideology of language teaching and learning different from that of gatekeepers’. The following excerpt from an audio-recorded interview with one of these induction teachers is a good example:

“[…] I’m not the kind of person who is going to tell one of my pupils: ‘right, my dear, you are in France and it’s to learn French. And you know, the Senegal…’ ((Gesture that indicates indifference)). They know that me, I am the institution, but that, at the same time, I don’t endorse that stuff about ‘we’re here to learn French, and that’s the only thing that matters and all the rest it’s a private issue’. Me, I say: ‘we’re here to learn French but you are Senegalese, and this, it interests me a lot’” (T2 interview 12: 350, my translation).

This positive ideology about newcomers’ multiculturalism and multilingualism enabled induction teachers to perceive the focus of my research positively, that is, as enhancing their work and
standpoints on teaching. In the end, I secured entry to an induction classroom taught by one of these induction teachers and accessed classroom interactions where more than seven languages were used.

6. Discussion.
In the following section, I would like to discuss how access negotiations reported in this paper were influenced – and hindered by – ideologies held in the French educational system and in French society at large. Taking into account the macro-context of access negotiations is not new, and has in fact been done by several scholars conducting ethnographic research in educational settings. In his ethnography of schooling, Gilborn (1994) for instance acknowledges the influence of wider educational reforms in his access to schools. Similarly, Troman (1996) discusses the role of macro-societal values in his unsuccessful attempts to access English primary schools to conduct ethnographic research. Likewise, Klaas (2006) addresses the impact of ideologies in his access negotiations to carry out race ethnographic research in white schools in South Africa. In this section, I will focus on two ideologies that have influenced my access negotiations with gatekeepers and induction teachers: France’s and Britain’s ideologies of integration, and monolingual versus multilingual ideologies of language teaching and learning.

France’s and Britain’s ideologies of integration
As I have shown, my identity claim of being an insider to the French community based on my French nationality was challenged by gatekeepers who seemed to perceive me as an ‘outsider’, a ‘foreigner’, studying France’s educational programmes for newly-arrived migrant children from the perspective of Britain’s ideology of integration. This indicates that local discursive identity negotiations taking place during the process of access were embedded in France’s and Britain’s conflicting ideologies of integration. To meet space constraints, these ideologies can only be briefly summarised. Great Britain operates a multicultural model of integration whereby migrant communities are recognised as such and co-live in British society. On the contrary, France operates what might be called a ‘monocultural’ model of integration, whereby migrants are integrated and assimilated to the French nation, which is seen and portrayed since the Revolution as a monolingual and monocultural entity. Based on the Republican principle of ‘Equality for All’, migrant communities are not recognised as such – the French state remaining “indifferent to differences” (Forquin, 2000: 156). In this regard, learning French is seen as a key tenet for a successful integration and is therefore the principal aim of induction classrooms, often at the expense of children’s first languages. Due to this ideological context, CASNAV representatives appear to have interpreted my focus on issues of language-in-education policy in multilingual contexts as being a focus on multilingual language practices per se; practices that they precisely discourage in favour of the sole use of French in the classroom.

Monolingual versus multilingual ideologies of language teaching and learning
During the course of access negotiations with gatekeepers and induction teachers, I have also shown that monolingual ideologies of language teaching and learning have influenced the way in which I presented myself and my research topic, and the way in which this presentation has been interpreted by my interlocutors. According to this ideology, one’s first language must be left behind in order to be able to acquire a second language. Castellotti (2001) notes that this monolingual ideology of language teaching and learning resulted in pupils’ first language(s) being considered as a “real ‘taboo’” (2001: 10) as they are thought to prevent second language acquisition. We recall that this ‘taboo’ on newcomers’ multilingualism has indeed been perceived during initial meetings with CASNAV representatives and has influenced my decision to present my research topic in broad terms. In turn, the two induction teachers I first observed oriented to a monolingual ideology of language teaching and learning.

However, a bottom-up approach to access revealed that some induction teachers hold a multilingual ideology of language teaching and learning. This ideology underlies the work of a strand of French researchers who consider learners’ multilingual repertoire as being strategic for language teaching and learning and as needing to be developed into a multilingual and multicultural competence (see for instance Coste, Moore and Zarate, 1997; Moore, 2008). In the specific context of induction
classrooms, Auger’s recent DVD designed for induction teachers (2008a) shows examples of teaching sequences grounded in children’s first languages. The fact that some induction teachers endorse this multilingual ideology has not been reported in previous studies - and shows the extent to which the process of access is in itself a process of data collection (Beynon, 1983: 42; Whyte, 1984: 34; Harrington, 2003: 599).

7. Concluding remarks.
I have shown in this paper the influence of ideologies in the ‘how’ and ‘why’ of identity negotiations involved in the process of access in multilingual school ethnography. During access negotiations, I tried to foreground aspects of my identity and of my research topic that would draw common ground with my interlocutors and facilitate my presence within the educational institution. However, my identity claims (of being French, of being a researcher and of being a teacher) have all been challenged by gatekeepers on the basis of wider ideologies held in the French educational system and in French society at large. In turn, the way I presented my research topic to gatekeepers was also shaped by my perception of the surrounding monolingual policy. In a similar way, I have reported how access negotiations with induction teachers have been embedded in ideologies of language teaching and learning. Access negotiations mediated by gatekeepers were especially hindered by institutional monolingual ideologies, as induction teachers most likely perceived me as an ‘evaluator’ closely associated with gatekeepers. However, a bottom-up approach to access negotiations revealed that some induction teachers hold multilingual ideologies, which gave me access to ‘de facto’ multilingual language policies in induction classrooms.

It goes without saying that this “trajectory of access” (Bruni, 2006) does not stop where this paper finishes, and includes further negotiations to access, for instance, inducted children’s language practices in small groups. Equally, this personal account of access negotiations does not claim to be prescriptive by any means. It is rather a call to consider the specificity of access negotiations in multilingual school ethnography – namely the way in which micro negotiations are intertwined with macro ideologies towards multilingualism in education and in society at large. This account shows that access strategies should therefore be part of ethnographic accounts as they are the first loci where ideologies are enacted, and represent, therefore, a first window onto the institution’s ideologies. Thus, whilst access strategies are understood as being “designed and adjusted according to the characteristics of the organization or group observed, its type (company or institution), its size (large, medium, small or very small), and the aims of the research” (Gobo, 2008: 120), I have illustrated the fact that, in multilingual school ethnography, access strategies are also “designed and adjusted” according to the gradual manifestation of the institution’s ideologies.
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Introduction
The notion of ‘label quests’ was first coined by Heath (1986) to refer to “language activities in which adults either name items or ask for their names” (1986: 168) during adult-child interactions. A prototypical example would look like this:

Example 1:
1. Adult: what is this/
2. Child: a cat
3. Adult: yes .) a cat

Label quests (LQ) are also typical classroom language activities and have been widely identified in classroom talk studies as being a useful teaching strategy in bi/multilingual classroom contexts (e.g. Arthur, 1996; Martin, 1999; Martin et al. 2006). However, scholars have not yet described the interactional mechanism of this teaching strategy and, more precisely, how it can be conducted in more than one language. Therefore, this paper aims to show the interactional organisation of LQ, investigating at what level of the LQ language alternation occurs.

Data set and methods
The discussion in this paper is drawn from a Conversation Analysis of a set of classroom interaction audio-recorded in an induction classroom for newly-arrived migrant children in France. In this induction classroom, eight languages were co-present (i.e. French, English, Spanish, Japanese, Polish, Lithuanian, Peul, and Arabic). I have analysed LQs conducted in more than one language in light of Schegloff’s framework of sequence organisation (2007), which accounts for “expansions” embedded within the minimal unit of the LQ. Three different structural organisations of LQs emerged; among which were, what I propose to call, ‘multilingual label quests’ (MLQ).

An example of multilingual label quest
I define MLQs as interactional sequences where labels are named or elicited in languages other than the medium. In our corpus, MLQs are interactional sequences where French is the ‘medium of classroom interaction’ (Bonacina and Gafaranga; submitted) and within which other languages are allowed at two specific levels: seconds or pre-second insert expansions (what I call Type 1 of MLQ) and post-expansions (what I call Type 2 of MLQ). Extract 1 gives an example of MLQ of Type 1.

Extract 1:
1. Teacher: ça s’appelle comment/
   what is it called/
2. Alexia: ah! (.), es una historieta! <Spanish>
   ah! (.), it’s a cartoon!
3. Micaela: que (.), comme (.), il parle-
   that (.), like (.), that speaks-
4. Brianna: en anglais on dit comics <English>
   in English we say comics

Transcription conventions can be found at the end of the paper.
Here, the teacher is trying to elicit the French label ‘bande dessinée’ (in English, cartoon) from her pupils. The first pair part of the MLQ (line 1) does not have its second pair part until many turns later (line 73) since pupils have difficulties finding the requested French label. However, the pupils still orient to the LQ by providing the label in their first language(s) in lieu of a second pair part. For instance, line 2, Alexia shows understanding (“ah!”), pauses and gives the label in Spanish. Line 4, Brianna gives the English label, signalling that it is not the expected French label (“en anglais”). The teacher acknowledges these turns (line 5) as leading to pre-second insertions. Between lines 5 to 60, the teacher initiates what might be called ‘translation quests’, that is, interactional sequences where the translation of a label is named or elicited. Line 5 to 7, the teacher initiates a translation quest into English: line 5 is the first pair part, Brianna’s answer line 6 is the second pair part and the teacher’s repeat line 7 is the sequence closure third. Then, line 7 to 60, the teacher initiates translation quests into Japanese, Lithuanian and Peul (a language from Senegal). Structurally speaking, these four translation quests are all embedded in the wider MLQ at the level of pre-second insertions. Lastly, the teacher reiterates the first pair part lines 60-1 and gives the French label line 73 – the second pair part of the MLQ. Pupils repeat in a chorus the new French label line 74 – which is the sequence closure third of the MLQ.

In brief, this extract shows that language alternation is orderly and part and parcel of the multiple layers of MLQs. It also indicates how traditional teaching practices such as LQs can be structurally expanded to accommodate the functional use of language alternation in classroom talk.

Transcription conventions
The conventions follow largely Jefferson (2004). Other key conventions are below:

**Bold** A bold font indicates a stretch of talk uttered in a language other than French.

**Word** A grey italicised stretch of talk indicates a free translation into English.

**<>** Left/right carats contain the indication of the language in which the preceding stretch of talk was uttered.
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74 Being newly-arrived migrants, these pupils are learners of French as a second language.

75 The full extract could not be reproduced due to space constraints.


The aim of this paper is to account for language choice and alternation phenomena we have observed in a French complementary school classroom in Scotland. In this classroom, talk can be conducted in French (the official medium of instruction), in English (the other language in contact) and in both French and English. A critical review of the literature has revealed that current studies of bilingual classroom talk are conducted either from a ‘local order’ perspective or from an ‘overall order’ perspective. While the local order perspective is indifferent towards the phenomena we have observed in the target classroom, the overall order perspective can account only for part of the data, namely cases where talk is conducted in the medium of instruction. Therefore, drawing on Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis, this paper suggests an alternative view. Building on Gafaranga (2007a, 2007b, 2009), we demonstrate that the notion of ‘medium of classroom interaction’ is a more appropriate “scheme” (Garfinkel 1967) for the interpretation of the bilingual practices we have observed.

Keywords: code-switching; bilingualism; classroom interaction; conversation analysis; complementary school; French.

Introduction

During participant observation in a classroom in a French complementary school in Scotland (hereafter conveniently referred to as ‘La Colombe’) and subsequent focused examination of the data we had collected, a situation emerged which we think requires an account. In the classroom, three possibilities were open for participants to conduct their interaction as practical social action. They could conduct their interaction in French, the prescribed medium of instruction; they could conduct it in English, the other language in contact; and they could talk using both French and English. Once one of these possibilities had been adopted, participants could deviate from it for specific functional effects. In ethnomethodological terms and following Gafaranga (2007a, 2007b, 2009), the issue these possibilities raise can be described as that of the overall order in bilingual classroom talk. Therefore this paper proposes an ethnomethodological / conversation analytic account of the situation we observed at La Colombe.

By way of an illustration of one of these possibilities, consider extract 1 below. In the extract, two children, Marie and Louise, are accomplishing a task which consists of creating sentences from words written on cards. Transcription conventions can be found at the end of the paper.

Extract 1:
163. Marie: « mon frère » « va » « au cinéma »
164. « aujourd'hui »
165. Louise: no but just move this
166. (.)
Marie: how about this/ (. ) « mes cousins » « aiment »
« regarder » « les films d’aventure »
Marie: there j’ai un autre (. ) « dans »
« ma chambre »
Louise: I’ve got one!
Marie: merci=
Louise: look! (. ) j’ai another one again
Marie: great
Louise: oui::!

Marie: « my brother » « goes » « to the cinema »
Louise: no but just move this
Marie: how about this/ (. ) « my cousins » « like »
Louise: I think that-
Marie: there I have another one (. ) « in » « my
bedroom »
Louise: I’ve got one!
Marie: thanks=
Louise: look! (. ) I have another one again
Marie: great
Louise: yes::!

As the transcript shows, the children are using both French and English to accomplish the task. Individual turns are completed in one language, but inter-turn language alternation occurs as well. A turn in one language may be responded to in the same language, but it may also be responded to in a different language. And, departing from this use of both English and French, participants consistently use French to refer to the French words on the cards.

We felt that this particular type of classroom order deserved an explanation for current accounts of language choice in bilingual classrooms, despite impressive results, seem to be limited in scope. Motivated by the desire to uncover the pedagogic functions of classroom code-switching (Ferguson 2003, 2009), these studies focus on the use of languages other than the medium of instruction prescribed by the school language policy. So, for example, investigating language choice in a classroom where French has been declared the medium of instruction, Heller argues that “any use of English must be seen as a direct contestation of the legitimacy of French, and, by extension, of the teacher’s authority” (1996, 150). Likewise, in her investigation of language choice in a bilingual classroom in a rural classroom in South Africa where English has been adopted as the medium, Probyn (2009) says that the other language in contact is “smuggled” in. As a last example, McGlynn and Martin (2009), in their investigation of language choice in a classroom in Gambia where English is the medium of instruction, describe the use of Mandinka and Wolof as a “break of the (‘no vernacular’) rule”. In all these examples, classroom interaction is seen as normatively conducted in the declared medium of instruction. From this normative use of the medium of instruction, participants would occasionally deviate into the other language(s) present in the setting for functional effects. Clearly, this assumption that classroom interaction is necessarily and normatively conducted in the medium of instruction prescribed by the school language policy can account for only part of the phenomena we have observed at La Colombe. It can account only for those cases where interaction is indeed conducted in French.

Thus our aim in this paper is to explore an alternative framework, a framework which would allow us to account for the totality of the data in the setting we have investigated and, hopefully, for language choice in other bilingual classroom settings as well. As Martin-Jones (1995) and Ferguson (2009) have made it clear, studies of classroom code-switching follow (ought to
follow) the trends in code-switching research at the community level. In a series of recent publications, Gafaranga (1999, 2007a, 2007b, 2009; Gafaranga and Torras 2001), drawing on ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, has consistently argued that language choice in bilingual conversation can be accounted for, not with reference to the grammarians’ notion of language, but rather with reference to the “actually oriented-to participants’ own code”, a code that he refers to as the medium². According to Gafaranga, this code may, but need not, be monolingual. It may also be bilingual. Drawing on Gafaranga, we will adopt the notion of medium of classroom interaction, instead of that of medium of instruction, and show how it can allow us to account for the language choice phenomena we have observed at La Colombe.

This paper is organised in four main sections. Section 1 describes the sociolinguistic context of the data used in this paper and the methods used to collect them. In section 2, we briefly review previous studies of bilingual classroom talk and show their limitations vis-à-vis the phenomena we have observed in the target classroom. Section 3 describes in detail the language choice patterns we have observed at La Colombe. Finally, in the fourth and last main section, we develop the notion of medium of classroom interaction and show how it can allow us to account for the phenomena we have observed at La Colombe.

CONTEXT AND DATA

Complementary schools – also referred to as ‘heritage language schools’, ‘supplementary schools’, ‘community language schools’ and ‘mother-tongue schools’ – are, in Britain at least, “voluntary, community organisations, aiming primarily at literacy teaching in the heritage languages to the British-born generation of young children” (Wei and Wu 2009, 196). They are implemented by ethnic minority communities willing to maintain their linguistic and cultural heritage in a society where the school system is failing to meet their needs (Wei 2006, 81; Creese and Martin 2006, 1). Despite being implemented in different settings, complementary schools in the UK share common defining characteristics. They take place out of school hours, or during weekends, in borrowed or rented premises. They are voluntary schools usually run and taught by parents. And, of interest for this paper, they operate either a One-Language-Only Policy or a One-Language-At-a-Time Policy (Wei and Wu 2009, 193); in other words, their (more or less overt) language policy is to compel learners to use the heritage language.

La Colombe, the French complementary school where the data for this paper were collected, was created in 1992 by a group of French expatriate parents and parents still contribute to its funding. Additional funds for the school are provided by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs through the programme F.L.A.M. (Consolidation du Français Langue Maternelle). This programme was set up to support educational initiatives for children aged between five and sixteen attending school in a language other than French outside of France (see http://www.progamme-flam.fr).

Similarly to other UK-based complementary schools, La Colombe meets once a week for two hours on the premises of a local mainstream primary school. Only children with a French native speaking parent are allowed to register in the school. Once admitted, children are allocated to classes on the basis of their age and proficiency in the French language. At the time of the study (the school year 2004-2005), there were five classes for a total of forty two children aged between five and thirteen. Teachers have to be native speakers of French. And, in line with the F.L.A.M. policy and with parents’ expectations, the school operates a French monolingual policy.

Interactions reported in this paper are drawn from the older class of this complementary school. The class was attended by ten children aged between nine and thirteen. The teacher, fully qualified for teaching in the mainstream Scottish educational system, was bilingual in French and English (native French and fluent English second language speaker). This teacher organised his teaching in three main sequences, namely an initial time for whole class discussion, a time for pair group work and a time for feedback with the whole group. Data were collected in all three phases of the teaching sequence.

Data were collected over a three-month period in the academic year 2004-2005 and involved participant observation in the five classes, interviews with stakeholders and parents and audio-recordings of classroom interaction in the advanced class. For the purpose of this paper and in line with the ethnomethodological / conversation analytic perspective we have adopted, only
transcripts of classroom interaction will be considered. Although access issues are common to multilingual school ethnographies (Bonacina, forthcoming), access to the school and the specific class was facilitated by the fact that the fieldworker (deleted) had a long established relationship with the school personnel as a former colleague. Ethics standards were complied with: disclosure checks, informed consent from the head of the school and signed consent from parents. Names and other explicit identification have either been changed or deleted.

**CODE-SWITCHING IN THE CLASSROOM: WHAT IS SWITCHED FROM?**

As indicated above, our main aim is to account for the fact that, at La Colombe, participants could choose to speak French, English or both French and English and, once a ‘base code’ had been chosen, they could switch from it to serve specific purposes. That is to say, our main question is that of the code which is switched from in bilingual classroom talk. In other contexts, this is known as the ‘base language’ issue (e.g. Swigart 1992; Auer 2000). With respect to the question of what code is switched from in bilingual classroom talk, current accounts of code-switching in the classroom divide into two main categories³. On the one hand, there are studies which approach language alternation from what we might call a ‘local order’ perspective. In this perspective, researchers focus on language contrast, either within turns and between turns, without any attention to whether there is or is not any organising principle beyond the local contrast. Typically, in this perspective, issues of whether or not there is a base code in the discourse they analyse are not felt to be particularly relevant. Space limitations do not allow us to review studies in this category in detail. We will thus only mention one by way of an illustration. Raschka, Sercombe and Chi-Lin (2009) have studied language choice in an EFL classroom in Taiwan and noticed that, in the classroom, both English and Mandarin were used. A short passage from the study can be used by way of illustrating these authors’ position. After they had given an extract of data, they wrote:

“In this extract, Ebony (the teacher) is talking in Mandarin about the inability to lose weight, then switches to English to highlight a topic shift in form (sic) of a discourse marker (…) and then continues in L1 to ask students how far they got in the previous class session. This extract is typical in that it was quite often difficult to establish whether, in fact, the base or matrix language being used was English or Mandarin” (2009, 164).

From this passage, it is easy to see that the authors’ interest is, not in whether there is an overall order in language choice, but rather in the juxtaposition of languages at the local level. The fact that no “base or matrix language” could be identified did not stop the authors from proceeding with their analysis, looking at switches as they occurred. A similar situation can be found in the burgeoning studies of code-switching in complementary schools. For example, Martin et al (2006) examined the issue of how bilingualism is managed in classroom interaction in a Gujarati complementary school in Leicester (UK) and reported that “participants spontaneously juxtapose Gujarati and English in order to create learning/teaching opportunities” (2006: 5, our emphasis). Clearly, this idea of the spontaneous juxtaposition of languages implies a local level view of language choice, or at least does not signal any status differential between the languages involved. Clearly, this local order perspective is not appropriate for the kind of issues we are pursuing. As we have said above, the issues our data raise are primarily those of the overall order in bilingual classroom interaction.

The second category of studies of bilingual classroom interaction consists of those which can be described as the ‘overall order’ perspective. In this category, a more or less explicit distinction is made between the declared medium of instruction and the other language(s) in contact in the classroom. Following this distinction, the medium of instruction is assumed to be the default choice against which the use of the other language(s) is seen as deviance. Thus, in these studies, the fact of using the medium of instruction is seen as unremarkable, while the use of the other language(s) is seen as noticeable and accountable, i.e. as requiring an account. In McGlynn and Martin (2009) study mentioned above, for example, the use of Wolof and Mandinka is seen as a ‘break of the rule’, not because of the local sequential context in which it occurs, but rather because it deviates from the normative use of English. Likewise, in Probyn (2009), the use of local South African languages such as Xosa can be seen as a case of ‘smuggling’ only by comparison to the
A particularly oblique form of the distinction between the normative use of the medium of instruction and other languages involved can be found in the many studies in which the term code-switching (CS) actually stands for the use of the language(s) other than the medium of instruction. An interesting case in point is Moodley (2007). Moodley studied learner-learner talk in a multilingual classroom in South Africa, focusing on Zulu speaking children in an English-only environment. Throughout this study, the term CS is used to refer to the use of Zulu. The following statement is revealing of this use of the term CS as a gloss for the use of languages other than the medium of instruction:

“The findings show that CS in group-work in the classroom is a natural phenomenon that occurs in the speech patterns of those who have the repertoire to do so. The findings also reveal that by strategic use of the learners’ NL (L1), by means of intersentential and intrasentential CS, learners themselves in learner-learner interaction were able to: enhance their vocabulary by providing their NL equivalents or synonyms or explanations, grasp difficult ideas and concepts, provide meaningful and significant additional information, etc…” (2007, 718; our emphasis). 

As the highlighted passage indicates, the use of NL (national language or learners’ L1) is the same as code-switching (intrasentential or intersentential). By implication, the use of English is normative, i.e. is not code-switching.

In the complementary school context, a study by Wei and Wu (2009) exemplifies the overall order perspective on code-switching in the classroom. Wei and Wu examined code-switching practices in five Cantonese complementary schools in Manchester (UK). Among other significant statements by the authors, we read:

“These schools are set up to teach Chinese literacy to the British Chinese children and their policy is to use Chinese only. However, as our evidence shows, both the teachers and the pupils use a great deal of English and they codeswitch frequently and regularly in and out of the classroom” (2009: 208, our emphasis).

As the statement makes it clear, the interesting observation was, not of the use of Chinese, but of the use of English by both teachers and pupils. On the other hand, the use of English was noticeable and interesting, not with reference to the immediately preceding or immediately following use of Chinese (local order), but by reference to the school’s language policy as a whole. To be sure, Wei and Wu also equate code-switching with the use of English. Our account of language choice practices at La Colombe follows in this tradition of research which adopts the overall order perspective on code-switching in bilingual classrooms.
Patterns of language choice at La Colombe

The overall order perspective on bilingual classroom talk as described above is a promising start in addressing the language choice phenomena we have observed at La Colombe. As we have seen, at La Colombe, one type of language choice pattern consists of using the medium of instruction, French in this case, as the default against which the use of the other language, English, is seen as deviant and therefore as accountable. An example of this pattern of language choice can be found in extract 2 below, a case of what Gafaranga (2000) calls medium repair (see also McHoul 1990; and Macbeth 2004 for a discussion of repair and error correction in classroom interaction). In the extract, Louise is telling the teacher her plans for the weekend.

Extract 2:
51. Louise: moi je vais aller entre euh (.) au camp (. ) faire
52. de la camp
53. Teacher: ah ouais d’accord (. ) oui
54. Louise: avec euh (. ) les (. ) guides
55. (. )
56. Teacher: les /
57. Louise: guides
58. Res.: les scouts
59. Louise: mais c’est pour les filles\
60. Teacher: ok merci Louise (.) et Patrick (. ) tu fais quoi ce
61. week-end/

In the extract, both French and English are used. However, they do not have the same status. In 54, in keeping with previous talk, Louise starts her turn in French. However, she runs into difficulty finding the mot juste as evidenced by the different “trouble markers” (Gafaranga 2000) (euh, pauses). She then moves into English, switching from her choice of French so far, to signal what she’s having difficulty with. That is, she uses English to initiate repair. On receiving this, the teacher uses a specific strategy, namely the pause in 55, to allow Louise to self-repair (see preference for self-repair in conversation in Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks 1977). When, to Teacher, Louise has not done anything as a result of the pause, he takes the turn, repeats ‘les’ with a rising intonation and, by so doing, explicitly calls for repair. That is, 56 is a case of other-initiation of repair. In 57, rather than providing the required repair, Louise repeats the English word ‘guides’, as if to say that she is unable to come up with the needed mot juste. In 58, Res suggests a possible equivalent in French (other-repair) with which Louise agrees only partially (59). Finally, in 60, Teacher closes the sequence before selecting Patrick as next speaker. Thus, in this case, the use of English can be seen as a case of deviance from the norm, and by implication, French can be seen as the norm. In other words, the use of English is noticeable by reference to the choice of French. A similar situation where French, the medium of instruction, is used as the base code is extract 3 below.

Extract 3:
08. Colin: c’est du peinture qui est- (.) qui est très:: (.)
09. euh:: (.) liquid
10. Teacher: qui est quoi /
11. Colin: liquid
12. Teacher: liquide
13. Colin: liquide

06. Colin: it is a paint that is- (. ) that is very:: (. ) erm::
07. (. ) liquid
08. Teacher: that is what/
09. Colin: liquid
10. Teacher: liquid
11. Colin: liquid

In 06, Colin is using French. However, he runs into difficulty, as evidenced by the trouble markers (self-interruption, pause, recycle, elongation, pause, holder, pause). These trouble markers are used by way of signalling that a problem has arisen. As nobody has come to the rescue, Colin shifts to English to signal exactly what the trouble source is. That is, Colin has used a variety of strategies, including language switching, to initiate repair. In 08, instead of providing repair as called for by Colin, Teacher does ‘doing being’ the teacher and initiates repair in his turn, by way of encouraging Colin to try further and come up with the missing word in French. In 09, Colin comes back with the same English word (‘liquid’). At this point, the teacher understands that Colin will not be able to solve the problem by himself and repairs the on-going problem (10) and in 11, Colin ratifies the repair. Briefly, here again, French is demonstrably the base code participants are using, and from which they deviate into English for specific functional effects.

Both examples above of the use of French as the base code occur in teacher-learner talk, but the use of French as the base code can also occur in leaner-learner talk. Here is an example. Lucie and Marie are completing sentences in an exercise where only the verb ‘être’ (i.e. ‘to be’) should be used. In this sequence, they are not in agreement as to whether to use ‘êtes’ (second person plural, present tense) or ‘sont’ (third person plural, present tense) in front of the word ‘vieux’ (adjective meaning ‘old’) and after ‘vous’ (2nd person plural personal pronoun).

Extract 4:

230. Marie: sont /
231. Lucie: êtes !
232. Marie: sont (« vieux »)
233. Lucie: [êtes! (. ) êtes! (. ) c’est êtes parce que c’est « vous » là (. ) alors faut ça (pointing at her exercise sheet))
234. (. )
235. (.)
236. (. )
237. Lucie: « vous » êtes ! « vieux »
238. Marie: how do you spell [that/
239. Lucie: [là là là ((pointing at the conjugation on her paper))
240. Marie: ah d’accord=
241. Lucie: « vous » êtes ! « vieux »

230. Marie: are /
231. Lucie: are !
232. Marie: are [ « old »}
Marie maintains that ‘sont’ should be used while Lucie is of the opinion that ‘êtes’ should be used instead. In turn 233, Lucie goes beyond stating her position and provides an account for it. Given this action, the expectation was that Marie would either counter-attack and provide an account for her own position or give in to Lucie’s point of view. In 236, a noticeable silence occurs, which is analysed by Lucie as indicating that Marie has given in. She therefore proceeds to concluding the sequence by phrasing the final sentence (237). In 238, Marie “moves out of closing” (Schegloff and Sacks 1973; Button 1986) and queries an aspect of Lucie’s position (spelling). To further mark this departure, she switches away from French and uses English. In 239, Lucie provides a second pair part to Marie’s first pair part, but misaligns with her by maintaining the use of French. In 241, Marie provides a ‘minimal post-expansion’, concludes the ‘post-expansion’ (Schegloff 2007) and noticeably moves back to French and re-aligns with Lucie at the level of language choice. Finally, in 242, Lucie concludes the sequence, repeating the agreed French sentence. Here again, the use of French is the base code and that of English is a case of functional deviance signalling the movement out of closing. Briefly, the first pattern of language choice at La Colombe consists of the choice of French, the medium of instruction, as the base code and, as already indicated, this pattern is consistent with current studies carried out under the overall order perspective on bilingual classroom interaction.

However, as we have already indicated, at La Colombe, there are also patterns of language choice which challenge the current overall order perspective on bilingual classroom interaction. The first of these patterns is when English is used as the base code. An example of this pattern is extract 5 below. In the extract, Lucie and Louise are accomplishing a word search looking at a grid of letters where some French words have been dissimulated amongst other letters.

Extract 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Lucie: I can’t find « attraper »</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>(. )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Louise: « coudre »</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>(. )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Lucie: where is « danser »</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Louise: I’m! supposed to find « danser »</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Lucie: no I! am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Louise: no!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Lucie: alright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>(. )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Louise: I can’t find any of mine (. ) I’m rubbish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Lucie: I can’t find « to catch »</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>(. )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Louise: « to sew »</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lucie: where is « to dance » /
Louise: I’m! supposed to find « to dance »
Lucie: no I! am
Louise: no!
Lucie: alright
Louise: I can’t find any of mine (.). I’m rubbish

As the transcript shows, talk in this case is conducted in English, with French being used only for the French words the children are looking for. An even more interesting use of English as the base code is extract 6 below. In the extract, two children, Colin and Pierre, are disputing the ownership of a card which happens to be lying between their respective piles.

Extract 6:
29. Colin: it’s mine
30. Pierre: no (.). it’s mine
31. (.)
32. Colin: c’est à moi
33. Pierre: okay (.). so you will have this one and I will
34. work with this one
35. Colin: thanks

In 29, Colin states his position and in 30, Pierre states his. In both cases, English is used. In 31, a pause, which could be attributed to Colin as next speaker, occurs. This pause may be interpreted as an opportunity Colin leaves open for Pierre to self-repair. As Pierre does not self-repair, Colin reformulates his position. In so doing, he departs from his previous use of English and uses French, as if to up the stakes. In 33, Pierre gives in and, interestingly, uses English, as if to downscale the tension. And, in 35, Colin shows appreciation to Pierre and he too uses English, shifting back from his previous use of French, as if to mark the new recovered interpersonal alignment. Thus, in this extract, as in the previous one, English is used as the base code from which participants switch to French for very specific purposes. Clearly, cases like these cannot be accounted for by reference to the medium of instruction as French, the medium of instruction, is not used as the base code.

The third pattern of language choice we have observed at La Colombe is when both French and English are used as the code. An example of this pattern is extract 1 above. As we have seen, in that extract, neither English nor French can be seen as the “language-of-interaction” (Auer 1984). Rather, the use of both languages itself is the code. Another example of this pattern is extract 7 below.

Extract 7:
251. Tony: ok (.). je cherche « plonger » (.). si tu
252. trouves « plonger » dis-moi
253. (.3)
254. Pierre: it doesn’t matter I’m going to the next
255. one (.). « retrouver » (.). mm (.). are you
256. looking for « reposer »/
Although both extract 1 and extract 7 can be seen as instances of the use of both English and French as the base code, a fundamental difference exists between the two. As we have seen, in extract 1, both participants are using both languages. In extract 7, on the other hand, Tony consistently uses French while Pierre consistently uses English. Other researchers have spoken of unreciprocal language choices (e.g. Zentella 1997) in situations like these. However, what is remarkable is that, despite these apparently diverging language choices, interaction proceeds smoothly as if nothing unusual has occurred. Here again, the notion that interaction in bilingual classrooms is normatively conducted in the medium of instruction imposed by the school language policy is not helpful.

To summarise the argument thus far, at La Colombe, three different patterns of language choice can be observed. Interaction can be conducted in French, the prescribed medium of instruction; it can be conducted in English, the other language in contact; and it can be conducted in both French and English. Out of these three patterns, the current overall order model of language choice in bilingual classrooms can account only for one, namely the pattern where French is used as the base code. Because of this insufficiency, in the section below, we explore an alternative model of the overall order in language choice in bilingual classroom interaction.

**FROM ‘MEDIUM OF INTERACTION’ TO ‘MEDIUM OF CLASSROOM INTERACTION’**

As Martin-Jones (1995) has noted, code-switching research at the classroom level is often influenced by trends of code-switching research at the community level. Research in classroom code-switching adopts models developed to account for code-switching at the community level. In code-switching research at the community level, researchers have been debating the issue of what counts as the code in bilingual interaction for some time now. Particularly, researchers have argued that the notion of *language*, a grammatical system, and that of *code*, a semiotic system, are different. Thus, already in Gumperz (1982), there is a suggestion that the “grammarian’s notion of language” and “the participants’ own notion of code” might be different. This issue was further taken up by Alvarrez-Cáccamo (1998) who introduced the notion of “communicative code”. Here again, it is argued that the notion of language and that of communicative code are different. Likewise, Auer (1984, 2000) has argued that, if participants alternate frequently between turns and within turns, none of the languages involved can be seen as the language-of-interaction, that is, the benchmark against which
occurrences of the other language must be seen. Rather, he maintains, the use of both languages itself must be seen as the code participants are using.

However, issues of what counts as code in code-switching has nowhere been felt as strongly as in studies of post-colonial contexts where, as Muysken (2000) has observed, alternation is mostly of the turn-internal type. Thus, in her investigation of language choice in a variety of settings in East Africa, Myers-Scotton felt the need to postulate a category of language alternation she referred as “code-switching itself as the unmarked choice” (1983, 1988). In this category, language alternation would do for its users exactly the same job as the use of any other language variety. Likewise, Meeuwis and Blommaert (1998), in their investigation of language choice among Zairians in Belgium concluded explicitly that, in this setting, there existed what they called “monolectal code-switching”. Along the same tradition, in a series of contributions, Gafaranga (1999, 2007a, 2007b, 2009) has argued that among the Rwandans (in Rwanda and in Belgium) and on specific occasions of interaction, code-switching itself could be seen as the code participants are using. To highlight the specificity of this linguistic code, Gafaranga speaks of the medium of interaction. Crucially, Gafaranga argues that this code may be monolingual, just as it can be bilingual. Gafaranga and Torras (2001) further respecified the concept and claimed that, in the case of the bilingual medium, different possibilities can be observed, namely the mixed mode, the parallel mode and the half-way between mode.

Although the notion of medium of interaction was initially developed to account for language choice in mundane conversations, some initiatives to use it to account for language choice in bilingual institutional settings have already been undertaken. Thus Torras (2005; Torras and Gafaranga 2002) has applied it in her study of service encounters in Barcelona and Cromdal (2005) has adopted the concept in his study of English-Swedish alternation in dyadic learner interaction. It is following these initial successes that we propose the notion of medium of classroom interaction as the “scheme of interpretation” (Garfinkel 1967) for language choice acts at La Colombe and, by implication, in bilingual classroom interaction in general. We define the notion of medium of classroom interaction as the ‘the linguistic code’ that classroom participants actually orient-to while talking, as opposed to the policy-prescribed medium of instruction.

To recall, three patterns of language choice were observed at La Colombe. The notion of medium of classroom interaction can easily account for them all. As we have seen, the first pattern is when French, the prescribed medium of interaction, is used as the base code. The notion of medium of classroom interaction easily accounts for this pattern, for in this case, we can speak of a French monolingual medium. Speakers may depart from this monolingual French medium for functional purposes (repairable deviance as in extracts 2 and 3 and non-repairable deviance as in extract 4). The second pattern, as we have seen, consists of the use of English as the medium. In this case, we will speak of a monolingual English medium, from which speakers can depart for specific functional purposes as in extracts 5 and 6. Finally, the third pattern, as we have seen, consists of the alternate use of French and English as the medium (i.e. as a bilingual medium), either in the form of the mixed mode as in extract 1 or in the form of the parallel mode as in extract 7.

CONCLUSION

To summarise, the main aim of this paper has been to account for language choice phenomena we have observed in the advanced class in a French complementary school in Scotland that we have conveniently termed La Colombe. In this classroom, as in the school as a whole, the policy-prescribed medium of instruction is French. However, observation revealed that actual talk could be conducted in French; it could be conducted in English and it could be conducted in both French and English. From these base codes, speakers could switch to one of the other languages involved for specific functional effects. We therefore set out to explore the various possibilities in which these patterns of language choice could be accounted for. A review of the existing literature on language choice in bilingual classrooms revealed that the perspective which gets closest to accounting for
these phenomena is what we termed the ‘overall order’ perspective on bilingual classroom talk. This is the perspective whereby bilingual classroom interaction is assumed to be normatively conducted in the medium of instruction prescribed by the school language policy. From this prescribed medium of instruction, speakers would switch to other languages for functional effects. When we applied this framework to our data, it became clear that it can account only for one of the three patterns we had identified, namely those cases where French was used as the base code.

Because of this limitation, we moved out of the bilingual classroom literature to explore other possibilities, looking specifically into models of language choice in bilingual conversation at the community level. Thus the overall order model of language alternation as developed by Gafaranga offered itself as a potential alternative. Drawing on this model we adopted the notion of ‘medium of classroom interaction’ as an alternative to that of ‘medium of instruction’. This notion of medium of classroom interaction proved to be adequate for the phenomena we had identified, accounting both for normative language choices as well as deviance from them.

At this point, a so-what problem arises. Previous studies of language choice in bilingual classrooms have amply demonstrated that code-switching is a resource that participants draw on, especially in contexts where they have to struggle with difficult subject content and learn a second language at the same time (Ferguson 2009). However, as the discussion above suggests, those studies might be theoretically flawed. Particularly, the underlying assumption that bilingual classroom interaction is normatively conducted in the policy-prescribed medium of instruction might not be always justified. The question which arises is therefore whether the respecification we have proposed above undermines or else improves the view that, in bilingual classroom contexts, code-switching is a resource for participants. Based on the evidence we have provided, this respecification improves the view that code-switching is a resource in bilingual classrooms in the sense that it contributes to a better understanding of what exactly goes on in bilingual classrooms. Before code-switching is claimed to be a resource, it must be clear exactly what it consists of, exactly what is switched from. For example, one of the most cited functions of code-switching is “CS for constructing... knowledge” (Ferguson 2009, 231). In the data we have looked at, this would be the case in extracts 1, 6 and 7. Yet, as we have shown, such a view would gloss over important differences. To start with, each of the three examples represents a different pattern of language choice (a mixed mode in example 1, a parallel mode in example 7 and a monolingual medium in example 6). Secondly, in all three cases, we cannot really speak of code-switching serving the said function as, strictly speaking, no code-switching has actually occurred. As we have seen, each of the three cases represents a different version of the code. In other words, in this case, the function is actually served by the various types of normative language choice in the classroom. Given the difficulties involved in generalising from a single case study and by way of a conclusion, an invitation is extended for more investigations of language choice in bilingual classrooms along the lines we have developed in this paper.

**TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTION**

Free translations into English are given after each extract. The start of a translation is signalled by a horizontal line.

Speakers’ names have been anonymised.

Each line, rather than each turn, is numbered on the left.

**Bold** Indicates that a part of speech is in English

**Italics** Indicates that a part of speech is being practiced.

````word```` Indicates that a part of speech is being read at loud

(..) Indicates a pause shorter than a second, within turn or between turns

(1) Indicates a timed pause within or between turns

word- Indicates a turn that is being interrupted or a word not completed

/ Indicates a rising intonation

\ Indicates a falling intonation

! Follows a part of speech uttered loudly compared to its surrounding speech

= Indicates a turn being latched by another speaker
:: Indicates a part of speech being elongated
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Notes
1. Here the notion of ‘medium’ and that of ‘language’ are seen as equivalent. However see below for a different conceptualisation of the notion of ‘medium’.
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3. Studies of code-switching in complementary schools remain very scarce and the studies referred to below mostly come from mainstream classrooms.
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At the start of the school day, a child asks each pupil if they eat at the canteen. Here, Hakim is doing the register.

---00:25---

1. Miss Lo: alors les enfants c’est vrai (. ) stop
2. (. ) une seconde
3. (.2)
4. Miss Lo: là tout le monde parle (. ) chacun
5. parle avec quelqu’un (. ) mais euh par
6. exemple ça fait trois fois que Hakim
7. ((laughing)) demande à Leila si tu
8. manges à la cantine (. ) il te demande
9. si tu manges à la cantine
10. Leila: non (. ) je ne mange pas à-
11. Miss Lo: attend (. ) mais là (. ) pour qu’elle
12. puisse t’entendre (. ) il faut qu’elle
13. ne parle plus avec Talia (. )
14. alors tu demandes (. ) tu lui fais un
15. petit signe (. ) et tu lui poses ta
16. question (. ) d’accord (. ) parce que
17. si tu lui poses ta question (. )
18. Leila tu manges à la cantine
19. Leila tu manges à la cantine (. )
20. Leila elle elle entend rien du tout
21. (. ) hein (. ) est-ce que tu manges
22. Andrea: Leila! [(.) yo salemos a la (. ) a
23. la (. ) tres cuatro por ahí porque
24. vamos a:: (. ) judo
25. Leila: [non je ne mange pas
26. Miss Lo: qu’est-ce que tu dis euh (. ) Andrea†
27. Andrea: aujourd’hui euh (. ) judo
28. (. )
29. Miss Lo: aujourd’hui (. ) quoi†
30. Andrea: judo
31. ?: chambara
32. Karen: c’est chambara!
33. (. )
34. Miss Lo: donc (. ) c’est-à-dire (. ) j’ai pas
35. compris
36. Andrea: aujourd’hui c’est judo
37. Miss Lo: oui (. ) mais dis-le moi autrement
38. (. )
39. Miss Lo: aujourd’hui (. ) qui va au judo†
40. (. )
41. Miss Lo: est-ce que Adriana va au judo†
42. Researcher: moi!
43. Miss Lo: ah (. ) Hakim (. ) et moi
44. (. )
45. Miss Lo: comment tu vas dire (. ) en français
46. Andrea: euh
47. Cristina: Maya et moi
48. (. )
49. Miss Lo: oui
50. (. )
51. Andrea: je vais aller-
52. Miss Lo: on! va
53. Andrea: on va (. ) au:: judo
Children are writing the little red riding hood in their language(s) to prepare for the multilingual play they will perform in front of the rest of the school.

---01:25---

Miss Lo: très bien (.) à quelle heure

Andrea: ( )

Miss Lo: voilà

---09:45---

Miss Lo: alors (.) qui c'est qui veut expliquer

à Cristina à quoi servait ce document↑

(.)

Leila: euh

(.2)

((Leila whispering to Talia))

Karen: ouais (.) [en espagnol et anglais-

Miss Lo: [alors qu'est-ce qu'il

fallait faire avec ça↑

Leila: mais Cristina-

Karen: [moi j'ai fait ça!

Miss Lo: [chut chut chut! (.) Karen [attends

Leila: [je (.)

tu tienes que traducir (.) et:: (.)

Karen: en espagnol (.) pour demain (.) que

on va faire le théâtre

Kenji: moi j'ai fait ça!

Miss Lo: alors Kenji! (.) attendez (.) posez

vos pochettes

(.2)

Miss Lo: euh (.) Leila (.) explique à Cristina

(.2) essaye d'expliquer à Cristina à

quoi servait ce document

Leila: ça c'est pour demain (.) que on va

faire le théâtre (.) c'est pour ça

que::-

Miss Lo: et donc qu'est-ce qu'on a euh (.)

décidé (.) ensemble (.) par rapport au

théâtre↑

(.)

Leila: que:: les enfants qui parlent euh (.)

espagnol va parler en espagnol (.)

les enfants qui parlent en japonais

va parler en japonais

(.)

Miss Lo: et pourquoi on a décidé de faire ça

comme ça (.) puisque on est en clin

pour apprendre le français pourquoi

on a décidé (.) que il y a des

enfants qui vont parler en espagnol

(. et des enfants qui (vont parler

en japonais

Leila: [que

Leila: parce que c'est (.) plus rigole↑

Miss Lo: hahaha ((laughs))

Researcher: hahaha((laughs))

Leila: "je sais pas"

Miss Lo: parce que c'est plus rigolo oui

Karen: parce que c'est plus marrant

Miss Lo: ah oui (.) parce que c'était plus

expressif (.) que quand vous étiez

dans votre langue c'était beaucoup

plus vivant que quand vous étiez en

français (.) [euh::

Talia: [en espagnol

Miss Lo: oui mais c'est pas que pour ça parce

que sinon on parlerait jamais

français (.) sinon on parlerait
Leila: qu’espagnol [et ce serait beaucoup plus:: 'attends (...) un deux troisi']
Leila: 'quatre'
Miss Lo: mais parce que on va le montrer à qui ce spectacle (...) enfin ce- cette petite (...) ce théâtre Cristina: à- à le cm1 Leila: cm1!
Leila: 'attend (.) un deux trois' Miss Lo: au cm1 (...) et qu’est-ce que vous pensez que les cm1 euh (.) connaissent de l’espagnol ou du japonais?
Leila: [non] Miss Lo: est-ce qu’ils connaissent le japon- l’espagnol et le japonais ?: [non] Leila: [non]
Kenji: moi je sais de l’espagnol Miss Lo: shh
Talia: moi je [connais japonais]
Karen: [parce que-]
Miss Lo: Karen (.) toi tu penses quoi Kenji: [moi je sais d’espagnol]
Karen: [parce que je pense]
Talia: 'anata no kaban' <your bag>
Leila: 'konichua' <hello>
Miss Lo: chut! (...) Talia!
Karen: [euh!: (...) que (.)) eux Kenji: ['hola']
Talia: 'arigato watashi' <thank you I>
Karen: apprendre [l’anglais Kenji: ['arigato' <thank you>]
Miss Lo: ah! (...) attendez écoutez Karen (.) elle a une idée [sur la question qui est intéressante Class: (((laughs)))
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: je pense que eux (...) ils apprendre
Kenji: ['arigato']
Class: [hahaha ((laughs))]
Miss Lo: tu crois (...) qu’ils apprennent! (.1) qu’ils apprennent
Karen: qu’ils apprennent (...) l’anglais Leila: cm1 apprend anglais
Miss Lo: d’accord (.1) les cm1 apprennent l’anglais (...) donc Karen dit oui moi je pense qu’ils connaissent notre langue puisqu’ils apprennent l’anglais (...) parce que ta langue Karen c’est ↑
Karen: ‘anglais’ Miss Lo: c’est l’anglais (...)
Miss Lo: donc pour toi [...] oui (...)
Leila: [([)] Miss Lo: les cm1 connaissent l’anglais (...) mais est-ce qu’ils apprennent l’espagnol ou le japonais?
?: [non] Talia: [non] Miss Lo: les cm1 connaissent l’anglais (...) mais est-ce qu’ils apprennent l’espagnol ou le japonais?
?: [non] Talia: le japonais (((laughs)))
Miss Lo: et pourquoi ils pourraient pas apprendre l'espagnol ou le japonais
Leila: parce que-
Karen: [parce que euh::]
Miss Lo: hein?
Leila: c'est trop difficile
Miss Lo: Kenji tu penses quoi
(·)
Miss Lo: [parce que ils ne pourraient pas apprendre le japonais]
Talia: non l'espagnol c'est facile
Miss Lo: Kenji: parce que (.euh:.)[japon est petit]
Talia: [because-]
Leila: c'est trop difficile
Miss Lo: Kenji tu penses quoi
(·)
Miss Lo: [parce que ils ne pourraient pas apprendre le japonais]
Talia: [because-]
Leila: iceni leshe [dicen leshe este chico [( · )] euh euh]
Kenji: et donc (.euh:)
Talia: hihiihi [(laughing)] (.euh: [cuidado que este chico [( · )]])
Leila: [haha ((laughs))]
Kenji: oui c'est intéressant (.euh: et donc]
Miss Lo: non mais (.euh:) non mais c'est pas (.euh:)
Miss Lo: Kenji: et donc (.euh:)
Leila: hicrihrih [(laughing)] (.euh:)
Miss Lo: donc il y a beaucoup de gens qui parlent japonais]
Miss Lo: Kenji: non
Leila: hihiihi [(laughing)]
Miss Lo: non! (.euh: il n'y a?:)
Kenji: il n'y a pas de homme
Leila: hihiihi [(laughing)]
Miss Lo: il n'y a pas- chut! (.euh:) Leila
Leila: [pardon]
Miss Lo: Kenji: [il n'y a pas de:: (.euh:)]
Talia: [il n'y a pas de personne]
Miss Lo: il n'y a pas beaucoup (.euh:)] de gens (.euh:)
Talia: [il y a beaucoup de personne]
Talia: [il y a beaucoup de personne]
Talia: [il y a beaucoup de personne]
Leila: non (.euh:)
Talia: [il y a beaucoup de personne]
Cristina: [il y a beaucoup de personne]
Kenji: oui
Miss Lo: donc tu penses que c'est pour ça (.euh:)
Kenji: [qu'on apprend pas le japonais (.euh:)]
Miss Lo: Kenji: 'oui'
Miss Lo: [en France]
Leila: dicen leshe no leche
Miss Lo: ah oui parce qu'il n'y pas beaucoup de-
Leila: [japonais]
Talia: [non (.euh:)] ouii: il y a beaucoup ici (.euh:)
de japonais
Cristina: mais non! (.euh:) il n'y a pas de japonais:
Talia: [il y a beaucoup de personne]
Cristina: no hay nadie aqui
Talia: [il y a beaucoup de gens qui apprennent le japonais]
Cristina: mais oui mais il y a une autre école
qui (. ) est japonaise

(.2)

Karen: [jacotaise]

Miss Lo: [donc c'est- (. ) c'est- hhh

(luaughing)}

Cristina: notre école

Kenji: moi moi (. ) travailler (. ) english

Miss Lo: [donc (. )

voilà une question intéressante (. )

et alors l'espagnol (.) qu'est-ce qu'il en est de l'espagnol parce que pour le coup l'espagnol ya beaucoup de gens qui parlent espagnol

(.2)

Karen: ( . )

Leila: mais c'est (. ) un peu difficile pour les français ( . ) l'espagnol

Miss Lo: ah d'accord (. ) donc c'est pour ça qu'on apprend pas l'espagnol

Leila: j'ai écouté comment (. . ) chantent en espagnol

Talia: hahaha (. ) oui: {laughing})

Leila: et elle dit (. . ) leshe

Talia: leshe (. ) chocolate

(.1)

Leila: et c'est [ ( . ) leche

Cristina: [oui c'est-

Cristina: oui (. ) moi aussi ça fait ça

Kenji: café

Talia: toi aussi tu dis leshe

Kenji: café aussi

Miss Lo: alors euh (. ) chut! (. . ) oui je vois (. . ) Leila tu parles de quoi là exactement c'est-à-dire que vous avez chanté en espagnol?

Leila: oui

Miss Lo: avec qui?

Leila: [avec cm1

Talia: [moi avec (. ) monsieur Parizi

Miss Lo: avec les cm1

Leila: oui

Miss Lo: d'accord (. ) et vous avez chanté la chanson qui s'appelle?

(.)

Cristina: café

Leila: [café

Talia: [café

Kenji: café

Cristina: moi aussi

(.2)

Miss Lo: et (. ) donc (.2) et donc vous l'avez chanté avec les enfants de la classe ou (. . ) bien vous l'avez chanté d'abord vous tout seul et puis les enfants ont- ont (. . ) essayé d'écouter ce que vous chantiez

Leila: non parce que (. . ) je suis tout seule

(.)

Miss Lo: d'accord

Leila: parce que Talia a (. . ) chanté avec monsieur Parizi

Miss Lo: d'accord

Leila: et moi avec euh (. . ) madame Verrier

Miss Lo: mais vous avez chanté (. . ) ce que je veux dire c'est vous avez chanté tous ensemble avec les enfants de la classe ou bien vous (. . ) on vous a fait chanter tout seul

(.)}
Leila: non (.) tous les enfants
Miss Lo: d'accord mais on vous a pas fait chanter tout seul pour que les enfants écoutent (.) non d'accord (.) parce que moi j'avais dit aux maîtres de ces classes (.) que peut-être vous pourriez chanter tout seul (.) pour que les enfants écoutent un peu (.) comment vous prononcez (.) d'accord (.) 

Talia: [on chante à douze

Miss Lo: [et donc toi tu dis que les enfants ne chantaient pas]

Leila: bien ((laughing))

Miss Lo: pas bien
Leila: non (.)

Miss Lo: c'est-à-dire (.) c'est l'accent qui était pas bien ou c'était- qu'est-ce qui [était pas bien]

Cristina: [parce que-

Talia: l'accent

Miss Lo: chut

Cristina: parce que les enfants y dit (.) aorr-

( . ) [ ] ahora et elle dit arr-

ahorra ((children laughing))

Miss Lo: d'accord (.) et:: ( . ) par contre le disque alors ( . ) était correct quand même ce qui était sur le disque Leila: oui: ( . ) le disque ou[i

Talia: [oui

Miss Lo: d'accord ( . ) et est-ce que était exactement comme vous:: [ ( . ) au mexique

?= ['halo ( . )

Leila: how are you ( . ) i'm fine thank you'

Talia: non

Miss Lo: c'était la même chose ( . ) le même es-

enfin ( . ) c'était la même euh ( . ) le même accent que pour vous?

Leila: non ( . ) pour [moi

Talia: [non

Miss Lo: ah

Talia: c'est difficile parce que vosotros

( . ) [je sais pas

Leila: [parce que c'est ( . ) le disque c'est en espagnol ( . ) mais d'Espagne

Leila: ( . )

Miss Lo: d'accord

Leila: c'est pas la m-

Miss Lo: c'est pas l'espagnol d'Espagne

Leila: d'accord ( . ) et donc

Miss Lo: qu'est-ce qui n'est pas pareil?

( . )

Leila: le ( . ) mm ( . )

Talia: le accent

Leila: [l'accent

Miss Lo: [l'accent

Cristina: [l'accent

( . )

Miss Lo: et c'est difficile pour vous de prendre cet accent?

Leila: non

Talia: oui ( . ) pour moi un peu

Miss Lo: oui ( . ) ou bien vous avez chanté comme vous- ( . ) avec euh- ( . ) comme
vous chantez en Argentine au Mexique

Leila: oui

Talia: oui

Miss Lo: oui (.) très bien (.) euh (.) on a pas parlé de ça mais on va faire (.)
on va participé à une chorale (.)
vous savez ce que c'est qu'une chorale

Talia: [oui

Miss Lo: qui sait qu'est-ce que c'est qu'une chorale

Leila: oh oh (.) hallo'

Miss Lo: devant devant (.) et puis (.)

Talia: [non

?: [non

Leila: estaloco ((talking to Talia))

Miss Lo: devant devant (.)

Cristina: derrière

Miss Lo: hahaha ((laughing)) non (.) pas derrière

((children laughing))

Cristina: chanter à coté

Miss Lo: non (.) est-ce que vous chantez tout seul devant les enfants

Karen: non

Cristina: non (.) chante ensemble

Miss Lo: voilà

Leila: [tout la classe

Miss Lo: [vous chantez ensemble (.) vous chantez à (.) avec des enfants des autres classes

Cristina: [avec-

Miss Lo: la même chanson (.) donc tout le monde- (.) elle s'appelle comment cette chanson?

Talia: [café

Leila: [café

Miss Lo: café

Kenji: café

Miss Lo: café (.) ou café?

Talia: [café

Cristina: [café

Leila: [café

Miss Lo: café ou café (.) moi je- je

Cristina: café

Leila: café

Miss Lo: café (.) comme ça vous dites en espagnol (.) moi je parle pas espagnol

Kenji: café

Miss Lo: café (.) d'accord (.) et donc on va tous chanter la chanson café

Miss Lo: donc Amkouel (.) Samba (.) euh (.) Kenji (.) on va tous apprendre (.) la chanson en espagnol

Leila: [Kenji a apprendre l'espagnol

Talia: [Kenji est très bien

Leila: [Kenji parle bien l'espagnol

Kenji: [non moi je ne sais pas

Miss Lo: [ah (.) Kenji parle bien l'espagnol

Talia: euh (.) aussi (.) Karen

Miss Lo: Karen aussi parle espagnol

Talia: hola amigos!

Leila: [ha ha (.) digo ( .)

Miss Lo: oui Karen tu veux dire quelque chose
Karen: euh (.1) parce que je (.) [elle dit]
que ça c’est tout petit
Cristina: [elle dit]
oui (.) mais pourquoi j’ai fait ce
tableau?
Miss Lo: j’ai fait ce tableau pour que (.3) mm
puisque (.2) dans- quand on va
faire la pièce (.) on va faire le
petit chaperon rouge en espagnol (.1)
tous les enfants ne vont pas parler
en espagnol (.4) d’accord’ (.1) ya- ya
peut-être le chaperon rouge il va
parler en espagnol et le loup il va
parler en japonais (.)
((children laughing))
Miss Lo: et donc il faut bien que vous sachiez
(.2) il faut bien que vous sachiez à
quel moment (.4) le loup demande (.2)
( .) où vas-tu (.) puisque vous parlez-
Leila: maîtresse!
Leila: ça je comprends pas bien les lettres
et j’ai fait ça
Kenji: c’est quoi!
Miss Lo: voilà (.1) donc chacun (.2) voilà (.2)
donc (.2) Kenji (.2) donc en fait (.4)
Karen tu avais bien fait ce qu’il
fallait faire(.) c’est-à-dire que tu
as traduit (.1) tu as traduit en
anglais (.1) le texte et que- quand
Kenji (.2) par exemple en japonais va
temander où vas-tu petit chaperon
rouge
Leila: et tu comprends pas
Miss Lo: tu vas pas comprendre mais toi tu vas
savoir que (.2) ça veut dire ça (.4)
parce que (.4) chut (.2) parce que les
phrases elles sont toujours dans le
même ordre dans toutes les langues
(.1) tu comprends?
Leila: c’est pour savoir si tu parles en
polonais (.2) c’est pour savoir que-
(.4) que tu dis (.3) mais c’est pas
pour dire la même chose que dans le
papier (.2) c’est pour [savoir-
Cristina: [elle- (.2) c’est pas euh (.1) comme tu
dis en anglais euh ( .) et tu dis en
espagnol
Talia: where did you go:†
Kenji: what did you do:
Cristina: et tu dis (.2) ou tu dis (.2) entre en
espagnol (.1) et tu dis en anglais
Miss Lo: voilà (.4) voilà (.4) Cristina elle a
bien expliqué (.1) lui elle va- (.2)
elle va te dire ‘entre’ en espagnol
et toi tu vas répondre (.1) [oui en
anglais
Cristina: [si elle
dit toc toc en espagnol (.2) et toi tu
comprends pas (.2) tu dis (.2) yes
Miss Lo: t’as pas besoin de comprendre ce
qu’on te [dit
Cristina: [tu vois]
Miss Lo: tu comprends†
(.1)
Miss Lo: est-ce que c’est plus facile si on le
fait tout en français†
Leila: non
Cristina: non!
Leila: c’est plus facile en espagnol [en jap- (.)
Cristina: [en espagnol
Leila: c’est plus joli
Miss Lo: ah plus joli d’accord (.) [mais plus facile
Leila: [et- (.)
Miss Lo: oui aussi
Miss Lo: alors c’est plus facile que si Kenji il te répond en jap- et si il te répond en japonais c’est plus facile que si il te répond en français
Kenji: non
Leila: oui:
Talia: oui
Cristina: oui c’est mieux
Leila: en français
Miss Lo: oui:
Miss Lo: vous comprenez pas le français
Leila: non:
Miss Lo: ah d’accord
{Talia laughing) Miss Lo: j’avais pas- (.) j’avais pas vu (.) je ne m’étais pas rendu compte que vous ne compreniez plus du tout le français
Talia: je sais parler le japonais
Kenji: très difficile le japonais
Miss Lo: euh (.)
Talia: "konichiwa" <hello>
Leila: [konichiwa <hello>
Miss Lo: [est-ce que tout le monde euh (.) Leila par contre (.) pour expliquer aux enfants (.) comment dire (.) les enfants (.) [de cm1 Miss Lo: [pour expliquer aux enfants de cm1 (.) ce qu’on veut vraiment faire (.) il faudra qu’on le joue une fois en français (.) qu’ils l’entendent une fois en français et après on dira (.) hop! (.) comme s’il y avait un coup de baguette magique (.) vous savez ce que c’est qu’un coup de baguette magique (19: 20)
Kenji: [baguette magique
?: [non
?: oui
Kenji: c’est quoi (.)
Cristina: [.
Leila: un corte de: (.) magico
Miss Lo: un coup! de baguette magique (.)
Kenji: baguette magique
Miss Lo: qui est-ce qui donne un coup de baguette magique normalement (.)
Kenji: [Karen
Cristina: [les enfants
Karen: les (.) enfants!
Miss Lo: non (.) dans une histoire qui est-ce qui donne un coup [de baguette
Kenji: [baguette magique
Karen: [heu [heu
Leila: je sais pas
Miss Lo: c’est le loup qui donne un coup de
1222. baguette magique
1223. Cristina: [non la maîtresse
1224. Kenji: [je sais pas
1225. Miss Lo: la maîtresse qui donne un coup de
1226. baguette magique (. ) magique! (. )
1227. j'ai pas dis un coup de baguette
1228. Karen: le chasseur!
1229. (. )
1230. Miss Lo: non (. ) vous avez pas compris
1231. Leila: la maman (. )
1232. (. )
1233. Miss Lo: est-ce que (. ) regardez (. ) je vais vous dessiner une baguette magique
1234. ((goes to the balckboard and draws))
1235. Kenji: son [père
1236. Miss Lo: la maîtresse qui donne un coup de
1237. Cristina: [le petit chaperon rouge
1238. (. )
1239. Kenji: son mère (. )
1240. Miss Lo: non (. ) c'est pas dans l'histoire du Petit chaperon rouge
1241. Cristina: le loup (. )
1242. Kenji: son père
1243. Cristina: [le petit chaperon rouge
1244. ((goes to the balckboard and draws))
1245. Miss Lo: [comme ça
1246. (. )
1247. (. )
1248. (. )
1249. Talia: non (. ) ça pourrait (. ) [euh (. )
1250. Kenji: son père
1251. Cristina: le loup (. )
1252. Kenji: [le petit chaperon rouge
1253. (. )
1254. Miss Lo: c'est (. )
1255. Leila: [hada! <fairy>
1256. Talia: [cinderella!
1257. Leila: c'est [quoi (. )
1258. Karen: [cendrillon
1259. (. )
1260. Miss Lo: ouais (. ) [dans cendrillon ya ça
1261. Leila: [el hada madrina <the fairy god mother>
1262. Miss Lo: donc qui [est-ce qui fait ça (. )
1263. Miss Lo: qu'est-ce qui [donne ça (. )
1264. Cristina: [la marraine
1265. Miss Lo: la marraine et la marraine c'est une (. )
1266. Miss Lo: [la marraine
1267. Miss Lo: tu sais la-
1268. Leila: [espagnol (. ) fe <faith>
1269. Cristina: fe
1270. Leila: [no Talia (. ) que es un fe (. )
1271. Talia: la fée (. ) tienes fe! en mi
1272. Leila: pero me parece que no están hablando de eso
1273. Miss Lo: celle-la là ((showing a picture of a fairy in a book))
1274. Kenji: c'est quoi fée (. )
1275. Miss Lo: la gentille fée (. ) ça vous dit rien (. )
1276. Miss Lo: [la gentille fée (. )
1277. (.
1278. (. )
1279. Miss Lo: tu sais la-
1280. Leila: en espagnol (. ) fe <faith>
1281. Cristina: fe
1282. Leila: no: Talia (. ) que es un fe (. )
1283. Talia: la fée (. ) tienes fe! en mi
1284. Leila: pero me parece que no están hablando de eso
1285. Miss Lo: celle-la là ((showing a picture of a fairy in a book))
1286. Kenji: c'est quoi fée (.)
1287. Miss Lo: [la gentille fée (. )
1288. Miss Lo: [la gentille fée (. ) ça vous dit rien (. )
1289. Miss Lo: [la gentille fée (. )
1290. (. )
Kenji: [c’est quoi
Miss Lo: [ça
1293. (.)
1294. Miss Lo: la fée qui change dans les histoires
1295. que ya- que ya
1296. Talia: ah: (.) [la hada madrina <the god
mother fairy>
1297. Miss Lo: [ya un crapaud et elle fait
1298. ça et-
1299. Leila: una hada madrina: (.) oui
1300. Kenji: ah
1301. Miss Lo: d’accord↑
1302. Kenji: ça c’est japon-
1303. Karen: madri-na
1304. Talia: en espagnol c’est hada madrina
1305. (.)
1306. .
1307. Karen: en anglais fairy
1308. Miss Lo: alors samba ça (.) tu as déjà entendu
1309. de parler de choses comme ça
1310. (.)
1311. Miss Lo: vous dites comment en espagnol↑
1312. Talia: hada madrina
1313. Leila: hada madrina
1314. Miss Lo: d’accord
1315. Kenji: /læpædoni/<children laughing>)
1316. (.)
1317. Miss Lo: chut (. et Kenji en japonais ya ça
1318. aussi!
1319. (.2)
1320. Kenji: non
1321. (.)
1322. Miss Lo: est-ce qu’il y a des histoires avec
1323. des fées comme ça (.) qui font (.)
1324. ding! (. et puis (.)) ça- il y a
1325. quelque chose qui—
1326. Leila: comme la cenicienta! <cinderella>
1327. ?: ( )
1328. Talia: asi no se dicen
1329. Leila: como se dicen?
1330. Talia: no se (.) [que en ingles se dice
1331. cinderella
1332. Miss Lo: [c’est quelqu’un qui a des
1333. pouvoirs magiques [et qui fait (.) ting!
1334. (.)) comme ça sur ta tête et hop tu
1335. deviens autre chose
1336. Leila: [la solution
1337. Miss Lo: ou bien je fais hop! (.) et la classe
1338. ça devient—
1339. Karen: ( )
1340. Leila: ah! que me haga hop! y tenga mucha
1341. ropa ropa sada (. t) ing! <she does
1342. hop! to me and I have lots of
1343. clothes>
1344. Miss Lo: une↑
1345. Karen: une (.) [euh:: (.)) palace
1346. Leila: [yo te juro si pido un deseo
1347. (.)) pido ropa <I tell you that if I
1348. had a wish (.)) I would ask for some
1349. clothes>
1350. Miss Lo: un palace voilà (.)) un (.)) ch— (.)) un
1351. [château;
1352. Talia: [yo (.)) dinero ((laughing)) <me, I
1353. would ask for some money>
1354. Leila: no yo (.)) porque yo me le logasto con
1355. cosas tantas entonces quiero ropa
1356. <not me (.)) because I waiste Money
1357. with silla things so I world prefer
1358. getting some clothes>
1359. Miss Lo: est-ce que ça ya ça au japon↑
1360. (.)
1361. Kenji: oui
Miss Lo: ya ça dans les histoires au japon
Kenji: oui
Miss Lo: et alors au sénégal ya pas ça et euh est-ce que ça existe
Kenji: peter pan
Karen: euh non
Miss Lo: tu penses quoi
Leila: ça existe pas
Miss Lo: non ça c'est dans les livres pour euh avec dans les livres de contes ça n'existe pas hein (.2)
d'accord très bien

Telling the story of Little Riding Hood.

Miss Lo: Kenji
Miss Lo: est-ce que tu arriverais puisqu'on va terminer sur l'histoire du petit chaperon rouge aujourd'hui et un petit peu demain est-ce que tu arriverais à me raconter l'histoire du petit chaperon rouge
Kenji: euh
Cristina: maîtresse! moi je sais
Kenji: euh:
Cristina: (une fois)
Miss Lo: (non c'est Kenji c'est)
Kenji: (oui)
Miss Lo: ah non pas en japonais parce que je ne vais pas trop comprendre

Miss Lo: Kenji: euh
Kenji: ah
Miss Lo: mais en français
Kenji: oui et-
Talia: après en japonais
Miss Lo: attend juste une question que je t'ai pas posée est-ce que cette histoire existe en japonais
Kenji: (oui)
Miss Lo: oui (.) tu connais cette histoire [euh]
Kenji: [oui]
Cristina: [en japonais]
Miss Lo: d'accord
Miss Lo: et (.) comment le petit chaperon rouge il s'appelle comment en japonais
Talia: [ouh::]
Kenji: aka zukin chan <le petit chaperon rouge>
Talia: aka /sukin/ chan <le petit chaperon rouge>
Miss Lo: tu peux [l'écrire au tableau]
Talia: [aka zukin chan <le petit chaperon rouge>]
Talia: ouh::
Leila: aka /sukin/ chan <le petit chaperon rouge> (.) 
todas son raras las palabras del japonés (.)
Leila: konichua <hello> (.)
Talia: anatano kaban <your bag> (.)
Leila: mochila (.)
Talia: digo atashi (.) yo
Leila: konichua <hello> (.)
Leila: nos están grabando (24:33) (.)
Talia: atashi (.)
Leila: konichua <hello> (.)
Talia: anatano kaban <your bag> (.)
Leila: mochila (.)
Talia: c'est (.) qué horrible (.)
Leila: chaperon rouge>
Talia: diigo atashi (.) yo
Leila: konichua <hello> (.)
Talia: anatano kaban <your bag> (.)
Leila: mochila (.)
Talia: digo atashi (.) yo
Leila: konichua <hello> (.)
Talia: anatano kaban <your bag> (.)
Leila: mochila (.)
Talia: c'est (.)
Leila: konichua <hello> (.)
Talia: anatano kaban <your bag> (.)
Leila: mochila (.)
Talia: c'est (.)
Leila: konichua <hello> (.)
Talia: anatano kaban <your bag> (.)
Leila: mochila (.)
Talia: c'est (.)
Leila: konichua <hello> (.)
Talia: anatano kaban <your bag> (.)
Leila: mochila (.)
Talia: c'est (.)
Leila: konichua <hello> (.)
Talia: anatano kaban <your bag> (.)
Leila: mochila (.)
Talia: c'est (.)
Leila: konichua <hello> (.)
Talia: anatano kaban <your bag> (.)
Leila: mochila (.)
Talia: c'est (.)
Talia: [aka zukin chan]

Kenji: oui

Miss Lo: et à la fin ( . ) est-ce que le- ( . ) le loup mange la grand-mère et le petit

162. Miss Lo: le chasseur tue le loup ( . ) puisqu’on a vu qu’ya-

163. (.)

164. Miss Lo: est-ce que dans le conte que tu connais au japon (. ) le chasse- le loup mange la grand-mère et le petit

165. Kenji: non

166. Miss Lo: ah non

167. Kenji: la grand-mère chaperon rouge mange et après (. ) chasseur euh

168. (.)

169. Miss Lo: ah oui (. ) le loup mange le petit chaperon rouge

170. Leila: [Talia (. ) el el cuento en español está el cazador†(25:59) <in the Spanish version of the store, is there a hunter†>]

171. Miss Lo: est-ce que dans le conte que tu connais au japon (. ) le chass- le loup mange la grand-mère et le petit

172. Cristina: de loup

173. Miss Lo: du loup

174. Kenji: euh (. ) mang- [ (. ) euh ventre

175. Miss Lo: ouvre le ventre (. ) de (. )

176. Talia: no (. ) solamente el final <no (. ) only at the end>

177. Miss Lo: et après le chasseur

178. Leila: yo nunca lo vi

179. (.)

180. Kenji: euh (. ) mang- [ (. ) euh ventre

181. Miss Lo: ouvre le ventre (. ) de (. )

182. Talia: no (. ) solamente el final <no (. ) only at the end>

183. Cristina: et après la grand-mère (( ) ah:

184. Kenji: [et après (. )

185. Miss Lo: je ne sais pas

186. (.)

187. Miss Lo: oui après ils sortent (. ) et après ça se passe très [bien

188. Cristina: [maîtresse

189. Miss Lo: alors! (. ) Kenji (. ) est-ce que tu pourrais essayer de raconter l’histoire là

190. Cristina: en japonais parce que

191. Miss Lo: de quoi ça parle

192. Kenji: en japon?

193. Miss Lo: en français! en français! puisque tu la connais en plus en japonais

194. Kenji: mm=

195. Miss Lo: =rapidement

196. (.)

197. Kenji: [euh

198. Miss Lo: [donc ça parle de quoi cette histoire (. ) parce que ya florence qui est la (. ) et: (. ) on n’a pas fait l’histoire ensemble (. ) je pense qu’elle connaît cette histoire mais peut être qu’elle a oublié (. ) parce que-

199. Cristina: un petit peu=

200. Miss Lo: "un petit peu (. ) parce que c’est quand elle était enfant à l’école (. ) qu’elle a fait [cette histoire [la grand-mère [']

201. --26:43--
Miss Lo: il n'y a pas de DVD (_) avec
l'histoire du petit chaperon rouge
moi le DVD qu'on va voir demain
(...) c'est (_) une histoire (_)
qui: (_) est (_) qui ressemble à
l'histoire du petit chaperon rouge
Karen: [c'est marrant
 (...) c'est marrant (_) c'est pas une
histoire (_) c'est pas la vraie
histoire du petit [chaperon rouge
d'accord]\[Karen: [c'est marrant
(...) ça n'existe pas
La petite (.) qui: (_)
Karen: [mais (_) mais maman aussi
elle a cherché sur internet (_) mais
quand elle a allé pour chercher le
DVD (_) elle a rien trouvé
Miss Lo: voilà parce que ça (_) ça n'existe pas
très connue (_) mais ça n'existe pas
très bien (_) euh: (_) donc
Leila: et puis notre euh: (_)
Miss Lo: [donc elle a raison ta mère
(...) ça n'existe pas
Miss Lo: [moi aussi j'ai cherché
Karen: [its funny
Miss Lo: j'ai beau coup cherché
Cristina: _, mais (_), mais maman aussi
Karen: [c'est mar[rant
Miss Lo: [donc elle a raison ta mère
(...) ça n'existe pas
Miss Lo: [moi aussi j'ai cherché
Karen: [non
Cristina: _, mais (_), mais maman aussi
Miss Lo: [c'est marrant
Karen: [c'est marrant
Miss Lo: [donc elle a raison ta mère
(...) ça n'existe pas
Karen: [its funny
Leila: _
Karen: [non
Leila: _
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Leila: _
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
Karen: oui\]
Miss Lo: oui
K
65. Leila: dans l’é- (%) dans école on ne
66. rencontre pas (%) le petit chaperon
67. rouge
68. Miss Lo: [
69. ? : [oui
70. Leila: je sais pas comment je le sais
71. (.)
72. Talia: [ma maman-
73. Miss Lo: [mais est-ce que vous racontez
74. d’autres histo- (%) vous travaillez
75. avec d’autres histoires en- à l’école
76. Talia: [je crois
77. Leila: [oui
78. Cristina: [
79. Miss Lo: oui (%) et est-ce que vous
80. travaillez avec des contes (%)
81. argentins mexicains tout ça ou pas
82. (.)
83. Leila: mm
84. Miss Lo: il y a des contes argentins des
85. contes mexicains?
86. Leila: oui
87. (.)
88. Miss Lo: oui
89. Talia: leyendas
90. (.)
91. Talia: como dicen
92. (.)
93. Leila: euh (.) légende
94. (.)
95. Miss Lo: des légendes (%) et y en a (%) et y
96. a des livres pour les enfants: avec
97. ces légendes qui sont:: euh (.)
98. racontées?
99. Leila: oui
100. Miss Lo: oui (%) et est-ce que vous faites ça
101. à l’école?
102. (.)
103. Talia: je ne ( )
104. Leila: hehehe ((laughing))
105. (.)
106. Leila: non
107. Cristina: [oui
108. Miss Lo: [non (%) vous faites jam- (%) vous
109. travaillez jamais avec une histoire à
110. l’école comme ça?
111. (.)
112. Talia: je crois
113. Leila: euh (.) oui
114. Cristina: oui
115. Leila: mais [pas tout le temps
116. Cristina: [oui Talia
117. Miss Lo: d’accord (%) pas beaucoup
118. Talia: pas beaucoup (%) c’est-
119. Miss Lo: d’accord (%) pas beaucoup
120. (.)
121. Miss Lo: c’est les petits ou les grands qui
122. travaillent avec ça=
123. Cristina: =petits
124. Leila: petits
125. Talia: c’est les petits
126. Miss Lo: d’accord (%) ok (%) très bien (%) euh
127. (%) Karen toi le petit chaperon rouge
128. aux Etats-Unis vous travaillez avec
129. (%) vous travaillez dessus?
130. Karen: oui
131. Miss Lo: oui
132. Karen: non mais euh (%) il y a juste la- (.)
133. le livre
134. Miss Lo: il y a juste le livre que vous lisez (.)
Karen: y a pas le DVD

Karen: nous on (.2) on travaille pas (.2) pas sur le petit chaperon rouge est-ce que vous travaillez sur d’autres histoires?

Karen: euh (.3) je sais pas

Miss Lo: est-ce que vous travaillez sur d’autres histoires

Karen: est-ce que vous travaillez sur d’autres histoires

Miss Lo: d’accord (.2) alors ce qu’on va faire pour la- la- (.2) tout de suite (.2) je vais vous donner un petit travail écrit (.2) d’accord (.2) donc euh-

Cristina: maîtresse on va regarder le petit chaperon rouge

Miss Lo: ((laughing)) Cristina (.2)

Leila: (38:55) (vamonos) a estudiar

Miss Lo: je crois que: (.2) c’est la dernière fois que je le dis aujourd’hui

Cristina: oui:

Miss Lo: je ferai l’annonce toute à l’heure (.2) demain (.3) qui c’est qui peut redire à Cristina le programme de demain (.2) demain [vendredi

Cristina: (demain

(38:55) (vamonos) a estudiar

Miss Lo: ce sera toi qui par- le – ra yeah:

Leila: tu commences euh (.2) Leila tu commences (.2) et Karen va continuer

Leila: demain [matin

Leila: [maîtresse on va faire-

Miss Lo: attends! (.2) alors demain matin

Leila: demain matin (.2) on va regarder le petit chaperon rouge (.2) on va faire un pic nique et on va (.2) faire le théâtre du petit chaperon rouge

Talia: et on va [voir le film

Miss Lo: [demain après-midi en fait

Leila: [après-midi

Cristina: [et le film aussi

Cristina: [demain

(38:55) (vamonos) a estudiar

Leila: oui (.2)

Cristina: ah (.2)

Miss Lo: demain après-midi (.2) nous allons goûter avec la classe de CM1 b donc il faut que vous apportiez (.2) quelque [chose à manger [’salsichas’ (.2) ah!

Miss Lo: mais pas trop hein (.2) parce qu’en général vous apportez beaucoup trop (.2) [juste un jus ou quelque chose à manger

Cristina: maîtresse en français ou en espagnol

Miss Lo: [maîtresse en français ou en espagnol

Leila: (un paquet de gâteau (.2) et

Miss Lo: ensuite (.2) pardon [maîtresse (.2) pic nique en français ou en espagnol

Cristina: c’est un (.2) pic nique français ou espagnol
((children laughing))

Miss Lo: tu veux dire la nourriture que vous apportez?

Cristina: oui

Miss Lo: et ben comme tu veux. Cristina si ça te fait plaisir d’amener des biscuits euh, colombiens tu en amènes.

Miss Lo: si tu en as.

Maya: (oui) (40:06)

Miss Lo: je sais pas si il faut amener des tortillas je suis pas sure, mais (.) ou des empanadas.

Karen: maîtresse!

Leila: mmm (laughing)

Miss Lo: c’est ça?

Talia: maman hier, elle a fait des empanadas.

Leila: et donc les mexicains a copié de los argentinos.

Karen: maîtresse!

Leila: non (laughing)

Miss Lo: et ça à l’air de créer du conflit.

Karen: maîtresse!

Leila: mmm (laughing)

Karen: on va écouter le (.) cassette.

Miss Lo: Karen a apporté la cassette du petit chaperon rouge.

Talia: en anglais (laughing)

Talia: quand on va-

Karen: (oui)

Miss Lo: Karen a apporté la cassette du petit chaperon rouge.

Cristina: et maîtresse

?: [( )]

Leila: quand on va-

Talia: in English?

Talia: (oui)

Leila: euh (.) aller là-bas pour (.) faire le ticket.

Miss Lo: cet après-midi

Talia: oui

Miss Lo: pour vous entraîner d’accord?

(.2)

Miss Lo: alors là tout de suite

Cristina: ( )

(.

Miss Lo: chut chut chut chut (.) je distribue un petit travail.

--41:03--
**T2 S1 D1 V1 E5:**

Children are working individually.

---44:25---

1. Talia: maîtresse on écrit en-dessous↑
2. (.)
3. Miss Lo: qu’est-ce qui est marqué↑
4. (.2)
5. Miss Lo: à la fin de la consigne (.) Talia
6. qu’est-ce qui est marqué à la fin de
7. la consigne↑
8. Leila: no tenemos que escribirlo acá
9. Talia (.5) tenemos que (.3) que escribirlo acá < we don't have to write it here>
10. Talia (.3) we have to write it there>
11. (.2)
12. Talia: ah!
13. (.8)
14. Miss Lo: alors le niveau euh (.) le niveau de-
15. (.) Samba Karen et Cristina vous devez faire quoi↑

---44:44---

**T2 S1 D1 V1 E6:**

Miss Lo is explaining the exercise to the second group. Microphone is close to Leila and Talia.

---45:40---

1. Miss Lo: à l’intérieur de ce texte il y a des
2. phrases (.3) d’accord (.3) des phrases
3. qui- [qui n'ont rien à voir
4. Talia: como se escribe panier
5. Miss Lo: avec l’histoire [.) il y a des
6. pièges (.3) d’accord↑
7. Leila: panier
8. Miss Lo: il y a des intrus
9. (.1)
10. Leila: p- a- n- i- e- r- (.3) panier
11. Miss Lo: vous savez ce que c’est des intrus↑
12. (.)
13. Cristina: quand l’histoire de la maman ( )
14. Miss Lo: ben des intrus c’est comme quelqu’un
15. qui s’est mis à la place (.3)à une
16. place ou il doit pas être (.3) par
17. exemple (.3) [si- si-
18. Cristina: le loup [il-
19. Leila: maîtresse!]
20. Miss Lo: [si on vous par- attendez (.3) si on
21. vous parle dans le texte d'un; (.3)
22. [d’une petite fille:
23. Cristina: [d’un petit chaperon rouge
24. Miss Lo: d’un petit garçon (.3) est-ce que
25. dans l’histoire du petit chaperon
26. rouge il y a un petit garçon
27. Cristina: non
28. Miss Lo: donc ça c’est ((Miss Lo keeps talking))
29. Leila: comme se escribe donne
30. Talia: mm↑
31. Leila: como se escribe donne
32. (.2)
33. Talia: den↑
34. Leila: si
35. Talia: al dento↑
36. Leila: no (.3) me donne
37. (.)
38. Talia: donner
Leila: [dear
Talia: donner
Leila: si
Talia: mm

T2 S1 D1 V1 E7:

Leila: maître[esse
Talia: [maîtresse
Miss Lo: oui
Leila: forette
Talia: mm
Miss Lo: non mais ça vous allez vous chercher
Talia: trouvé, eh, comment ça peut
Miss Lo: s'écrire si vous ne savez pas l'écrire
Talia: c'est bien comme ça, déjà fo:-
Miss Lo: et et puis après on va vérifier si
Talia: ça peut s'écrire si vous ne savez pas l'écrire
Leila: [le loup (.) est
Miss Lo: il est (.) ça là ((pointing to the picture))
Leila: ça ((miming hiding behind her hands))
Miss Lo: escondido (.) pero como se dice
Leila: ça ((pointing back to the picture again))
Miss Lo: c'est quoi-
Leila: [je sais en espagnol mais je sais pas
Miss Lo: en français
Talia: ouais mais alors qui c'est-
Leila: [Cristina! (.) comme se
dice escondido en frances
Cristina: que!
Leila: escondido en frances
Cristina: escondido en frances (.) euh (.)
Miss Lo: je me suis!
Miss Lo: derrière la porte ((opening the door and hiding behind the door)) (.) je
Talia: me suis!
Miss Lo: voilà: ((closing the door back))
Miss Lo: euh (.). euh (.). Leila
Leila: oui!
Miss Lo: elle a dit caché ou caché
Leila: caché
Miss Lo: donc c'est
Leila: e- r- ?
Leila: mm
Miss Lo: elle a dit cachè ou caché
Leila: caché
Miss Lo: donc c'est
Leila: mm
Miss Lo: ça c'est le même é que quel mot? (.)
qu'on avait vu
Leila: mm
Miss Lo: ça c'est le même é que quel mot↑ (.)
Leila: café
Miss Lo: café d'accord (.). hein (.). donc tu ne te trompes pas de sens l'accent là
Leila: e- r- ?
Talia: comme ça
Miss Lo: cachè: ou caché:
Talia: caché
Miss Lo: ah (.). caché (.). c'est comme ça
Leila: mm
Leila: mm
Miss Lo: ça c'est le même é que quel mot↑ (.)
qu'on avait vu
Talia: Leila!
Leila: mm
Talia: en frances es (.). pan (.). pan (.).
hehe (.). ( ) smack! con su beso
Talia: en español sería mmua!
Talia: y pum!
Talia: maîtresse!
Miss Lo: mm
Talia: comment écrit fleur↑
Miss Lo: fl::: - (.). et après eu: (.). comme euh: dans:
Leila: [fleur:r
Miss Lo: euh (.). c'est comme dans
Talia: café
Miss Lo: non
Leila: haha
Miss Lo: eu comme euh: (.). le eu de bonheur:
Talia: [pe.u.re/
Leila: hehe
Miss Lo: pe- (.). [pe.u.re/ (.). hehe
Miss Lo: peur (.). il a peur (.). il a peur du loup (.). il a peur (.). on a vu ce mot peur
Talia goes to the blackboard)
36. (.4) Talia: je sais pas comment
37. (.5) {((Talia writing))}
38. Miss Lo: il (.3) a
39. (.3)
40. Miss Lo: chu:::t (.) non non il a c’est le
41. verbe (.) voilà (.) peur! (.) tu te
42. rappelles pas comment on écrit peur
43. (.2)
44. Miss Lo: fleur euh: (.) comme euh:
45. Leila: /fleure/
46. Miss Lo: danseur! (.) seur il y a le:
47. (.)
48. Leila: chasseur!
49. Miss Lo: chasseur voilà (.) chasseur
50. Talia: comme ça?
51. Miss Lo: chasseur mi- euh Talia (.) tu vois
52. pas chasseur!
53. (.2) {((Talia writing))}
54. Miss Lo: ben voilà très bien (.) c’est juste
55. (. ) ben voilà bravo (.) et ben voilà
56. fleur c’est comme chasseur
57. (.2) {((Talia writing))}
58. Miss Lo: et très bien (.) très très bien (.)
59. donc ça c’est eur! (.) d’accord!
60. (.10)
61. (.4) {((Miss Lo is talking in the background with another
group))}
62. (.3)
63. Talia: pero fijate que dice les (.) entonces
64. (...)
65. (.6)
66. Leila: oye Talia que estoy terminando esto
67. Miss Lo: le pluriel (.) como dice?
68. Leila: con un s al final
69. Talia: /fleurés/
70. (.4)
71. Leila: (si)
72. {((Miss Lo is talking in the background with another
group))}
73. (.3)
74. (.)
75. Leila: ah
76. {((silence for the next minutes while T is
talking with the other group))
77. (--56:20--

**T2 S1 D1 V1 E9:**

--59:42--

1. Leila: maîtresse
2. (. )
3. Miss Lo: oui
4. Leila: il lui (.) donne↑ (.) un chemin
5. (.2)
6. Cristina: maîtresse j’ai-
7. Leila: c’est-
8. Miss Lo: ah (.) il lui donne un chemin
9. (. )
10. Talia: c’est pas ça
11. Miss Lo: non (.) c’est quoi quand on fait ça
12. là ((pointing with her finger))
13. (.2)
14. Talia: montre
15. Miss Lo: oui
16. (.2)
17. Talia: euh c’est le même ici et ici
18. (.2)
19. Karen: j’ai fini maîtresse
20. (.3)
21. Miss Lo: il lui
22. (.2)
23. Talia: montre (.) et ici c’est le même
24. (.)
25. Miss Lo: ah non mais c’est pas un chemin (.)
26. non ça c’est il lui donne (.) c’est
c27. ce que tu as marqué (.) et là c’est
28. il lui montre tu as raison (.) mais
29. il lui montre c’est pas un chemin (.)
c30. c’est une†
31. (.)
32. Miss Lo: alors (.) dans notre histoire on a un
33. chemin (.) mais alors si on trouvait
34. (.) un mot- un autre mot en français
35. qui voudrait dire (.) qui pourrait
dire la même chose
36. Leila: il lui donne un:
37. Miss Lo: c’est pas il lui donne c’est il lui
38. montre
39. (.2)
40. Miss Lo: une (.) parce que là c’est féminin
41. alors c’est [pas un chemin
42. Leila: [il lui montre une
43. (.4)
44. Miss Lo: comment ça s’appelle ça là (.) ou on
45. va avec la voiture (.) une†
46. Ni: rue
47. Miss Lo: une†
48. Leila: rue
49. 50. (.)
51. Miss Lo: une roue†
52. Leila: oui
53. Miss Lo: presque (.) une roue c’est la- la-
54. (.) ce qui permet à la voiture
d’avancer (.) mais quand on est sur
55. une†
56. (.3)
57. Miss Lo: une rou- te!
58. (.2)
59. Leila: mm
60. Miss Lo: la route (.) une route
61. (.3)
62. Miss Lo: la route c’est plus grand que le
63. chemin (.) voilà le chemin
64. ((drawing))
65. 66. (.)
67. Cristina: Talia mais non:
68. Miss Lo: quand vous venez à l’école euh (.)
69. Leila
70. Leila: oui
71. Miss Lo: vous- vous prenez (.) vous venez par
72. La route
73. Talia: oui
74. Cristina: [non
75. Miss Lo: [par la route (.) [d’accord
76. ?: [que hiciste† <what did you do†>
77. Miss Lo: donc là c’est une route
78. Talia: ( ) (01:01:08)
79. (.2)
80. Leila: il lui montre (.) [comment s’écrit
81. montre†
82. (.)
83. Leila: montre
84. Talia: [c’est à moi
85. 86. (.2)
87. Leila: montre
88. Talia: montre
89. (.2)
90. Miss Lo: mon (.) on (.3) tre
91. ((Mi writing))
92. Leila: montre
93. Talia: montre (.) a ver
94. (.2)
95. Miss Lo: attention parce que je sais pas si
96. c’est pareil que l’espagnol hein
97. (.2)
98. Miss Lo: vous avez l’air de trouver que c’est
99. pareil que l’espagnol (.) faites voir
100. (.3)
101. Miss Lo: ah oui (.) c’est- ça en espagnol
102. aussi!
103. Leila: non
104. (.)
105. Miss Lo: ah d’accord
106. Leila: hehe
107. (.)
108. Talia: le enseña un camino
109. (.3)
110. Leila: mm (.) si
111. Talia: en espagnol aussi
112. Miss Lo: il y a le on en espagnol (.) on↑
113. Leila: [non
114. Talia: [hein↑
115. Miss Lo: ah non (.) d’accord
116. Leila: [non (.) ‘on’ (.) eso
117. no hay
118. (.)
119. Talia: ah non
120. (.2)
121. Miss Lo: ben alors pourquoi (.) alors comment-
122. ah oui d’accord (.) parce que j’ai
123. pas compris Leila ce que tu lui as
124. dit en espagnol là tout de suite (.)
125. tu lui as dit montre en espagnol
126. Talia: non (.) elle (.) elle a dit qu’il
127. y a pas (.2) [montre
128. Leila: [‘on’ (.) il n’y a pas en
129. espagnol
130. (.2)
131. Miss Lo: le ‘on’
132. Leila: oui
133. Miss Lo: bonbon garçon: (.) ‘on’ ‘on’
134. ‘on’: (.) il y a pas ça↑
135. (.2)
136. Leila: [si (.) o- n-
137. Talia: [ahora (.) ah non
138. Leila: mais on dit (.) on
139. Miss Lo: ah: voilà: d’accord (.) c’est ça
140. que tu lui as expliqué d’accord
141. Talia: que cosa↑
142. Leila: que pasa está diciendo en realidad el
143. ‘on’ (.) que no hay (.) bonbon (.)
144. como lo escribis↑ (.) bon (.) bon (.)
145. si hay el ‘on’ (01:02:17) <we happen
146. to say in fact the ‘on’ (.) it
147. doesn’t exist (.) in sweet (.) how do
148. you write it↑ (.) sweet (.) yes there
149. is the ‘on’
150. Miss Lo: ouais (.) c’est-à-dire que vous avez
151. (.) vous avez o- n- (.) mais le o- n-
152. en espagnol n’est pas le ‘on’ en
153. français (.) puisque vous dites on
154. (.) en es- en français (.) o- n- ça
155. fait pas on ça fait ‘on’
156. (.3)
157. Miss Lo: mais ça s’écrit pareil mais c’est pas
158. la même- le même son
159. (.2)
160. Miss Lo: d’accord
161. (.6)
162. Amkoulel  maîtresse
163. ((Miss Lo is talking to another group))
164. Talia:  que- como (.), que le enseña?
165. (.)
166. Leila:  que?
167. Talia:  que le enseña?
168. (.)
169. Leila:  a quién?
170. Miss Lo:  ou la il y a des mots que tu as oublié
171. (.talking to another group))
172. Leila:  [à la mère]
173. Talia:  [il lui montre
174. (.3)
175. Leila:  une route
176. (.20)

---01:03:30---

T2 S1 D1 V1 E10:

---01:03:42---

50. Leila:  Talia levanta la mano
51. Talia:  por qué?
52. Leila:  porque no entiendo (.), levanta de la mano (.), si no se me (acalamba
53. <otherwise it gives me pins and
54. needles>
55. Talia:  [sería (.), 'le
56. loup part' (.), 'en' (.1) c'ou[rir]
57. Leila:  [eso no sé
58. (.3)
59. Talia:  'vers la maison [de la grand-mère] (.)
60. hehe
61. Leila:  [non Talia
62. (.2)
64. Karen:  maîtresse!
65. Miss Lo:  oui
66. Cristina:  [fini!
67. Talia:  [il court ( )
68. Miss Lo:  j'arrive
69. (.)
70. Leila:  maîtresse!
71. (.4)
72. Leila:  olvidás alguna vez sola que (. )
73. (.01:04:03)
74. Talia:  hein?
75. Leila:  que divertido! (.), miras (.), alguna
76. vez sola y vengo todo ( ), (.), que
77. divertido!
78. Miss Lo:  très bien {{singing}}
79. Maya:  ( ) (01:04:13)
80. Miss Lo:  [très bien
81. Talia:  [que es de Piotr
82. (.2)
83. Miss Lo:  [alors (.), il me manque celui de:
84. (.5) Maia
85. Talia:  [corazón partido
86. (.)
87. Miss Lo:  [attends Maia je vais
88. Talia:  [labios divididos 'mi amor'
89. ((singing))
90. (.)
91. Leila:  maîtresse!
92. Miss Lo:  oui
93. Leila:  c'est quoi ce dessin?
94. (.4)
95. Miss Lo:  il montre une route (.), c'est ce
qu’on a dit toute à l’heure (.) que
ça peut pas être un chemin puisqu’ils
ont [marqué une déjà ((Miss Lo walks away))
Talia: [non mais (.) maîtresse!
Miss Lo: oui
Talia: c’est ça
Leila: [non l’autre maîtresse
Talia: [le loup (.) part
Talia: [en courant (.) quoi
Miss Lo: ah (.) en↑
Talia: en (court↑
Leila: [court
Talia: vers la maison de la grand-mère
Miss Lo: [ouais (.) on l’a pas vu
ça encore (.) en (.) courant! (.) en
Leila: [marchant (.) en jouant
Talia: [corante
Miss Lo: en-
Leila: c- o- r- e- n- t-
Miss Lo: courant (.) ‘an’ (.) le ‘an’ de maman
Leila: ah (.) c- o- u- r- a- n- t-
Miss Lo: oui (.) très bien
Leila: /ko.urante/↑
Talia: /ko.urante/↑
Miss Lo: tu dessines ((speaking to Maya))
Leila: /ko.urante/↑
Maya: avec ma maman
Miss Lo: ah avec ta maman d’accord (.) était
très difficile↑
Maya: un peu
Miss Lo: un peu? (.) d’accord (.) alors je
vais reprendre avec toi toute à
l’heure (.) alors pour l’instant il
faut que je te donne la suite attend
(.) parce qu’alors la suite
Talia: como decir↑
Miss Lo: [non tu vas me faire la suite de
l’histoire
Talia: [/ko.urante/
Leila: /ko.urante/↑
Talia: [sin t-↑
Leila: si con t-!
Talia: con↑
Leila: t-!
Talia: [/ko.urante/↑
Leila: /ko.ʊʁɑ̃tɛ/

(.2)

Leila: ha (.) c- o- u- r- a- n- t-

Talia: /ko.ʊʁɑ̃tɛ/↑

Miss Lo: mais euh [(.] Leila

Leila: ["porque con le a"

(.2)

Talia: /ko.ʊʁɑ̃tɛ/↑

Leila: /ko/- /u/- /ʁɑ̃tɛ/

Miss Lo: [Leila

Talia: [ah

Miss Lo: [Leila

(.)

Miss Lo: quand tu lui épelles un mot

(.

Miss Lo: hein

(.)

Leila: [oui

Miss Lo: [quand tu lui épelles un mot (.)

c'est mieux [parce que tu lui donnes

le nom des lettres

Talia: [maîtresse

(.)

Miss Lo: mais si tu lui donnes le- la- la

prononciation en espagnol alors qu'en

français on dit pas /ko.ʊʁɑ̃tɛ/ (.] on

dit courant (.) parce que le t- on le

dit pas

(.

Miss Lo: parce que /ko.ʊʁɑ̃tɛ/ en français ça

existe mais pour dire courante en

français il faut quoi↑

(.3)

Talia: cou- [courant

Leila: [il faut mettre (.) autre

lettre

Miss Lo: oui (.) et quelle lettre

Leila: é-↑

Miss Lo: oui (.) e-

(]((Talia laughing))

Miss Lo: il faut le e- derrière le t- (.] donc

si tu lui dis ça (.] si tu lui- (.)

tu lui dis (.] pour qu'elle écrire

(.

courant (.) tu lui dis /ko.ʊʁɑ̃tɛ/ (.3)

et ben elle va écrire avec un e-

normalement

(.1)

Miss Lo: donc là tu lui f- (.] tu- tu vas lui

faire faire une erreur (.] je préfère

que quand tu lui (.] tu l'aides (.)

tu lui dises pas ça en espagnol

(.)

Miss Lo: puisque ça c'est un mot français donc

c'est pas la peine de- de le

prononcer en espagnol (.] parce que

ça va nous- nous (.] compliquer les

choses (.] donc tu lui dis plutôt (.)

c- o- u- r- a- n- t-

(.

Miss Lo: tu lui épelles le mot

Leila: d'accord

Miss Lo: mais tu lui dis pas d'écrire /ko.ʊʁɑ̃tɛ/

Leila: hehe ((laughing))

Miss Lo: parce qu'[après elle va mélanger (.)

hein↑

Talia: /ko.ʊʁɑ̃tɛ/

Leila: hehe ((laughing))

(.-}
T2 S1 D1 V2

---01:07:44---

T2 S1 D1 V2 E1:

Small group recording.

---11:06---

1. Talia: Leila (.) como se escribe ‘dormir’
2. Leila: mm†
3. Talia: y [el se duerme
4. Piotr: (bla bla bla
5. (.2)
6. Talia: en la cama
7. (.4)
8. Leila: mm
9. (.3)
10. Leila: ‘dormir’ creo que escribe ((write on a piece of a paper how to write the word))
11. (.10)
12. Kenji: ça c’est raconte† (.1) raconte (.)
13. (.2)
14. Leila: haha ((laughing)) (. parle
15. (.3)
16. Kenji: parle†
17. ((Leila and Talia laughing))
18. Leila: blablabla
19. (.3)
20. Leila: no entiendo este
21. (.2)
22. Talia: como se ( )
23. (.3)
24. Kenji: prendre rouge
25. (.20)
26. Kenji: tres difficile
27. Talia: c’est facile
28. Kenji: parce que ( )
29. Talia: quoi†
30. ((Talia and Leila laughing))
31. (.10)
32. Talia: là c’est donner (.) donner (.) là
33. c’est-
34. (.20)
35. Leila: montre montre
36. Talia: montre (.) il montre
37. Maia: que es esto†
38. (.10)
39. Talia: regarde regarde
41. ((Talia and Leila laughing))
42. Leila: c'est quoi ça?
43. Talia: no se ()
44. (.3)
45. Kenji: montre↑ (. ) montre↑ (. ) montre un arbre
46. Talia: non!
47. ((Kenji and Talia laughing))
48. (.8)
49. Leila: c'est quoi ça↑
50. Kenji: montre (. ) un maison
51. Talia: ça c'est maison↑
52. ((Kenji laughing))
53. Kenji: arriver (. ) rivière
54. Leila: c'est quoi ça↑ (. ) c'est quoi ça↑ (. )
55. dans le petit chaperon rouge c'est quoi ça↑
56. (.3)
57. Kenji: c'est quoi ça↑
58. Leila: regarde Kenji
59. Talia: regarde Kenji
60. (.)
61. Kenji: une ['route'
62. Talia: ici c'est [en rouge
63. Leila: [oui c'est-
64. Talia: [regarde c'est en rouge
65. Kenji: ['route' (. ) c'est quoi 'route'
66. Talia: ça (pointing to the drawing))
67. Kenji: attends ([Kenji opens his digital dictionary])
68. Talia: ah hahaha {laughs)
69. (.)
70. Maia: que↑
71. Talia: una rota
72. (.3)
73. Kenji: route!
74. Talia: oui
75. Leila: hahaha
76. Talia: d'accord d'accord d'accord (. )
77. marcher une route
78. Leila: le duele la cabeza↑ (14:10)
79. Talia: mmm {laughs)
80. Leila: ( )
81. (.5)
82. Talia: y luego le dice tontos a los argentinos
83. Kenji: oui mais moi très gros
84. Talia: haha {laughs)
85. Kenji: faut écrire ici↑
86. (.)
87. Leila: ( )
88. (.)
89. Talia: c'est intelligent les argents (. )
90. pas les japonais
91. (.1)
92. Kenji: moi au secours (. ) parce que moi au
93. secours
94. Leila: mmmmmm {laughs)
95. (.)
96. Leila: dice porque yo tuve ( )
97. Talia: [porque que↑
98. Maia: [Talia como se dice mochila↑
99. Leila: porque tuve ( )
100. Maia: Talia como se dice [mochila]
101. Talia: [mmm mmm
102. ([laughs)
103. (.)}
Kenji: cours
Leila: [kaban
Maia: [atashi <I>
Talia: non
Leila: kaban <bag>
Talia: atashi <I> c'est yo <I> anata no
kaban <your bag> (.) kaban (.)
Leila: mochila anata no <your> (.) tu <you>
haha ((laughing))
Kenji: Talia (.) ça c'est 'court' ↑
Leila: ((Mi and Talia laughing))
Kenji: 'courant' (.) c'est 'courant'
Leila: [en courant
ten (.)
Kenji: cou (.1) rant
Leila: parce le dija ( )
Kenji: courant (.) c'est quoi ↑
Leila: (.)
Kenji: couant (.) c'est quoi↑
Leila: (.)
Talia: les dicen tontos a los argentinos
(.2)
Computer: courante (.1) courante (.1)
(.2)
Talia: quoi↑
Leila: que veis ( )
Kenji: [courant (.1) comme ça (.1) ouahhh
((imitating someone running))
Kenji: courant (.1) vers
Leila: haahaha ha (.) está loco
Talia: haahaaaahah
Kenji: la
Leila: que es un payaso esto=
Kenji: =maison
Talia: que es un payaso esto=
Kenji: de la
Talia: en tu clase hace eso↑
Kenji: grand-mère
Maia: porque en verdad [
Leila: [no esta [(
Talia: [no esto si
Leila: y dice ( )
Leila: parece el teléfono (16:00)
Talia: dice (.1) dice (.1) un deux trois
Kenji: sept huit
Talia: hahaha hahaha
Kenji: ici ça↑ (.1) et ici écrire↑
((girls are laughing))
Leila: ( ) (((laughing))
Talia: es que dice (.1) chiss (.1) y luego el
dice sept huit
Leila: que repite ( ) (((laughing))
(Talia: ça c'est ici écrire↑
Leila: [oui!
Leila: regarde Kenji (.1) toi
Leila: regarde Kenji (.1) tu es plus petit
Kenji: oh là là

Leila: il y a plus

Maia: bueno tiene ()

Kenji: moi plus grand!

Maia: le duele la cabeza (((laughing)))

Talia: viste la cana que puso (.) le hizo así (((girls laughing)))

Leila: le duele la cabeza

Kenji: c'est pas bien

Maia: oye{

Leila: [ça fait mal à la tête

Talia: Kenji regarde

Leila: [ça fait mal à la tête

Kenji: [pauvre

Maia: [es una ( )

Kenji: /fæıl/

Maia: yo vengo japonés (imitating Leila)

Talia: facile!

Maia: yo vengo japonés (imitating Kenji)

Leila: yo vengo de Japón!

Kenji: mm

Leila: yo vengo de Japón!

Kenji: de donde vienes Kenji

Maia: yo vengo de Japón

Talia: de donde vienes Kenji

Kenji: yo vengo de Japón

Maia: yo vengo japonés

Talia: como te llamas

Kenji: quoi

Talia: comme te llamas (.) comment tu t’appelles

Kenji: euh:

Talia: me llamo

Kenji: me llamo

Talia: Kenji
Kenji: me llamo Kenji (.).

Maia: Kenji como se dice espagnol ↑

Leila: comment s'appelle ça en espagnol ↑

Kenji: /goma/↑

Talia: goma

Leila: goma↑

Miss Lo: ça y est c'est fini↑

Leila: [non maîtresse c'est plus difficile ça

Kenji: [non maîtresse

Talia: Kenji

Miss Lo: mais vous avez le droit de prendre un dictionnaire si vous voulez (.) mais je sais pas si ça va beaucoup vous-

Leila: [vous avez pas le droit de prendre un dictionnaire en espagnol

Leila: [et ça c'est quoi (.) ça c'est un (.) payaso <clown >

Miss Lo: déguisé

Talia: maîtresse je veux manger (.) ça fait rouahhhh (.) mon (ventre

Leila: [ça fait (.) ça fait mal a la [tête maîtresse

Miss Lo: [chut chut chut! (.)

Miss Lo: déguisé ((writing on the board)) (.)

il est déguisé en (.) on avait vu pour euh (.) l'anniversaire (.) on allait se déguiser en (.) d'accord↑ (.)

((Miss Lo moves away and starts talking with Samba on the other side of the classroom))

Talia: Kenji

Leila: Kenji (.) espagnol

Talia: [comment on dit en espagnol↑

Kenji: goma

Talia: oui

((Leila and Talia laughing))

Kenji: ((starts singing))

Leila: Kenji (.) como te llamas↑

((girls laughing))

Kenji: ((caughing))

Talia: por qué (.) por qué (.) por qué por qué

por qué (19:05)

Leila: me está robando la goma!

((Talia laughing))

Leila: non! Ça c'est moi!

Maia: ( )

Leila: me quiere sacar la regla!

((laughing))

Talia: el japonés

((girls laughing))

Talia: le petit chaperon japonais

((laughing))

Leila: akazukin chan <le petit chaperon
Leila: akazukin chan <le petit chaperon rouge>
Talia: anata no kaban <your bag>
Leila: rouge>
Talia: atashi <I> (.1) arigato <thank you>
Maia: que este (.1) Kenji (.4) Kenji

Kenji

Kenji: la maman ((reading his exercise at loud))

Talia: es que es tan tierno <it's just that he's so sweet> ((laughing))

Leila: haha ((laughing))

Kenji: maman

Talia: te dice (.1) tonta (.1) te dice tonta

Kenji: c'est quoi!

Leila: tonta

Talia: viste!

Leila: dis [tonta

Kenji: [c'est quoi! (.1) j'ai pas compris

Talia: pourquoi tu dis a Leila qu'elle a (.1) comme ça!

Talia: Kenji (.3) comment on dit arigato <thank you> en espagnol

Kenji: gracias

((girls laughing))

Leila: buena memoria tiene

Miss Lo: alors

Leila: ça fait mal a la tête maître-

Leila: la tele!

Talia: la tele

Leila: la tête ((laughing))
They talk about the story of Little Red Riding Hood. They are talking about what the wolf can eat.

--03:00--
1. Miss Lo: il peut manger des lapins (.) qu’est-
2. (.)
3. ce qu’il peut manger d’autre?
4. ?: euh (.) [les poules!
5. Hakim: [les poules
6. Miss Lo: les poules ouais (.) quoi d’autres?
7. (.)
8. Miss Lo: Julia (. ) qu’est-ce qu’il peut manger d’autres?
9. (.)
10. ?: =le cheval
11. (.)
12. Matilda: non!
13. (.)
14. ?: les chèvres!
15. Miss Lo: les chèvres voilà (.) ouais
16. ?: les moutons?
17. Miss Lo: voilà (.) les moutons (.) et puis
18. dans les histoires ça mange aussi des
19. fois les?
20. ?: les chez-
21. (.)
22. Hakim: les grand-mères
23. Miss Lo: la grand-mère (.) les enfants (.)
24. hein?
25. Julia: la ( )
26. Miss Lo: la?
27. Julia: la ( )
28. Miss Lo: la chair fraîche elle dit julia mais
29. oui (.) la chair fraîche!
30. (laughing)
31. Hakim: c’est quoi?
32. Julia: la ( )
33. Miss Lo: la chevrette?
34. (.)
35. Julia: le chevreuil!
36. (.)
37. Miss Lo: le chevreuil! (.) c’est moi qui
38. n’entends pas (.) le chevreuil (.)
39. d’accord
40. Hakim: c’est quoi maîtresse?
41. Miss Lo: le chevreuil c’est quoi (.) tu
42. expliques a Hakim ce que c’est qu’un
43. chevreuil?
44. (.)
45. Julia: euh
46. Miss Lo: c’est un animal de la forêt (.) euh
47. il y en avait dans quelle euh
48. Julia: un cheval un peu
49. Miss Lo: c’était (.) on avait vu ça oui vous
50. avez déjà vu ça dans les bons amis
51. ?: c’est un peu petit
52. Miss Lo: voilà (.) c’est petit
53. (.)
54. Talia: écureuil?
55. (.)
56. Miss Lo: c’est comme un (.) [c’est comme une
57. biche un petit peu
58. ?: [non écureuil
59. (.)
60. Maia: el otro
61. Miss Lo: [bambi (.) tu vois pas bambi?
62. ?: [écureuil c’est pas ça
Miss Lo: bon alors (.) euh (.) chut

Talia: ah (.) como bambi

Miss Lo: les- les (.) avant que je continue

avec les petits et que les grands

vous fassiez autre chose

Talia: un ( ) (04:06)

Miss Lo: Hakim parce que chevreuil (.) tu vas regarder dans le livre (.) je voulais juste vous faire écouter deux passages

---04:12---

T2 S1 D1 V5 E2:

---27:59---

1. Miss Lo: Andrea on est en train de travailler nous (.) alors merci de sortir tranquillement

2. (.)

3. Hakim: au revoir!

4. Andrea: tienes un

5. (.)

6. Miss Lo: alors pourquoi t’as dit (.) Julia (.) féroce et rhinocéros

7. (.)

8. (.)

9. Julia: je sais pas

10. Miss Lo: non mais c’est bien (.) mais qu’est-ce qui est pareil dans féroce et rhinocéros? (.) qu’est-ce qu’-

11. Talia: ah! (.) parce que le (.) c’est (.) c’est ( )

12. (.)

13. Miss Lo: non (.) elle a dit (.) féroce (.) c’est comme rhinocéros

14. (.)

15. Miss Lo: féroce c’est comme-

16. (.)

17. ?: c’est roce (.)

18. Miss Lo: oui( .) on entend roce! ( .) et donc quand- quand il y a deux mots qui se terminent pareil comme ça on dit ça rime (.) comme dans la poésie (.) ça rime ( .) est-ce que ça existe les rhinocéros féroces

19. (.)

20. (.)

21. Miss Lo: féroce c’est comme-

22. ?: c’est roce!

23. Miss Lo: oui( .) on entend roce! ( .) et donc quand- quand il y a deux mots qui se terminent pareil comme ça on dit ça rime ( .) comme dans la poésie ( .) ça rime ( .) est-ce que ça existe les rhinocéros féroces

24. (.)

25. Talia: non

26. ?: oui

27. (.)

28. Miss Lo: les rhinocéros féroces

29. Talia: [non

30. ?: [non

31. (.)

32. Miss Lo: ah ( .) peut-être que ça existe ( .) je sais pas

33. Talia: je pense que ça rime ( .) rhinocéros

34. ( .) parce que en espagnol c’est ( .)

35. riniceronte ( .) je-

36. Miss Lo: alors est-ce que si on dit en espagnol un rhinocéros féroce ( .) ça va faire oce oce comme ça!

37. (.)

38. ?: oce oce ((laughing))

39. Talia: euh::

40. Miss Lo: comment on dit en espagnol

41. Talia: feroz ( .) riniceronte (28:56)

42. Miss Lo: non ( .) ben c’est pas pareil ( .) ben en français ( .) c’est fero-

43. riniceronte ( .) je-

44. Miss Lo: rhinocéros féroce on entend le même-

45. Talia: ah! ( .) feroz y rhino- ( .) c’est quoi

46. (.)

47. Miss Lo: qu’elle a dit!

48. (.)

49. Miss Lo: elle a dit rhinocéros féroce
54. Talia: ah (.) feroz rhinocéros (.) oui
55. ?: roce roce roce
56. Miss Lo: on entend roce (.) très bien (.)
57. alors (.) mais là ya pas de rhinocéros dans cette histoire (.)
58. alors là qu'est-ce qui se passe?
59. Talia: c'est quoi rhinocéros?
60. Miss Lo: roce roce roce
61. Talia: ah oui c'est rinoceronte (.) euh
62. Miss Lo: il dit (.) toi vas par là (.) alors il faut le dire autrement

---29:29---
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---32:36---

22. Maia: maîtresse!
23. Miss Lo: oui Maia
24. Maia: euh (.) ( )
25. (.2)
26. Talia: que quieres decir?
27. Miss Lo: non non non Talia (.) elle- elle
28. essaye de le dire en français
29. Maia: un show
30. (.3)
31. Talia: show (.) show (.)
32. Maia: es el de caperucita roja (33:03)
33. (.3)
34. Talia: que ( )
35. (.2)
36. Maia: el de todos los idiomas
37. Talia: que si lo vamos a hacer
38. Miss Lo: Maia!
39. Talia: elle a dit que si on va faire le- (.)
40. le show (.) le petit chaperon rouge ( )
41. (.1)
42. Miss Lo: non mais (.) après (.) pas tout de suite (.) d'accord? (.) hein? (.) il ne faut pas (.) Julia et Anika et (.) elles ne font pas le spectacle (.)
43. parce qu'elles sont pas là le matin
44. (.2) d'accord? ( .) d'accord? ( .) alors
45. (.1) donc là ( .) qu'est-ce qu'il fait
46. ( .) il arrive
47. (.2) il arrive

---33:33---
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---35:44---

1. Miss Lo: et regardez ( .) là on le voit qui mange la
2. grand-mère
3. (.)
4. Talia: il a une grande bouche!
5. (.)
6. Miss Lo: [hein?]
7. ?: [( .) trop peur!]
8. Miss Lo: il a une grande bouche ( .) vous savez
9. comment on dit la bouche pour un animal?
10. (.1)
11. Talia: ah euh ( .) en espagnol c'est hocico
12. Miss Lo: et en français c'est la gueule!
13. ?: gueule!
14. Miss Lo: la gueule du loup ( .) [mais ça]
15. ?: [gueule?]
16. Miss Lo: la gueule ( .) mais ça c'est que pour les
17. animaux (.) les chiens (.) les- les- [(.)
18. mais pas pour les- les personnes
19. Talia: [oui
20. ?: les chats†
21. Miss Lo: parce que si on dit ça pour une personne
22. c'est comme un gros mot (.) [hein†
23. Talia: [maîtresse!
24. (.) [c'est le loup-
25. Julia: [ma maman-
26. Miss Lo: elle t'a dit quoi ta maman là-dessus†
27. Julia: quand tu dis pas- (. ) quand tu dis pas (. )
28. la gueule
29. Miss Lo: elle t'a dit qu'il faut pas dire la
30. gueule† (. ) et- et euh (. ) parce que tu
31. disais ce mot là†
32. Julia: non
33. Miss Lo: ah non d'accord (. ) mais elle t'a appris
34. ça (. ) qu'il faut pas dire ce mot là (. )
35. d'accord (. ) okay
36. (.2)
37. Miss Lo: donc [ça c'est pour la-
38. Talia: [maîtresse
39. Miss Lo: oui
40. Talia: en espagnol (. ) pour le chien et (. ) le-
41. le chien [(.) et le chat
42. Julia: (le chien le chat
43. (. )
44. Talia: c'est (. ) hocico (. ) pour le perroquet (. )
45. c'est (. ) pico
46. Miss Lo: le bec en français aussi oui (. ) oui en
47. français aussi
48. Talia: et (.1) comme ça!
49. (.1)
50. Miss Lo: et (. ) est-ce qu'on dit des fois hocic- (. )
51. c'est hocico c'est ça†
52. Talia: hocico
53. Miss Lo: est-ce qu'on dit hocico pour euh (. ) une
54. personne†
55. Talia: non c'est boca
56. (. )
57. Miss Lo: d'accord
58. Talia: labios (. ) boca (36:39)
59. Miss Lo: d'accord (.1) très bien (. ) en français
60. des fois on dit (. ) on dit gueule pour une
61. personne mais ça c'est vraiment quand on
62. est très en colère parce que c'est co-
63. comme un gros mot (. ) [faut pas le dire
64. Talia: [c'est quoi gueule†
65. (. )
66. Talia: [c'est le-
67. Miss Lo: [la gueule c'est la bouche du chien
68. Talia: ah
69. (. )
70. Miss Lo: donc si on dit à quelqu'un (. ) ferme ta
71. gueule (. ) c'est en fait (. ) c'est un gros
72. mot (. ) c'est une insulte (.1) voyez† (. )
73. parce que normalement on- on peut pas dire
74. ça
75. ?: dans la cour il y a quelqu'un qui (
76. )
77. Miss Lo: ah (. ) dans la cour il y a quelqu'un qui a
78. dit ça†
79. ?: { }
80. Miss Lo: tu as déjà entendu ça† (. ) ferme ta gueule
81. (. ) ou bien ta gueule (. ) t'as déjà
82. entendu ça†
83. ?: oui
84. Miss Lo: oui† (.) ben oui parce que ça c'est des
85. gros mots (. ) et donc il y en a qui les
86. disent
87. (.)
88. Maia:  
89. Miss Lo: voilà (.) mais faut pas les dire parce que sinon si vous les dites vous allez avoir des problèmes
90. Talia: [no le repite Maia
91. Maia: [haha (laughing)]
92. Miss Lo: [hein]
93. Talia: je dis à Maia (.) ne re- te (.) ne répète pas
94. Miss Lo: ah voilà (.) tu dis a Maia qu’il faut pas qu’elle apprenne çà (.) d’accord (.) très bien
95. Julia: parce que c’est pas poli
96. Miss Lo: voilà (.) c’est pas poli (.) très bien (.) c’est pas poli (.) [mais ça existe
97. Talia: [c’est pas joli
98. Miss Lo: mais c’est pas joli (.) voilà (.) euh
99. Julia: donc qu’est-ce qui se passe là
100. Talia: tu dis à Maia (.) ne re- te (.) ne répète pas
101. Miss Lo: ah voilà (.) tu dis à Maia qu’il faut pas qu’elle apprenne ça (.) d’accord (.) très bien
102. Julia: parce que c’est pas poli
103. Miss Lo: voilà (.) ça c’est pas joli (.) voilà (.) euh
104. Talia: [es la ( ) (39:23) (non
105. Miss Lo: [hein (.) tu dis à Maia qu’il faut pas
106. Julia: [parce que la grand-mère elle était belle
107. Miss Lo: oui Amélie tu veux dire quelque chose
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--38:10--

--39:16--
1. Miss Lo: et est-ce que le petit chaperon rouge s’en rend compte (.) est-ce que le petit
2. chaperon rouge s’en rend compte (.) est-ce qu’elle reconnaît-
3. (.)
4. ?: [non
5. ?: [non
6. Talia: [no lo abras Maia
7. (.)
8. ?: [non
9. (.)
10. ?: [non
11. Talia: [es la ( ) (39:23)
12. Julia: [parce que la grand-mère elle était belle
13. et maintenant elle est en noir
14. Talia: [Maia (.) es la cosa que lo prendes (.)
15. no lo habras (39:29)
16. Miss Lo: la grand-mère était beige (.) la grand-
17. mère elle était euh (.) elle avait pas de
18. quoi (.) parce que les loups ils ont quoi
19. (.) des!
20. ?: des petits cheveux sur le visage
21. (.)
22. Miss Lo: ils ont quoi (.) ils ont des? (.) comment ça s’appelle les petits cheveux
23. ?: moi je sais pas! ( )
24. Miss Lo: [des! (.) comment ça s’appelle ça? (.) je
25. suis pas un loup hein (.) je suis pas un
26. loup (.) mais ça s’appelle comment ça?
27. Talia: moi oui (.) je suis un loup (.) hmmhm
28. {(laughing)}
29. ?: des
30. Miss Lo: c’est quoi ça? (.) hein? (.) ça s’appelle
31. comment ça?
32. (.)
33. Miss Lo: ça c’est des cheveux (.) et ça c’est des
34. (.)
35. Julia: mon papa est (.) comme ça
36. Miss Lo: ton papa il en a ouais (.) mais c’est un
37. loup ton papa
38. Julia: non
39. Miss Lo: non (.) c’est quoi alors!
40. (.)
41. Miss Lo: c’est des poils!
36. Miss Lo: des poils! (.) [d’accord]
37. Talia: [en espagnol c’est vellos
38. (.)
39. Julia: mon papa ( )
40. Miss Lo: hein!
41. Julia: mon papa il est pas ( ) parce que il est très gentil
42. Miss Lo: vous entendez ce que nous dit Julia (.)(à)
43. c’est quand même surprenant (. elle dit que son papa n’est pas un loup parce qu’il est très gentil
44. (.2)
45. ((children laughing))
46. Miss Lo: et aussi parce que- (.) il a des poils
47. Julia: mais pas autant que le loup hein!
48. Miss Lo: oui
49. Talia: [ya que ve ( ) (40:46)
50. Julia: ( )
51. Miss Lo: [espera que le mete y le saca
c’est le vent qui souffle (.) donc quand même qu’est-ce qu’elle se dit le petit
52. chaperon rouge!
53. (.)
54. Miss Lo: elle reconnaît pas que c’est un loup (.)
55. mais quand même il y a des choses un peu bizarres (.) qu’est-ce qui est bizarre!
56. ?: elle dit (.) [grand-mère comme tu as du
57. grandes oreilles
58. Talia: [el chico (.) por que crees que era un palo asi! (41:00) ((working
59. with Leila))
60. Miss Lo: voilà (.) c’est-à-dire que le loup il a des oreilles plus grandes que celles de
61. sa†
62. ?: grand-mère
63. Miss Lo: grand-mère (. et il a des yeux plus†
64. ?: grands que la grand-mère
65. Miss Lo: que ceux de la grand-mère (.) et il a des dents plus†
66. Talia: non
67. ?: grands!
68. Miss Lo: [non euh
69. Talia: [Maia tu tijeras están ahí afuera
70. (41:28)
71. Miss Lo: longues
72. ?: longues que la grand-mère
73. Miss Lo: que la grand-mère

---41:38---
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T2 S1 D1 V6 E1:
Miss Lo is explaining the date to the intermediate group while the other groups are working on their own. The microphone is with the advanced group.

---00:00---
1. Miss Lo: très bien (.) alors comment tu sais
2. qu’après le 31 c’est le premier février†
3. ?: ( )
4. Miss Lo: tu le sais (.) ah ben bravo (.)
5. félicitations (.) vas-y alors
6. Leila: [en qué lo hizo Talia†
Miss Lo: [février]. c'est marqué là-bas février

Talia: 

Miss Lo: fév- (.2) vas-y (.2) fé (.2) é (.2) voilà

Talia: 

Kenji: trop petit

Miss Lo: [r- (.2) r- (.2) comme dans livre]

Talia: [laurie (.2) regard (.2) ir (.2) mic]

Miss Lo: [oui mais alors le r- la il est (.2) hein (.2)]

Matilda: non

Talia: let (.2) at (.2) r (.2) g

Miss Lo: [r- (.2) r- (.2) comme dans livre]

Talia: 

Miss Lo: [r- (.2) r- (.2) comme dans livre]

Talia: can I listen?

Miss Lo: [what is it?]

Miss Lo: il est tout petit là le r- (.2) comme le v-

Hakim: comme ça↑

Miss Lo: oui c'est ça mais il est trop petit là (.2)

regarde (.2) et hop (.2) non on verra après

la (.2) févr- (.2) l- (.2) er

Talia: [can I listen?]

Miss Lo: alors er- (.2) alors là c'est le er- de

janvier

Miss Lo: le er de janvier

?: 

Miss Lo: t'es dans la classe de qui

?: 

Miss Lo: ah c'est la même d'accord ben (.2) euh

mélanie elle a été- (.2) oui on a échangé

de liste

?: ah oui d'accord

Miss Lo: merci bien ((Miss Lo takes the list))

Talia: por que no se encontraron ahí↑ (01:16)

<why did they not meet there?>

Leila: quién↑

Talia: no se encontraron (.2) no se la cambiaron

<they didn’t bump into each other (.2) they
didn’t exchange it> ((referring to the
list of pupils))

Miss Lo: alors (.2) févr- (.2) on en est où là ↑ (.2)

févr-

C?: er (.2) er (.2) er

Miss Lo: er (.2) e- (.2) r-

Miss Lo: voilà (.2) de quelle année↑

Hakim: 2008

Miss Lo: vendredi premier février donc (.2) Cristina

hier c’était quel jour↑

Cristina: euh (.2) c’était trente

Miss Lo: non mais le jour (.2) c’était dis-moi la

date d’hier↑ tu t’en rappelles de la
date d’hier↑

Cristina: c’était jeudi trente (.2) trente

PlotR: trente et un

Leila: trente et un Cristina

Karen: trente et un

PlotR: c’est trente et un

Karen: si c’est trente et un

Miss Lo: trente et un↑
Andrea comes back with empty hands as the folder she was sent to get had been given in the meanwhile by a child from another classroom.

--03:00--
1. (Knocks on the door)
2. Talia: Andrea
3. Miss Lo: et lundi quatre-
4. Leila: ( ) rien
5. Miss Lo: comment ya rien!
6. Leila: j'ai dis-
7. Miss Lo: t'as donné à la maîtresse?
8. Leila: oui
9. Talia: mélanie por que no [()] (03:08)
10. Miss Lo: [Talia! (.) elle parle
11. (children laughing))
12. Leila: (elle m'a déjà expliqué)
13. Miss Lo: elle t'a déjà expliqué
14. (everyone laughing and door closing)
15. Miss Lo: toi là (.) hop hop hop {speaking to Talia} (.) Talia il faut la laisser s'exprimer (.) il faut la laisser parler d'accord? (.) je voulais lui faire une blague en plus
16. Leila: te callas (03:30) <shut up> {note that in Spain there wouldn't be an accent there}
17. Miss Lo: alors! (.) d'accord Andrea↑ (.) donc demain ce sera le deux février

--03:43--

Andrea and Hakim are about to leave the induction classroom and go to their mainstream classroom for maths.

--05:50--
07. Miss Lo: allez-y Hakim et Andrea (.) vous allez en mathématiques (.) à toute à l'heure
08. (noises of chairs being pushed on the floor)
09. Leila: Andrea cuaderno te falta! (05:55)
10. Talia: si ella lo tiene
11. Miss Lo: euh (.) Amkouel (.) est-ce que tu peux s'il te plaît (.) faire l'appel (.) c'est-à-dire que tu demandes aux enfants s'ils mangent ou s'ils restent à l'étude mais à voix haute
12. Leila: au revoir
13. (noises of the door closing)

--06:12--

Andrea and Hakim are about to leave the induction classroom and go to their mainstream classroom for maths.
Miss Lo is checking that Matilda wrote her text in Lithuanian for the play on Little Red Riding Hood where all children will play their role in their L1. Matilda didn’t understand the French expression “c’est pour mieux” and therefore didn’t translate it in Lithuanian.
Miss Lo: mais tu l’as marqué en lituanien non (.) c’est pour mieux t’entendre! (.) c’est
pour mieux
Leila: nunca escuché [la palabra (.) (15:27)
Miss Lo: [ah non (.) tu l’as pas écrit à chaque fois tu comprenais pas ce que ça voulait dire ‘c’est pour mieux’ (.1) [c’est ça (.) tu l’as pas écrit la non plus (.) d’accord
Leila: [‘quiero agarrar este micrófono’ (]
Miss Lo: par exemple (.) regarde euh (.) qu’est-ce qu’on pourrait faire pour expliquer a-
Talia: canta para que venga ( )
Cristina: à Matilda
Miss Lo: qu’est-ce qu’on pourrait faire pour expliquer à Matilda
Leila: ( )
Miss Lo: euh (.) si on veut aller se promener dans la forêt?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [a
Leila: à Matilda
Miss Lo: qu’est-ce qu’on pourrait faire pour expliquer à Matilda euh (.) ce que ça veut dire ‘c’est pour mieux’ par exemple euh (.) [ai on veut aller
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: euh (.) si on veut aller se promener dans la forêt?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
Leila: [es para mejor
Miss Lo: pour mieux se promener dans la forêt qu’est-ce qu’on va mettre (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire (.) on va prendre des sandales (.) qu’est-ce qu’on va faire?
pour mieux t’embrasser’ (.) ‘c’est pour
mieux te manger’ (.) donc ce que je pense
c’est que peut-être- (.) est-ce que tu
sais- (.) est-ce que tu sais le dire en
anglais† (.) est-ce que tu pourrais le
traduire en anglais† (.) ‘c’est pour mieux
te manger’ (.) comment tu dirais ça en
anglais†

Karen:  euh
Miss Lo:  chut! (.) non non Karen tu dis rien (.)
on va voir
Matilda:  it’s better to eat
Karen:  better
Miss Lo:  est-ce que c’est comme ça que– (.) alors
(.) redis-le Matilda
Miss Lo:  parce qu’en anglais c’est pas moi qui vais
faire le prof (.) la maîtresse (.) ça va être Karen (.) parce que c’est Karen
qui sait ça mieux que moi (.) donc (.)
comment tu dirais c’est pour mieux te– (.)
comment tu dirais en anglais euh (.)
come tu as une grande bouche (.) comme
tu as de grandes dents (.) c’est pour
mieux te manger mon enfant (.) comment tu
diras ça en anglais (.) Karen écoute
cé qu’elle dit Matilda
Miss Lo:  vas-y (.) c’est pour voir (.) si tu as
compris ce que ça veut dire (.) dis-le
moi en anglais pour voir
Matilda:  attends (.) dis-moi encore
Miss Lo:  alors (.) comme tu as de grandes dents
Matilda:  j’ai oublié comment on dit ça
Miss Lo:  t’as oublié l’anglais d’accord (.) et
Matilda:  c’est pour [mieux te manger]†
Karen:  [how]
Miss Lo:  alors dis-lui Karen (.) comme tu as de
grandes dents
Karen:  how (.2) how big are your teeth
Miss Lo:  et l’autre il répond (.) c’est pour mieux
te manger
Miss Lo:  non tu avais commencé à le dire toute à
l’heure ((speaking to Matilda))
Talia:  tu as oublié l’anglais
Miss Lo:  attends (.) chut!
Matilda:  it’s better to eat!
Miss Lo:  est-ce que c’est ça Karen (.) est-ce que
on va dire it’s better to eat†
Karen:  euh (.)
Talia:  for better–
Karen:  it’s better to eat you my child
Miss Lo:  c’est comme ça qu’on dit en anglais (.)
it’s better to- (.) donc elle a compris
alors ce que ça veut dire (.) c’est ça†
(.) alors voilà (.) alors essaye de dire
cça ‘it’s better to eat’ (.) t’essaies de
le dire en lituanien! ((laughing)) (.)
d’accord? (.) c’est pour mieux te manger
ça veut dire ‘it’s better to eat’ et du
temps it’s better to eat t’essaies de voir
comment on dit ça en lituanien (.) tu
sais le dire en lituanien ça!

Miss Lo: comment tu dis en lituanien alors c'est pour mieux te manger?

Matilda: mm (.2) mm (laughing)

Miss Lo: Matilda elle elle a- elle parle français (.1) lituanien (.1) et anglais (.1)

alors du coup (.1) il faut qu'elle cherche dans la bonne euh (.1) dans la bonne euh

Cristina: [tête

Miss Lo: [dans le bon tiroir (.1) dans la bonne tête

voilà (.1) il faut qu'elle cherche dans la bonne tête qu'est-ce qu'on dit

Kenji: ah (.1) c'est pas bien

Miss Lo: tu vas trouver comment on le dit?

Kenji: oublie de anglais (.3)

((children laughing))

Matilda: j'ai oublie toutes les langues!

Miss Lo: toutes les langues t'as oublié (.1) moi je crois que tu t'en rappelles des trois mais bon (.1) ça c'est peut-être difficile à trouver là tout de suite (.1) tu vas voir peut-être que ça va venir toute à l'heure hein

Karen: ouais parce qu'on va faire ()

Leila: a mi nunca me pasó que me digan also en francés y no lo pueda traducir en español (20:49) <me it never happened to me that someone tells me something in French and I can't translate it in Spanish>

Miss Lo: alors! euh::: (.1) juste la c'est moi qui vais faire ça rapidement

---21:02---

Small group interaction.

---25:16---

1. Talia: Kenji (.1)
2. Kenji: quoi!
3. Talia: c'est fini toute la classe
4. (.1)
5. Talia: c'est fini!
6. Leila: no Talia (.1) por hoy sólo!
7. (laughing)
8. Talia: c'est fini Leila!
9. Miss Lo: chut chut! (.1) chut!
10. Kenji: c'est fini! (.1) quoi c'est fini Leila?
11. (girls laughing)
12. (.3)
13. Kenji: c'est la fin

---25:40---

---25:56---

27. Miss Lo: alors! (.1) je vous ai apporté un petit
28. livre
29. Leila: comment s'appelle!
30. Miss Lo: qui s'appelle (.1) justement alors je suis désolée il est petit
31. (.1)
32. (.3)
33. Leila: shur-
34. Kenji: cha-
35. Miss Lo: il s'appelle!
36. Leila: chou château↑
37. Miss Lo: John↑
38. ()
39. Talia: Johnny Depp↑!
40. ()
41. Miss Lo: c'est marqué- (.) c'est Johnny Depp là↑
42. [(children laughing)]
43. Class: non:;
44. Miss Lo: [il ressemble à Johnny Depp↑
45. Leila: [maîtresse je vois pas
46. ()
47. Leila: chur-↑ ((trying to read the title of the
48. book))
49. Matilda: do you like Johnny Depp↑
50. Talia: I love him!
51. Matilda: ah! ((laughing))
52. Karen: ah c'est John Chater-
53. ()
54. Leila: john château gâteau
55. Miss Lo: ben c'est un nom euh: un peu anglais ça
56. (.) comment tu dirais en anglais ça↑
57. Karen: john
58. (.)
59. Leila: oh là là
60. Karen: chater (.)
61. Miss Lo: ouais (.) chaterton
62. Karen: chaterton
63. Miss Lo: alors c'est pas chaterton hein (.) là
64. c'est un mot anglais alors attention (.)
65. en fait en français 'on' comme ça (.) ça
66. fait on ((writing on the black board))
67. donc si c'était en français on dirait
68. 'john chaterton' (.) mais comme on pense
69. que c'est un américain
70. Matilda: c'est un livre anglais
71. Miss Lo: oui mais le livre il est en français
72. Matilda: oh
73. ((children laughing))
74. Miss Lo: et bien on va dire (.) john↑
75. Karen: chaterton
76. Miss Lo: chaterton voilà
77. ((children laughing with T))
78. Miss Lo: on va prononcer comme Karen d'accord↑

--27:20--
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--29:20--

32. Miss Lo: Karen tu as raison (.) par exemple c'est
33. quand quelqu'un disparaît (.) quand
34. quelqu'un disparaît (.) comment on dit
35. quand quelqu'un est perdu (.) quand
36. quelqu'un est enlevé
37. (.)
38. Miss Lo: kidnappé
39. (.)
40. Miss Lo: ça existe en anglais ça kidnappé↑
41. Karen: oui (.) kidnap
42. Miss Lo: ah ben voilà (.) tu vois c'est pareil (.)
43. kidnapper (.) et bien on appelle un
détective pour faire quoi↑
45. Talia: il va chercher la personne qui s'est
46. perdue
47. Miss Lo: voilà (.) il va faire une enquête (.) il
48. va aller à la recherche de la personne qui
49. est perdue (.) et il ya des films qu'on
50. fait comme ça avec ce genre d'histoire et
51. qu'on appelle comment↑
52. (.)
Karen: des films euh:

Talia: como se dice de misterio

Cristina: ah ouais (.) c'est des trucs
des trucs (.) c'est une enquête policière (.) une enquête c'est-

Miss Lo: donc ça c'est quoi ce genre de films

Miss Lo: [des films policiers:]

Talia: [como se dice de misterio] (.)

Miss Lo: vous ne connaissez [pas les films policiers]

Cristina: ah ouais (.) c'est des trucs

Miss Lo: ça fait peur

Talia: maîtresse comment on dit-

Miss Lo: [des films policiers:]

Talia: et après il vole des enfants

Miss Lo: donc ça c'est quoi ce genre de films

Miss Lo: [des films policiers:]

Talia: [como se dice de misterio] (.)

Miss Lo: vous ne connaissez [pas les films policiers]

Cristina: ah ouais (.) c'est des trucs

Miss Lo: ça fait peur

Talia: maîtresse comment on dit-

Miss Lo: donc ça c'est quoi ce genre de films

Talia: [como se dice de misterio] (.)

Miss Lo: vous ne connaissez [pas les films policiers]

Cristina: ah ouais (.) c'est des trucs

Miss Lo: ça fait peur

Talia: maîtresse comment on dit-

Miss Lo: donc ça c'est quoi ce genre de films

Talia: [como se dice de misterio] (.)

Miss Lo: vous ne connaissez [pas les films policiers]

Cristina: ah ouais (.) c'est des trucs

Miss Lo: ça fait peur

Talia: maîtresse comment on dit-

Miss Lo: donc ça c'est quoi ce genre de films

Talia: [como se dice de misterio] (.)

Miss Lo: vous ne connaissez [pas les films policiers]

Cristina: ah ouais (.) c'est des trucs

Miss Lo: ça fait peur

Talia: maîtresse comment on dit-

Miss Lo: donc ça c'est quoi ce genre de films

Talia: [como se dice de misterio] (.)

Miss Lo: vous ne connaissez [pas les films policiers]

Cristina: ah ouais (.) c'est des trucs

Miss Lo: ça fait peur

Talia: maîtresse comment on dit-

Miss Lo: donc ça c'est quoi ce genre de films

Talia: [como se dice de misterio] (.)

Miss Lo: vous ne connaissez [pas les films policiers]

Cristina: ah ouais (.) c'est des trucs

Miss Lo: ça fait peur

Talia: maîtresse comment on dit-

Miss Lo: donc ça c'est quoi ce genre de films

Talia: [como se dice de misterio] (.)

Miss Lo: vous ne connaissez [pas les films policiers]

Cristina: ah ouais (.) c'est des trucs

Miss Lo: ça fait peur

Talia: maîtresse comment on dit-

Miss Lo: donc ça c'est quoi ce genre de films

Talia: [como se dice de misterio] (.)

Miss Lo: vous ne connaissez [pas les films policiers]
Miss Lo introduces the label ‘bande dessinée’.

---36:32---
1. Miss Lo: il y a des cases oui
2. Leila: et toutes les images euh (.). il a le chat
3. (.)
4. Cristina: ya le chat qui marche
5. Leila: et tous les images
6. Miss Lo: oui il y a plein d’images (.). mais en fait
7. (.). regardez (.). est-ce que ya le texte
8. qui est écrit à coté
9. ?:
10. Miss Lo: il est écrit où le texte
11. Cristina: il est comme ça
12. (.)
13. Miss Lo: il est écrit ici (.). avec des petites
14. flèches qui partent de la bouche des
15. personnages (.). ça s’appelle comment?
16. Talia: ah! (.). es un historieta!
17. Leila: que (.). com[me (.). qui parle
18. Karen: [en anglais on dit [comics
19. Miss Lo: [voilà
20. m: que les personnages parlent-
21. Miss Lo: voilà (.). voilà (.). en anglais on dit]
22. Karen: comics
23. Miss Lo: comics
24. Leila: car on fait comme ça (.). le cercle c’est
25. pour qu’ils parlent (.). quand on fait
26. comme (.). euh (.). tout comme ça ((drawing
27. in the air)) c’est comme qu’elles pensent
28. Miss Lo: voilà (.). en anglais elle dit Karen (.).
29. ah en anglais on dit comics
30. Talia: en espag[noi historieta
31. Leila: [en espagnol historieta
32. Talia: oh:: (.). comics aussi
33. Miss Lo: historieta ça s’écoute comment?
34. Leila: Talia
35. ((Miss Lo writes on the board))
36. Cristina: [i
37. Leila: [h - i - s - t - o - r - [-i - e - t (.).]te non
38. non (.). e- est pas e
39. Karen: [histoire!
40. Kenji: [historia
41. Miss Lo: ah (.). é c’est quoi? (.). e
42. Leila: e
43. Miss Lo: ah d’accord
44. Kenji: histo- ri- e- ta
45. Miss Lo: [et en japonais (.). Kenji?
46. (.). en japonais?
47. Kenji: manga
48. (.)
49. Miss Lo: hein?
50. ?:
51. Miss Lo: manga ((Miss Lo writes it on the board))
52. (.)
53. Matilda: manga manga ((playing with the accent))
54. Cristina: manga
55. Talia: en japonais maîtresse! ((A asks T if the
56. word çan be written in the Japanese
57. alphabet))
58. (.)
59. Kenji: oui (.). manga
Karen: c’est comme mangea

Talia: Kenji! (.) écris en japonais

Miss Lo: au sénégal il y a des choses comme ça↑

Miss Lo: est-ce que ya des journaux↑ (. ) moi [je sais qu’il y en a

Kenji: [non

Miss Lo: il y a des petits journaux avec des petites histoires avec des images et des [( (]

Talia: [comment on écrit↑

Kenji: quoi↑

Talia: [écris en japonais

Miss Lo: [comme euh (. ) comment ça s’appelle↑ (. )

Tu connais samba le nom des journaux pour les enfants avec des histoires↑

Talia: [écris ici↑

Kenji: [non

Miss Lo: non t’as jamais vu↓

Leila: quel est esto Talia↑ (38:25)

Talia: lo que hizo acá

Miss Lo: chut!

Talia: en el examen

Miss Lo: [d’accord (. ) chut! (. ) eu (. )

Matilda (. ) est-ce que en Lituania vous avez des histoires comme ça là↑

Kenji: Sénégal

Talia: comics

Miss Lo: non

Leila: ¡qué esto Talia!

Talia: en el examen

Karen: elle sait pas

Miss Lo: non↑

Talia: oh elle a oublié tout!

Miss Lo: et en français donc personne sait comment ça s’appelle en français ça↑

Miss Lo: non↓

Leila: que esto Talia

Miss Lo: chut!

Miss Lo: non (. ) comment ça s’appelle [en français↑

Leila: "istoria"↑

Miss Lo: non

Crstina: des phrases↑

Miss Lo: non!

Talia: non::

Miss Lo: comment ça s’appelle en français les livres [comme ça avec les-

Karen: `/istoria/`

Miss Lo: non

Crstina: des phrases↑

Miss Lo: non!

Talia: non::

Miss Lo: comment ça s’appelle en français les livres [comme ça avec les-

Kenji: `/istorita/`

Crstina: des bulles!

Miss Lo: les bulles ouais (. ) les bulles c’est pour quand on parle (. ) ça s’appelle des bulles les- les- comme ça la (. ) ça s’appelle des bandes dessinées!

All: bandes dessinées

(Miss Lo writes on the board)

Miss Lo: des bandes dessinées

(Miss Lo writes on the board)

Miss Lo: alors dessinées (. ) pour quoi dessinées↑

Leila: parce qu’il y a des dessins

Miss Lo: parce qu’il y a beaucoup plus de dessins que dans↑

Leila: une histoire

Miss Lo: un album ou un petit euh:. (. ) roman (. )

tres bien donc c’est une bande dessinée

Kenji: bande dessinée

Miss Lo: alors...
Teacher-led sequences on Little Red Riding Hood.

--41:18--
((children have just been given the document and start reading bits of it while Miss Lo keeps distributing the document to the rest of the class))

29. Leila: 'détective' (.).
30. Talia: sale (.).
31. (.)
32. Leila: hermanos y detectives
33. (.)
34. Talia: hermanos.
35. Leila: y detectives.
36. Miss Lo: alors on va prendre (.) alors (.) la première page.
37. (.)
38. Miss Lo: qu’est-ce qu’on voit (.) Leila.
39. Leila: euh (.) on voit une petite fille (.) mais c’est pas une fille (.) c’est comme une souris.
40. Miss Lo: ouais (.). c’est une petite souris.
41. Leila: (.) le détective (.) et une madame qui frappe à la porte.
42. (.)
43. Miss Lo: voilà (.) le détective il est où.
44. (.)
45. Leila: il est tout dans la (.) dans la:: (.) officina!
46. Miss Lo: dans son bureau.
47. (.)
48. Miss Lo: hein.
49. (.)
50. Miss Lo: il est dans son bureau (.) et puis (.) qui est-ce qui arrive (.) qu’est-ce qui se passe tout d’un coup.

--42:08--

Teacher-led sequence. One child does not understand the expression “je vous en prie” and Miss Lo along with other classmates are trying to explain it.

--45:49--

1. Karen: après elle dit (.) ’retrouve-la (.) je vou-
2. Miss Lo: ça veut dire quoi ça?
3. Leila: je vous en prie (.) comme (.) euh
4. Cristina: ça veut dire si tu-
5. Miss Lo: chut chut chut!
7. (.)
8. Cristina: non
9. Miss Lo: ah d’accord (.) [non mais la c’est pas pareil
10. Cristina: [maîtresse (.) maîtresse!
11. (.)
12. Cristina: ça veut dire
13. Miss Lo: chut (.) yesiça deux secondes (.) alors quand on dit (.) merci (.) [je vous en prie.
14. (.)
15. Kenji: [de rien
16. Miss Lo: ça veut dire (.) de rien (.) euh (.) c’est pas grave.
17. Leila: ah (.) je vous en prie.
18. Miss Lo: tandis que là c’est-
19. (.)
20. Leila: oh (.) s’il vous plait::
26. Miss Lo: oui (. ) je vous en prie: faite tout
27. [pour retrouver ma fille
28. Leila: [Talia (. ) sabes que es ( . ) por favor
29. Talia: sì
30. Leila: algo así (46:18)
31. (. )
32. Talia: [te lo supplico
33. Miss Lo: [non (. ) c'est plus que ça (. ) c'est plus
34. que ça je vous en prie
35. Miss Lo: c'est plus que por favor
36. Leila: "te lo supplico"
37. Miss Lo: c'est-
38. (. )
39. Talia: te lo supplico
40. Miss Lo: voilà! (. ) exactement alors (. ) c'est une
41. (. ) supplication en français (. ) une
42. supplication (. ) tu vois ça ressemble
43. Leila: s'il vous plait!
44. Miss Lo: s'il vous plait je vous en prie faites
45. tout pour sauver [ma fille (. ) sinon je
46. vais mourir de chagrin
47. Kenji: 
48. Miss Lo: voyez (. ) c'est quelque chose comme ça
49. (. ) c'est pas euh (. ) s'il te plait! tu
50. peux trouver ma fille merci bien (. ) c'est
51. pas pareil (. ) Hein (. ) c'est beaucoup
52. plus fort (. ) alors! (. ) Matilda...
53. 
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--57:15--

1. Talia: maîtresse (. ) pourquoi c'est (. ) 'la jeune
2. fille en rouge'↑
3. (. )
4. Cristina: parce que c'est une fille qui elle est
5. habillée en rouge ( ( )
6. Miss Lo: [parce que c'est un- c'est
7. un (. ) comment dire (. )
8. Karen: young (. ) a young girl
9. Cristina: tu mets un chapeau ( )
10. Talia: mais aussi il y a (. ) jeune
11. Miss Lo: parce que est-ce qu'on (. ) est-ce qu'on
12. sait son âge↑
13. Cristina: non
14. (.2)
15. Miss Lo: est-ce qu'on sait son âge↑
16. Talia: non
17. Miss Lo: est-ce qu'on nous dit qu'elle est toute
18. petite (. ) qu'elle a sept ans huit ans
19. Cristina: non
20. Miss Lo: non (. ) peut-être qu'elle a- (. ) elle
21. pourrait avoir quel âge↑
22. Kenji: très petite
23. Leila: trois ans↑
24. Kenji: trois ans↑
25. Miss Lo: trois ans c'est petit (. ) mais elle
26. pourrait avoir (. ) une jeune fille elle a
27. quelle âge une jeune fille
28. Cristina: euh quatorze!
29. Miss Lo: oui quatorze ans! (. ) douze ans
30. Cristina: treize ans
31. Talia: [haz la ( ) niña en rojo (58:00)
32. Miss Lo: [on ne sait pas en fait (. ) on ne sait pas
33. (. )
34. Miss Lo: tres bien (. ) alors juste avant que je
35. vous donne la feuille
36. Leila: no ( ) significa euh
Miss Lo: chut!
Leila: también
Miss Lo: je vous dis pas la faim pour l'instant

---58:19---
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Children have to colour in red all the images of the little girl. Leila and Cristina explain the instructions to Talia.

---01:04:50---
19. Talia: que tengo que dibujar↑
20. (.)
21. Leila: tene- tenemos que pintar toda las cosas
22. Cristina: de: la nenita ((south american term)) en
23. Talia: ah
24. Cristina: la niña
25. (.)
26. Talia: ça aussi c’est de la petite fille↑
27. Cristina: oui
28. Talia: et ça↑
29. Cristina: y ya cayó esto
30. (.)
31. Leila: esto (.), esto (.), esto (.), esto (.), esto (.), esto
32. Matilda: esto (.), esto
33. (.)
34. Leila: bueno
35. Cristina: el otro que cayó (.), y este (.), esto
36. (.2)
37. Kenji: petite fille ça aussi
38. Leila: quoi↑
39. (.)
40. Kenji: ça
41. Leila: je sais pas je sais pas ((singing))

---01:05:20---
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---00:45---
1. Hakim: c’est quoi ça↑ ((pointing to the recorder))
2. Researcher: ça c’est pour enregistrer
3. Hakim: ah
4. Researcher: tu vois (.), donc la il y a un micro
5. (.)
6. Hakim: pour écouter et-
7. Researcher: qui va dans le fil (.), et qui va dans la machine la (.), tu vois (.), et après moi je mets un casque (.), et puis je peux écouter
8. (. tu vois (.)) c’est pour mon travail
9. (.)
10. Amkoulel ça c’est bien
11. Researcher: c’est bien hein↑
12. (.)
13. Amkoulel toutes les classes tu vas ou-
14. Researcher: non (.), juste la clin
15. (.)
16. Amkoulel t’as été (hôpitaux)
17. Hakim: l’autre jour je t’ai vu avec madame
18. (.)
19. Amkoulel au puteau (.), j’ai un frère (.), il
20. Hakim: l’autre jour je t’ai vu avec madame
21. (.)
22. Amkoulel s’appelle alsam
23. (.3)
24. Researcher: ah oui (.), c’était l’année dernière alors
25. Amkoulel j’ai un frère (.), il travaille a
26. (hôpitaux)
28. Researcher: a l’hôpital?
29. Amkouel il s’appelle massur
30. Researcher: et qu’est-ce qu’il fait a l’hôpital?
31. Amkouel non (.) il travaille en clin
32. Researcher: en clin
33. Amkouel oui
34. (.)
35. Researcher: ton frère
36. Amkouel oui c’est mon frère (.) a (puteaux)

--01:59--
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--25:10--
1. Miss Lo: j’aimerais bien qu’on explique à Karen
2. (.) parce que Karen était absente (.)
3. Miss Lo: j’aimerais bien que vous lui (.) que
4. quelqu’un essaye de lui expliquer ce qu’on
5. a fait l’autre jour en grammaire (.) c’est
6. à dire on avait fait– on avait (.) on
7. avait vu qu’en français on disait
8. (.)
9. Piotr: lui
10. (.)
11. Miss Lo: on dit– (.) la–
12. Leila: leur leur
13. Miss Lo: là c’est moi qui parle d’accord (.) on
14. avait vu qu’en français on disait (.) je
15. (.) donne (.) un cadeau ((Miss Lo writes on
16. the board))
17. Cristina: à mon frère
18. Andrea: à mon frère
19. (.)
20. Kenji: à ma soeur ((writes on the board))
21. Miss Lo: à mon frère ((writes on the board))
22. (.)
23. Miss Lo: on avait vu qu’en français on disait je
24. Cristina: donne
25. Kenji: donne
26. Miss Lo: donne
27. Kenji: le [cadeau(.] un cadeau
28. Miss Lo: [un cadeau(.] à mon frère (.) et que
29. (.) pour ne pas toujours répéter à mon frère
30. (.) on pouvait aussi dire (.) je
31. Andrea: [lui
32. Cristina: [lui donne
33. Miss Lo: je
34. Kenji: [lui
35. Andrea: [lui
36. Miss Lo: lui donne
37. Kenji: donne
38. Miss Lo: donne
39. Andrea: donne
40. Kenji: un
41. Andrea: un cadeau
42. Miss Lo: un [cadeau
43. Kenji: [un cadeau
44. (.)
45. Miss Lo: d'accord]
46. Kenji: [oui
47. Andrea: [non (.) parce que lui remplace a mon
48. frère Karen
49. Piotr: non (.) yesica
50. (.)
51. Andrea: [non c'est Karen
52. Miss Lo: [donc miçaela (.) est-ce que tu peux
53. expli- est-ce que tu peux venir au tableau
54. (.) viens voir
55. Kenji: viens voir (.) c'est leur c'est
56. Miss Lo: parce que justement on va lui demander en
57. anglais parce qu'on avait fait dans toutes
58. les langues (.) on avait regarder dans
toutes les langues dans quel ordre on
59. disait les choses (.). et on s'était
60. aperçu que (.) ça changeait (.). alors
61. donc vas-y (.) montre lui les deux phrases
62. (.) et écoute bien
63. (.3)
64. Kenji: ( )
65. Miss Lo: chut!
66. Andrea: je donne un cadeau a mon frère (.). et
67. aussi (.). je lui donne un cadeau ((reading
68. the blackboard))
69. (.1)
70. Miss Lo: [donc (.). a la place de frère on mettait]
71. Andrea: lui donne
72. Miss Lo: on mettait lui
73. Andrea: lui
74. Miss Lo: et qu'est-ce qui se passait par rapport a
75. cette phrase là'
76. Kenji: change!
77. (.3)
78. Miss Lo: a la place
79. Piotr: on change
80. Andrea: et on change de [place
81. Kenji: [frère et lui
82. Miss Lo: voilà (.) le mot qui ( . ) le mot qui
83. parlait du frère (.). c'est-à-dire le mot
84. 'lui' qui remplace le frère (.). du coup
85. (.). il change de place (.) parce que la on
86. dit 'je donne un cadeau a mon frère' (.). mais
87. quand on dit 'je lui! Donne un cadeau' (.)
88. le mot 'lui' il est tout de suite a cote
89. du sujet (.) il est tout de suite a cote
90. de 'je' (.). alors on avait regarde dans
91. plusieurs langues (.). on avait vu qu'en
92. peul c'était comment (.) euh (.) mon can
93. (.) comment c'était' (.) je donne'
94. (.)
95. Amkoulel
96. Piotr: "mon cana cala"
97. (.)
98. Miss Lo: c'était comment' (.) redites moi la
99. Kenji: je donne
100. Miss Lo: miçaela va á ta place merci
101. Kenji: je donne un cadeau(.) ses frères
102. Miss Lo: attendez (.) chut! (.) c'était
Amkoulel (          )
Miss Lo:  le premier mot c'est
Amkoulel (.)
Miss Lo:  mioca (.) non
Amkoulel (.)
Miss Lo:  dis-moi
Amkoulel (          )
Miss Lo:  biaça
Amkoulel (          )
Miss Lo:  monome cadeau
Piotr:  "monome cadeau"
Miss Lo:  ah (.) c'est pas comme l'autre jour! (.)
ça a change (.) l'autre jour vous m'avez dit (.) monome cadeau
de mioca (.) non
Miss Lo:  mioca (.) non
Piotr:  monome cadeau
Miss Lo:  dis-moi
Amkoulel (           )
Miss Lo:  biaça
Amkoulel (           )
Miss Lo:  monome cadeau
de mioca (.) non
Piotr:  monome cadeau
Miss Lo:  dis-moi je m'en rappelle plus (.)
etait je donne c'est ça (.) monome
de mioca (.) non
Samba:  (          )
Leila:  /preznə/ (.)
Miss Lo:  chut!
Samba:  (          )
Miss Lo:  et mon frère (.) c'était comment en
peul (.)
Samba:  (          )
Miss Lo:  ah oui (.) était monome
de mioca (.) non
Samba:  (          )
Miss Lo:  cadeau (.)
Leila:  monome
Samba:  oui
Miss Lo:  cadeau (.)
Leila:  monome
Samba:  oui
Miss Lo:  cadeau était en français (.)
de mioca (.)
Samba:  oui
Miss Lo:  cadeau était en français (.)
de mioca (.) cadeau ([writes on the board])
Kenji:  frère aussi!
Miss Lo:  monome
Samba:  oui
Miss Lo:  monome était mon frère
Samba:  oui
Miss Lo:  c'est ça hein?
Leila:  monome
Miss Lo:  on avait vu qu'en peul était (.)
dit (.) monome (.) 'cadeau' (.)
Piotr:  monome
Leila:  non (.) monome
Miss Lo:  euh 'monome cadeau monome' (.) était à
mon frère était un peu comme en français
de mioca (.) non (.) monome cadeau
Piotr:  monome
de mioca (.) non (.) monome
Miss Lo:  euh 'monome cadeau monome' (.) était à
mon frère était un peu comme en français
de mioca (.) non (.) monome cadeau (.) dans le même ordre (.) d'abord la
personne (.) après qu'est-ce qu'elle fait (.)
dit (.) la personne qu'est-ce qu'elle fait (.)
de mioca (.) non (.) monome cadeau (.)
Leila: c'est (.) comme en français
Miss Lo: comme en français
Leila: oui
Miss Lo: puisque (.) redis-nous en espagnol!
Leila: yo (.) le doy (.) un regalo a mi hermano
Miss Lo: voilà (.) alors on était pas d'accord sur le doy
Kenji: oui
Miss Lo: parce que le doy ça ressemble à lui donne
Leila: là donc euh (.) est-ce que c'est possible
de dire (.) yo- yo (.) comment?
Cristina: [yo doy un regalo-
Leila: [mais je l'ai demande a ma- ma maman et elle me dit que oui on dit (.) yo le doy
Miss Lo: le doy (.) d'accord
Leila: oui
Miss Lo: yo le doy
Leila: un regalo
Miss Lo: un regalo un cadeau
Leila: a mi hermano
Miss Lo: a mi hermano
Piotr: un regalo /prezento/
Kenji: yo ( )
Piotr: un regalo
Miss Lo: on avait vu (.) en lituanien est-ce qu'on avait vu en lituanien↑
Matilda: [oui
Leila: [oui
Miss Lo: alors était comment en lituanien↑ (.)
(.)
Piotr: c'est comme espagnol
Matilda: je dis?
Miss Lo: oui
Kenji: comme espagnol oui (.)
Matilda: je (.)
Miss Lo: ouais
(.)
Matilda: donne
Miss Lo: ouais
(.)
Kenji: un cadeau
Leila: un cadeau
(.)
Matilda: c'est comment
Miss Lo: vas-y (.) je↑ (.) donc 'je' c'était
comment en lituanien↑
Matilda: je donne (((laughing)))
(.)
Miss Lo: hm hm
Matilda: un cadeau pour mon frère
Miss Lo: c'est comme ça qu'on dit↑ (.) alors dis-le moi en lituanien↑ (.) c'est pareil alors
((writes on the board))
(.)
Miss Lo: je donne un cadeau pour mon frère↑ (.)
c'est comme ça qu'on dit en lituanien
Matilda: oui et (.) et euh (.) il y a une différence
Miss Lo: ah
Matilda: le ( ) (.2) echoma (.2) je donne
mon frère un cadeau
Miss Lo: ah!
Matilda: ça aussi!
Miss Lo: ah! (.) on peut aussi dire ah ouais (.) on peut
peut aussi changer l'ordre (.) on peut
aussi dire (.) je donne à mon frère un cadeau (.) c'est ça (.)

Miss Lo: d'accord (.) et alors (.) en japonais (.)

était surtout en japonais que c'était différent (.) en japonais on disait comment euh Kenji

Kenji: euh (.) je (.)

Leila: je (.) frère (.)

Kenji: euh (.) attend

Piotr: frère (.) [je frère

Leila: [frère donne cadeau

Piotr: je frère donne cadeau

(.)

Leila: [non (.) je frère cadeau donne

Cristina: [donne cadeau

(.)

Cristina: oui

Kenji: attend

(.)

Miss Lo: moi j'attends hein (.) ya pas de problème

Piotr: oui (.) je (.) frère (.) [cadeau(.) donne

Kenji: [euh (.).je frère

(.)

Cristina: donne

Miss Lo: chut!

Leila: cadeau donne

Piotr: cadeau donne

Kenji: euh attends

(.2)

Piotr: cadeau donne

(.)

Kenji: cadeau donne

(.)

Miss Lo: était quoi en (.)

Leila: ça[deau donne

Piotr: [je frère cadeau donne

(.)

Miss Lo: donc était (.) le mot qui veut dire 'je'

Leila: frère (.) cadeau donne

Miss Lo: voilà (.) je regarde j'ai marque

Kenji: attends

Miss Lo: moi j'avais marque qu'en japonais était

je (.) alors après était 'a mon frère

(.)

Piotr: ça- cadeau donne

Miss Lo: cadeau(.) et (.) le fait de dire qu'est-ce qu'on fait avec le cadeau on le donne

était à la fin ((writes on the board))

(.)

Miss Lo: Kenji c'était ça

Kenji: oui (.) beaucoup japon

Miss Lo: Hein

Kenji: euh (.) je (.3)

Miss Lo: ben dit-le en japonais

Kenji: euh (.) je (.). je cadeau(.) cadeau frère

donne beaucoup

Miss Lo: ah (.) on peut changer en fait (.) on peut dire je cadeau(.)

Leila: frère

(.)

Miss Lo: donne c'est toujours à la fin c'est ça

(.)

Miss Lo: et c'est ça qu'on peut changer

Kenji: oui

Miss Lo: je donne un cadeau à mon frère ou je donne

à mon frère un cadeau (.) en français

aussi on peut dire je donne à mon frère un cadeau (.) mais on dira plutôt je donne un
Leila: cadeau à mon frère (.) hein?

Cristina: il a dit en japonais maîtresse

Miss Lo: si tu dis ça en japonais (.) chut! (.) on écoute! (.) ça fait quoi?

Kenji: euh (.) watashi <I>

Piotr: watashi <I>

Kenji: watashi wa onichan ni purezento wo watasu <L brother to present particle give>

Miss Lo: ah (.) prezento c'est cadeau!

Piotr: [oui!

Kenji: [oui!

Miss Lo: ah! (.) c'est marrant

Leila: comme en anglais

Miss Lo: et watashi <to give> c'est pour je donne

Piotr: /prezent/

Kenji: je donne est watasu

Piotr: /suæsi/

Miss Lo: chut chut chut (.3)

Karen: I give (.) a present to my brother ((Kenji slams the door))

Miss Lo: donc en anglais (.) Kenji est-ce que tu peux faire doucement la (.) je suis pas contre le fait que vous sortiez mais c'est doucement voilà (.) hein?

Leila: hahahaah (laughing)

Miss Lo: merci (.) alors (.) on va dire (.) donc (.) on va dire (.) d'abord quoi alors (.) si c'était avec le français ça va être comment (.) I give c'est quoi alors?

Karen: c'est je donne

Miss Lo: c'est je donne (.) alors ça va être (.) 'je' après ça va être 'donne' (.) après (.2)

Karen: euh (.3) je donne (.) un cadeau(.) a mon frère

Miss Lo: en anglais

Karen: I (.) give my brother a present

Miss Lo: ah (.) my brother c'est plutôt a mon frère (.) {{writes on the board}}

Piotr: present (.) comme en polonais et en (.) japonais

Miss Lo: c'est ça?

Karen: oui

Miss Lo: d'accord (.3)

Piotr: presento (.) present (.) et [

Miss Lo: [donc vous avez vu que dans la plupart des langues on dit (.) dans la plupart des langues ici la dont on a parlé (.) on dit d'abord 'je' (.) on dit qu'est-ce qu'on fait (.) on
381. donne (.) et après le cadeau a mon frère
382. ou a mon frère le cadeau(.) et à la fin
383. il y a qu'en japonais que le donner c'est
384. à la fin (.) mais alors maintenant ce que
385. je veux savoir
--34:22--
386. Miss Lo: parce que ça on ne savait pas (.) on avait
387. pas vu ça la dernière fois (.) est-ce que
388. (.) on a aussi ce système (.) pour pas
389. répéter toujours à mon frère je donne un
390. cadeau à mon frère je donne une montre à
391. mon frère (.) donc on peut dire je donne
392. un cadeau à mon frère (.) je lui donne une
393. montre
394. ?; oui
395. Miss Lo: d'accord (.) pour pas répéter tout le
396. temps à mon frère à mon frère à mon frère
397. (.) est-ce que ça ça existe dans vos
398. langues (.) alors par exemple
399. Leila: moi oui
400. Miss Lo: en polonais (.) est-ce qu'on peut dire (.)
401. en polonais c'est pareil c'est ça (.) je
402. donne un cadeau à mon frère?
403. Piotr: oui
404. Miss Lo: et est-ce qu'on- (.) on a quelque chose
405. comme ça (.) qui ressemble à ça qui est
406. (.) je (.) lui donne un cadeau
407. Piotr: [oui
408. Piotr: oui
409. Miss Lo: ça existe en polonais?
410. Piotr: oui
411. Miss Lo: vas-y alors (.) comment on va dire en
412. polonais?
413. Piotr: euh (.) ja (35:03)
414. Miss Lo: ja ([writing on the board])
415. Piotr: jemu
416. Miss Lo: jemu c'est lui hein (.) jemu c'est lui
417. ([writing on the board])
418. Piotr: daye
419. Miss Lo: daye c'est donne ouais ([writing on the
420. board])
421. Piotr: prezent
422. Miss Lo: prezent ([writing on the board]) (.) vous
423. avez vu c'est rigolo parce que en- (.)
424. c'est prezentno en (.)
425. Leila: oui
426. Piotr: hhmm ([laughing])
427. Miss Lo: en ja[ponais
428. Cristina: [et en anglais
429. Miss Lo: present en- (.) en anglais (.) prezent en-
430. en (.) polonais (.) donc la on a jemu (.)
431. jemo c'est comme lui
432. Piotr: jemu
433. Miss Lo: jemu (.) jemu (.) pardon
434. Cristina: jemu c'est quoi
435. Miss Lo: excuse moi
436. Leila: hahaa ([laughing])
437. (.)
438. Miss Lo: en polonais on a ça (.) est-ce que en
439. espagnol on a le même système
440. Cristina: euh oui
441. Miss Lo: alors fais voir (.) on va voir si c'est
442. ça
443. Leila: [yo
444. (.)
445. Cristina: yo doy
446. Leila: yo
447. (.)
448. Piotr: yo le
449. Miss Lo: ouais
450. Leila: le doy
Leila: le c'est lui
Piotr: le
Miss Lo: ah!
Cristina: le doy
Leila: le
Miss Lo: d'accord le ((writing on the board)) (.).
Miss Lo: alors la c'est le (.) alors là c'est le (.).
le (.) et là-bas c'est (.). jemu
Piotr: oui
Miss Lo: jemu (.). vous l'écrivez avec les lettres
du russe ou pas?
Piotr: euh non
Matilda: non!
Piotr: I (.). j
Miss Lo: ouais
Piotr: euh (.). e
Miss Lo: ouais
Piotr: m
Miss Lo: ouais
Piotr: ou- u (.).u
Miss Lo: comme ça^1
Leila: jemu
Miss Lo: donc en polonais-
Piotr: jemu
Miss Lo: en polonais (.) on a (.) alors en français
on a lui (.) en polonais on a
Cristina: jemu
Miss Lo: jemu
Miss Lo: en (.) en espagnol on a a (.) le (.) c'est
ça^1 (.) le (.) et on le met a la même
place on dit^1 (.) yo
Miss Lo: [le (.) doy
Leila: [le (.) doy (.) un regalo (.) un regalo
Miss Lo: un regalo (.) ça marche (.) donc c'est
pareil en espagnol (.) alors maintenant en
peul (.) est-ce qu'on a ça (.) en peul
Miss Lo: est-ce qu'on peut dire (.) au lieu de dire
(.). je donne un cadeau a mon frère (.)
est-ce qu'on peut dire je (.) lui (.)
donner un cadeau
Miss Lo: non^↑ (.) on dit toujours- il y a une- on
dit je donne un cadeau a mon frère^↑ (.) il
y a que cette façon de la de dire
Samba: oui
Miss Lo: et il y a pas une façon pour dire je (.)
il y a pas une autre façon de dire ça^1 si
on veut donner un cadeau à son frère (.)
on peut pas le dire autrement^↑
Samba: oui
Miss Lo: ouais (.). avec lui
Miss Lo: il y a pas un mot qui remplace mon frère^↑
(.). non^↑
Miss Lo: on dit toujours je- (.) donc on va dire je
donner un cadeau a mon frère je donne une
Cristina: montre à mon frère je donne un (.)
Miss Lo: un ballon à mon frère (.) on va pas dire
je lui! Donne (.)
Miss Lo: non (.). d’accord (.) bon (.) alors voilà
( .) en lituanien ya ça! ( .) on dit
comment alors
Miss Lo: donc c’est a dire ( .) c’est à dire euh
Matilda: ( .) Matilda
((children talking))
Karen: y en a un pour le garçon et un pour la
fille
Miss Lo: ah un pour le garçon et un pour la fille
(.) on va voir ça après alors ( .) on va
voir ça après ( .) euh ( .) donc comment
tu vas dire en lituanien ( .) je lui
donne un cadeau
Matilda: aš
Miss Lo: ouais
Matilda: jam duodu dovana (38:28)
Miss Lo: alors attends ( .) iaš c’est je↑
Miss Lo: c’est ça↑
Matilda: aš!
Miss Lo: aš c’est toi ( .) d’accord ( .) jam c’est
quoi↑ ( .) c’est lui↑
Matilda: oui
Miss Lo: ah d’accord ( .) daš↑ ( .) c’est donne↑
Matilda: dovana
Miss Lo: oui
Piotr: dovana
Matilda: duodu c’est donne
Miss Lo: ouais (.). duodu c’est donne ( .) et dovana
c’est un cadeau
Matilda: ouais
Miss Lo: t’as vu je suis forte en lituanien hein
(.). ça y est
Matilda: hahaha ((laughing))
Miss Lo: donc lituanien (.). on va avoir en
lituanien euh (.). ((writing on the
board)) la c’est comment le mot t’as dit↑
Matilda: y en a deux
Miss Lo: ouais alors on va en prendre un d’abord
(.). celui que tu as dit pour mon frère (.).
etait↑ (.). jam↑
(.).
Cristina: jam
Matilda: jam
Miss Lo: jam ça s’écrit comment↑ (.).
Cristina: j
Matilda: j (.). am
Miss Lo: a- m↑ (.). d’accord
Piotr: maîtresse c’est pas emu (.). emu
Leila: [c’est jemu
Piotr: [tu as écrit emu (.). jemu (.). jemu
Miss Lo: ah oui pardon (.). excuse moi (.). voilà (.).
alors maintenant (.). en anglais ( .) ça va
être comment en anglais Karen (.). je lui
donne un cadeau (.). si on veut pas dire
toujours a mon frère↑
Piotr: his!
Miss Lo: comment je vais dire (.). je vais dire (.).
je lui donne un (cadeau
Piotr: my my

Karen: I give

Miss Lo: donc I

Piotr: [his

Miss Lo: c’est je ((writing on the board))

après (.)

Karen: give him

Miss Lo: ah! (.) c’est give him (.) give c’est

Karen: give c’est

Miss Lo: donne

Miss Lo: donne

Cristina: yes je savais

Miss Lo: I give

Miss Lo: {{(children laughing)}

Miss Lo: him

Karen: him

Miss Lo: a present (.) euh les autres regardez ce

très intéressant (.) parce que (.) on va

marquer l’anglais ici et le français

{{(writing on the board)}

Miss Lo: qu’est-ce qui se passe avec l’anglais la

(.) regardez un peu

{{(writing on the board)}

Miss Lo: I (.). regardez les autres (.) les autres

c’est je lui donne (.) je jemu (.) da-

Piotr: daye

Miss Lo: daye (40:15)

(.

Cristina: le doy

Miss Lo: comment c’est je?

Leila: yo

Miss Lo: yo le doy

Piotr: [yo (.) yo le doy

Miss Lo: alors en anglais regardez ce qui se passe

c’est I (.) give him (.) qu’est-ce qui

change?

Piotr: I [give

Leila: [que on dit pas (.) je lui (.) on dit je
donne lui

Miss Lo: voilà (.) alors la dans toutes les langues

qu’on a vues (.) sauf le peul parce que le

peul on a pas vu (.) mais dans toutes les

langues qu’on a vues (.) il existe la même

chose qu’en français (.) c’est a dire je
donne un cadeau mon frère et on peut

aussi dire je lui donne un cadeau (.) et

le lui (.) qui- qui correspond au frère

(.) il est a cote du sujet (.) sauf en

anglais (.) donc pour toi Karen (.) ça va
être un peu différent de l’anglais (.)

parce que du coup (.) en français il faut

bien penser que (.) c'est pas je donne lui

un cadeau c'est je lui! Donne un cadeau

(.) parce que c’est très différent de

l’anglais la (.) maintenant l’autre chose

(.) puisque y en a qui m’ont dit qu’il y

avait deux mots

Piotr: oui (.) en [polonais

Miss Lo: [ça ça m’intéresse (.) en

français on a vu que lui (.) si c’est je
donne un cadeau à ma soeur on va dire je!

Cristina: lui donne

Miss Lo: lui donne un cadeau (.) même si c’est une

fille

Cristina: ouais! (.) je savais!

Miss Lo: alors est-ce qu’en polonais (.)
662. Piotr: oui
663. Miss Lo: c’est le même mot pour une fille ou un garçon?
664. Piotr: non
665. Miss Lo: non!
666. Piotr: une fille c’est :jej
667. Miss Lo: :jej (.) qui écrit :
668. Piotr: :
669. Matilda: :jej
670. Piotr: e
671. Miss Lo: ((Miss Lo writes on the board))
672. Piotr: :
673. :: ((Miss Lo writes on the board))
674. Piotr: :
675. ::
676. Miss Lo: :jej
677. Cristina: [:jej]
678. Miss Lo: [donc (.) si c’est :
679. ::
680. Matilda: :jej
681. Piotr: :jej
682. Miss Lo: alors c’est ja (.) euh (.) Piotr (.)
683. je lui donne (.) si c’est un garçon on va dire (.) [:ja
684. Piotr: [ja jemu daye
685. Miss Lo: ja iemu daye (.) et si c’est une fille :
686. Piotr: je jei! daye (41:44)
687. Miss Lo: je jei daye (.) donc toi quand tu dis en polonais je lui donne (.) quand tu- tu (.) tu sais si on parle d’une fille ou d’un garçon (.) alors qu’en français si je dis je lui donne (.)
688. Cristina: je lui donne
689. Miss Lo: est-ce qu’on sait si le lui c’est un fille ou un garçon :
690. Leila: non
691. Cristina: lui c’est un garçon :
692. Leila: parce que lui-
693. Miss Lo: ah! (.) yesiça si je dis je donne un cadeau à mon frère je lui donne un cadeau (.) je donne un cadeau a ma soeur :
694. Cristina: lui donne
695. Piotr: lui :
696. Miss Lo: lui donne un cadeau (.) et pourtant la soeur elle est :
697. Cristina: fille
698. Miss Lo: fille (.) et pourtant c’est (.) lui ça change pas
699. Piotr: çà change pas
700. Miss Lo: donc ça change pas en français :
701. Cristina: lui donne
702. Piotr: lui :
703. Miss Lo: lui donne un cadeau (.) et pourtant la soeur elle est :
704. Cristina: fille
705. Miss Lo: fille (.) et pourtant c’est (.) lui ça change pas
706. Piotr: çà change pas
707. Miss Lo: donc ça change pas en français :
708. Cristina: lui donne
709. Piotr: lui :
710. Miss Lo: lui donne un cadeau (.) et pourtant la soeur elle est :
711. Cristina: fille
712. Miss Lo: fille (.) et pourtant c’est (.) lui ça change pas
713. Piotr: çà change pas
714. Miss Lo: donc ça change pas en français :
715. Cristina: lui donne
716. Piotr: lui :
717. Miss Lo: lui donne un cadeau (.) et pourtant la soeur elle est :
718. Cristina: fille
719. Miss Lo: fille (.) et pourtant c’est (.) lui ça change pas
720. Piotr: çà change pas
721. Miss Lo: donc ça change pas en français :
722. Cristina: lui donne
723. Piotr: lui :
724. Miss Lo: lui donne un cadeau (.) et pourtant la soeur elle est :
725. Cristina: fille
726. Miss Lo: fille (.) et pourtant c’est (.) lui ça change pas
727. Piotr: çà change pas
728. Miss Lo: donc ça change pas en français :
729. Cristina: lui donne
730. Miss Lo: voilà!
731. Leila: les deux!
Miss Lo: donc euh (.) yesiça (.) [regarde]
Leila: [c'est comme en français]
Miss Lo: n'oublie pas ce qu'on est en train de faire (.) on parle de (.) on parle la du déterminant devant les mots (.) on sait que en espagnol (.)
Leila: oui
Miss Lo: il y a masculin et féminin (.) en espagnol si on dit (.) le garçon ou la fille (.) c'est pas le même mot (.) mais là on parle (.) dans cette leçon la (.) quand on dit (.) à mon frère (.) hein (.) c'est quand je donne à! mon frère à! ma soeur (.) et qu'on remplace par le mot qu'ils appellent le pronom (.) personnel (.) complément (.) et ben ce pronom (.) celui la (.) en espagnol en français (.) c'est le même pour une fille ou pour un garçon (.) c'est à dire que quand on dit (.) je donne un cadeau (.) je lui donne (.) et ben ça peut être à une fille ou à un garçon (.) on ne sait pas Piotr: yo le doy
Miss Lo: d'accord (.) alors est-ce qu'en anglais ça change?
Cristina: on sait pas!
Miss Lo: I give him (.) et si c'est une fille on va dire (.) c'est comme ça him (.)
Karen: euh non (.) c'est him
Miss Lo: ouais c'est ça (.)
Miss Lo: et (.)
Karen: her
Miss Lo: [ah! (.) donc en anglais aussi ça change (.) si la personne a qui je donne le cadeau c'est une fille (.) le mot la (.) [le pronom la (.) c'est pas le même (.) d'accord (.)]
Piotr: [her (.) her (.) her]
Miss Lo: donc en anglais il y a deux choses qui sont pas pareil (.) c'est pas à la même place (.) parce que vous dites (.) I give her (.) I give him (.) alors qu'en français on va dire (.) je lui donne (.) donc c'est pas à la même place et en français on va mettre un mot pour deux (.)
Karen: choses
Miss Lo: oui euh (.) deux notions (.) féminin masculin (.) en lituanien ça change si c'est une fille (.) c'est ce que tu m'as dis [toute à l'heure Matilda: [ben oui Miss Lo: ben oui (.) ben oui! (.) ben oui alors (.)
c'est quoi Piotr: ja ja ja (.) ja (.)
Matilda: ja ja ja (.)
Miss Lo: ja ja (.) I (.) après (.)
Leila: a- I
Leila: ai::
Piotr: a- I
Miss Lo: a I avec tréma (.)
Cristina: ouaou
Miss Lo: d'accord Cristina: ja ja deux fois
Miss Lo: très bien
Piotr: jaj jaj jaj jaj jaj jaj jaj jaj jaj jaj jaj! ((laughing))
Matilda: [c’est même que le polonais
Miss Lo: [donc qu’est-ce qui marche exactement
comme le français?
Piotr: non
Miss Lo: [euh
Leila: [l’espagnol?
(.
Piotr: je?
Miss Lo: Piotr
Karen: le sénégalais?
(.
Amkouel maîtresse!
Miss Lo: ça marche exactement comme le français en
polonais [: c’est dans le même ordre (.)
et
Leila: non!
Piotr: Miss Lo: ah non [parce que il y a deux mots!
Piotr: [non
Miss Lo: ça marche exactement comme le français en
espagnol en fait (.) donc vous normalement
c’est pas difficile pour vous (.) cette
histoire là (.) en lituanien (.) là
place c’est là même
Matilda: c’est avec une igrec
Miss Lo: ah c’est avec un igrec
Matilda: non pas là-bas (.) pas là-bas
(.
Miss Lo: c’est bon (.) ok
(.
(.(children laughing))
(.
(.
Miss Lo: en anglais c’est plus difficile (.) le
plus difficile c’est pour l’anglais (.)
parce que c’est ça qui est le plus
différent (.) et il faudra qu’on demande
(./ a (.) Kenji (.) en japonais
Leila: [ouais
Piotr: [en japonais c’est trop difficile
Miss Lo: parce que-
Matilda: >/jigaio/ /jigai/
Miss Lo: [ouais
Miss Lo: [ouais
Matilda: [en japonais c’est trop difficile
Miss Lo: parce que-
Matilda: >/jigaio/ /jigai/ /jín/ /ʃʊŋ/ /ʃʊŋ/
(.(imitating japonese sounds))
Miss Lo: [on va voir si ça existe en japonais
Piotr: prezento <present>
Karen: on va mis le japonais†
Matilda: arigato <thank you>
Piotr: [konishua! <hello>
Cristina: [arigato <thank you> (.) ça veut dire
merci
Miss Lo: je vais le rajouter (.) je vais le refaire
là-bas le tableau
Cristina: arigato <thank you> ça veut dire-
Matilda: atashi <I>
Miss Lo: euh bon (.) euh (.) chut!
Piotr: atashi /keja/
(.(imitating japonese sounds))
(45:31)
(.
(.
Miss Lo: le pluriel du coup c’est comment le
pluriel (.) on avait vu qu’en français
était† (.) si je donne un cadeau a mes
parents ça va être je†
Cristina: je les [donne
Leila: [leur!
Miss Lo: non pas je les! Donne
Leila: [leur!
Miss Lo: [je†
Miss Lo: leur! Donne

Piotr: ah (.) [en pologne c’est-

Cristina: [ah maîtresse!

Miss Lo: alors (.) alors (.) on va voir (.) en

français ça va être leur (.) donc ça c’est

pas pareil (.) que-

Leila: yo le doy (.) yo le doy

Miss Lo: ya (.) le pluriel (.) quand ya deux

personnes (.) quand je donne a deux

personnes ou a [trois personnes

Cristina: [je leur donne

Miss Lo: ça change c’est leur (.) alors en ang-

Piotr: en polonais aussi!

Miss Lo: en polonais

Piotr: euh (.)

Leila: I- m-

Leila: I- m-

Leila: I- m-

Miss Lo: euh (.) ya im day si c’est que des garçons

(.) si c’est que des filles si c’est (.)

Cristina: c’est pareil

Miss Lo: euh (.) oui

Piotr: oui (.) oui

Cristina: maîtresse!

Miss Lo: d’accord (.) en espagnol!

Cristina: c’est (.)

Leila: est les!

Cristina: el! (.) el!

Leila: les

Cristina: les

Miss Lo: les (.) ça écrit comment [en espagnol

Leila: [1- é- s-

Y: 1-

Y: 1-

Leila: é- s-

Miss Lo: e!

Leila: oui

Miss Lo: e- s- (.) c’est pareil si c’est le père la

mère (.)[deux copines je-

Leila: [oui

Cristina: les doy

Miss Lo: donc c’est!}

Leila: les doy

Leila: les
donne

Piotr: le les les

Leila: donne

Miss Lo: parce que les parents ils sont deux

Matilda: ah

Miss Lo: c’est pas comme je donne un cadeau a

Matilda (.). je lui! donne un cadeau parce

Matilda: hahaha (((laughing)))
Piotr: (           )
Matilda: jiems (           )
Miss Lo: pour tout le monde ou pour deux (.) pour le pluriel en fait c’est ça!
Matilda: jiems
Miss Lo: la ça va être compliqué ((laughing))
( . )
Piotr: jiems
Matilda: hahahaha ((laughing))
Piotr: jiems
Miss Lo: parce que quand tu dis (.) j’arrive pas à entendre comment ça s’-
Leila: I- m- m- s-
Piotr: e- m- s-
Leila: I- e- m- s-
Matilda: hahahaha ((laughing))
((Matilda writes it herself on the board))
Leila: s-
Piotr: s-
Leila: ouais! (.) je sais lituanien
Piotr: moi aussi!
(.3)
Cristina: je savais
(.)
Miss Lo: et en anglais† alors euh (.) Karen
(.)
Karen: (    ) them
Piotr: our!
(.)
Karen: pas our
Miss Lo: them
Karen: them
Miss Lo: [them
Cristina: [them
Miss Lo: them c’est pour†
Matilda: them!
Miss Lo: tout le monde ou pour deux personnes†
(.)
Piotr: them
Karen: c’est pour euh (.3) tout le monde et deux personnes
Miss Lo: voilà (.) et si les personnes ce sont que des filles ou que des garçons ou filles
garçons mélanges c’est pareil† (.) c’est un seul mot†
(.3)
Karen: oui
Miss Lo: c’est le pluriel (.) d’accord (.) donc la (.) qu’est-ce qu’on voit quand même (.)
que dans toutes les langues (.) dont on a parlé (.) on va- on va- on va rajouter
après le japonais (.) on va voir si c’est-ça marche (.) euh (.) quand même (.)
y a un seul mot pour le pluriel (.) ya un seul pronom la pour le pluriel (.) comme
en français (.1) et (.) que par contre entre le féminin (.) et le (.)
Leila: masculin
Miss Lo: masculin (.) ya des langues qui mettent deux mots et ya des langues comme le
français ou l’espagnol qui en mettent
Miss Lo: qui un seul (.) d’accord (.) euh (.) en réalité est-ce que ça pose un problème si
on met qu’un seul mot (.) si on dit (.) je lui donne un cadeau†
Cristina: je leur donne

Miss Lo: non si on dit au singulier je lui donne un cadeau

Miss Lo: en général quand on va utiliser ce mot là je lui donne un cadeau [la]

Leila: [oui]

Miss Lo: ça veut que (.)

Cristina: je donne un cadeau

Miss Lo: en général quand on va utiliser ce mot là je lui donne un cadeau [la]

Leila: oui

Leila: à ma soeur ou à mon frère ou à une copine un copain

Miss Lo: soit on va remettre derrière je lui donne un cadeau à mon frère mais ça en général on a dit que le lui ça remplace à mon frère donc en général en français (.) même si vous en espagnol tu me dis que vous le dites en français si on dit lui on va pas remettre à mon frère c'est a la place mais en général (.) si on utilise lui le pronom samba c'est pour pas répéter tout le temps à mon frère à mon frère parce qu'au bout d'un moment c'est pas joli d'entendre (.) je donne un cadeau à mon frère (.) je donne un cadeau à mon frère et je lui donne un bisou parce que c'est son anniversaire là on va mettre lui pour pas répéter à mon frère donc comme avant on a dit à mon frère on sait que lui c'est le garçon on sait que c'est le frère puisqu'on en a parle juste avant vous voyez (.) ou alors sinon je dis bon (.) euh (.) attends Piotr (.) je vais voir samba (.) je lui donne son cahier mais juste avant j'ai dis quoi

Leila: [samba]

Piotr: [samba]

Miss Lo: samba donc on sait que le lui la (.) ça veut que (.) le lui la (.) c'est samba d'accord donc (.) en général je lui donne pour savoir si c'est une fille ou un garçon c'est que avant on en a parle (.) d'accord juste une chose samba en peul comment tu vas dire (.) je leur donne un cadeau

Miss Lo: je donne un cadeau à mes parents je leur donne un cadeau tu vas dire quoi alors

Leila: [samba]

Miss Lo: tu peux le dire ça en peul ou pas

Miss Lo: non mais tu peux dire je donne un cadeau à mes parents
Miss Lo: voilà (.) c'est ça que tu vas dire (.) je donne un cadeau à mes parents (.) et tu vas dire comment par rapport à je donne un cadeau à mon frère (.)

Samba: en peul

Miss Lo: en peul ouais

Piotr: euh (.) /makam/

Leila: euh

Cristina: /mænæ/

Miss Lo: en peul ouais

Piotr: non /mænæm/ c'est (.)

Cristina: /mænæm/ c'est (.)

Piotr: /mænæm/ c'est (.) à mon frère

Miss Lo: ah euh (.) c'est mon frère (.) alors euh je donne c'est (.)

Cristina: /mækæmæ/ [cadeau]

Leila: 

Miss Lo: /mænæm/ c'est (.) à mon frère

Piotr: /mækæmæ/ [cadeau]

Cristina: /mækæmæ/

Leila: [non /kæmæn/]

Miss Lo: attendez attendez j'entends plus samba (.) il peut même plus parler samba parce que vous parlez à sa place (.) c'est comment samba ils ont raison (.)

Samba: (/mækæm/)

Miss Lo: ah /makam/! (.) d'accord (.) c'est moi qui-

Matilda: /mækækæmæ /

Samba: cadeau

Miss Lo: cadeau en français (.) et après

Samba: manom

Miss Lo: a mon frère (.) mais à mes parents alors ça va être comment (.)

Samba: (.9)

Piotr: /makamæ/

(.)

Piotr: comme le chinois! ((laughing))

Miss Lo: cadeau (.) ça va être (.) ça va être (.) makam (.)

Matilda: /mænæ/ /mekæmæ/

Miss Lo: me (.)

Matilda: /me/ /næ/ /me/

Piotr: /me/ /mk/

Miss Lo: chut! (.) alors (.) je vais recopier ce tableau là-bas et puis vous me ferez penser à demander à Kenji puisqu'on a pas le- le- la langue de Kenji (.) donc euh Karen (.) je te donnerai les exercices après a faire a écrit...

---52:16---

**T2 S1 D3 V8 EZ:**

First sequence on the book « cow girl ».

---01:00:09---
Miss Lo: et donc elle elle dit ‘les petites filles sages’ ne?
Cristina: jouent pas
Miss Lo: s’amusent pas
?: pas
Miss Lo: elles ne s’amusent pas (.). c’est elle qui dit ça (.). c’est la petite fille la qui sages ne s’amusent pas
Cristina: haha (.). elle est comme ça (.). ah jouer Miss Lo: alors elle n’aime pas jouer à la maison (.). qu’est ce qu’elle aime faire?
():
Matilda: elle aimes [euh-
Leila: [elle aimes jouer avec euh (.). la poubelle (.). avec tous les chats Miss Lo: oui elle aime jouer (.). mais donc c’est où! là (.). c’est où? (.). c’est pas à la maison c’est où?
?: dans la poubelle!
Miss Lo: non pas dans la poubelle non c’est (.). c’est une place spéciale pour (.). pour euh-
Karen: junkyard (.). junkyard!
Piotr: c’est une place spéciale pour-
Matilda: junkyard!
Piotr: pour tous les ah pourquoi tu répètes Miss Lo: chut chut chut!
Leila: pour tout le qu’on met dans la poubelle Karen: [euh en anglais on dit Miss Lo: [oui Karen: elle est dans le junkyard Miss Lo: oui mais en français on dit quoi?
():
Miss Lo: si tu connais pas la traduction du mot c’est pas grave tu trouves un autre mot (.). [elle aimes pas jouer Cristina:
Miss Lo: écoutez ce que je dis (.). elle n’aime pas jouer à la maison (.). elle aime jouer?
Karen: dehors!
Leila: dehors Miss Lo: dehors Piotr: ordures (.). ordures
():
Miss Lo: et elle ne veut pas rester (.). avec les petites filles sages (.). qu’est-ce qu’elles font là les petites filles sages!
Matilda: elle fait [le pic nique
Leila: [mange Miss Lo: voilà qui font un pic nique Leila: elle fait [le pic nique Karen: [aussi le
():
Miss Lo: mange!
Karen: tea party!
Leila: mange avec le thé
 ():
Miss Lo: voilà (.). elles!
Piotr: [avec les poupées Leila: [elles [boivent pas ça Karen: [en anglais on dit tea party Miss Lo: en anglais on dit tea party mais en français ya pas de tea party donc elles font quoi? (.). elles font un!
():
Leila: pic nique Miss Lo: un pic nique (.). ou bien quand c’est à quatre heures c’est quoi!
Leila: un petit déjeun- non non (.) déjeuner pas
non
Miss Lo: elles† (..) elles font un†
non
Leila: [non
Miss Lo: [un goûter!
Leila: un goûter
donc elle dit 'je ne veux pas être une petite jeune fille qui aime rester assise
à (.) a babababa
Cristina: parler
Miss Lo: non (..) parler mais†(..) des fois on vous dit en classe 'arrête de’†
Leila: parler†
Miss Lo: bavarder (..) bavarder c'est parler beaucoup.

Matilda: maîtresse!
Miss Lo: Matilda
Matilda: j’ai pas comprend (..) pourquoi ça c’est ( ) avec ça†
Miss Lo: je n’aime pas jouer à la maison tranquille oui (..) 'les petites filles ne s’amusent pas’ c’est très bien (.)
alors qu’est-ce qui t’embête là†
(.1)
Matilda: ça
Miss Lo: elle dit quoi? (..) elle dit quoi à son père (..) je veux (.1) je veux être une cow girl
Matilda: je veux (.1) je veux être une cow girl
Miss Lo: voilà
Matilda: mais pas ça
Miss Lo: si 'simplement’ (.2)
Miss Lo: euh: (..) Karen (..) comment est-ce qu’on dit euh (..) comment on peut dire- tu peux me dire juste en anglais (..) deux phrases (..) la première phrase c’est (..) je veux être une cow girl (..) et l’autre phrase c’est (..) je veux simplement! être une cow girl (..) elle dit ça à son père (..) pour que elle comprenne Matilda c’est quoi simplement
(.)
Karen: je veux être une cow girl
Miss Lo: comment on dit en anglais†
(.1)
Karen: I want to be a cowgirl
Miss Lo: et si maintenant elle dit à son père (.)
Miss Lo: mais non mais papa (..) je veux simplement! être une cow girl
(.1)
Karen: c’est (..) simplement c’est justement†
Miss Lo: seulement (..) simplement (..) je veux juste être une cow girl
Kenji: juste
Karen: euh
Miss Lo: pour dire à son père (..) c’est pas compliqué [c’est pas compliqué que je
Karen: I just wanna be a cow girl.

Miss Lo: tu vois Matilda (.), tu sens la différence?

Karen: I just wanna be a cow girl.

Miss Lo: ya (.), je veux être une cow girl (.), voilà (.), et là elle dit à son papa (.), elle insiste parce que elle veut que son papa lui dise (.), je veux simplement être une cow girl (.).

Karen: I just wanna be a cow girl.

Miss Lo: voilà (.), just! (.), want (.), to be (.).

Karen: elle dit pas want to be (.), c'est I just want to be (.), simplement (.), I just! (.).

Karen: I just wanna be a cow girl.

Miss Lo: voilà (.), just! (.), want (.), to be (.).

Karen: elle dit pas want to be (.), c'est I just want to be (.), simplement (.), I just! (.).

Karen: I just wanna be a cow girl.

Miss Lo: tu vois (.), donc simplement (.), on pourrait l'enlever mais (.), regarde dans le texte (.), tu as le droit de t'aider avec le texte (.), tu le mets à la bonne place hein!

Cristina: maîtresse j'ai fini!

Miss Lo: alors...

---36:56---

T2 S1 D3 V11

T2 S1 D3 V11 E1:

Children from the lowest group are asked to draw their house and family back in their country. Here, we hear Miss Lo talking with Matilda.

---23:15---

1. Miss Lo: et il y a pas des maisons en Lituanie?
2. (.), il y a que des immeubles?
3. Matilda: non il a une maison mais euh hahaha
4. (laughing)
5. Miss Lo: il y a des maisons mais?
6. (.)
7. Matilda: mais moi et maman habitent dans un immeuble
8. Miss Lo: dans un immeuble (.), vous vous habitez dans un immeuble
9. Matilda: oui
10. Miss Lo: ok (.), et ton grand-père et ta grand-mère ils habitent?
11. Matilda: ah (.), dans la maison
12. Miss Lo: dans une maison
13. Matilda: oui
14. Miss Lo: d'accord
15. Matilda: et mon cousin et cousine (.), le même que moi (.), dans un immeuble
16. Miss Lo: dans un immeuble (.), d'accord
17. Miss Lo: et l'école elle était à coté de-
18. Matilda: non j'ai pas école en Lituanie!
19. Miss Lo: t'as pas été à l'école en Lituanie?
20. Matilda: non (.), j'ai (.), je sais pas comment dis ça en français
21. Miss Lo: à la crèche (.), au jardin d'enfants
22. (laughing)
23. Matilda: c'est quoi?
24. Miss Lo: c'est pour les petits enfants!
Matilda: oui c’est pour les petits enfants
Piotr: parce (.) parc [(.)] parc
Miss Lo: [non le jardin d’enfants]
(.)
Miss Lo: la crèche
Matilda: en anglais c’est nursery
Miss Lo: voilà (.1) d’accord
(.2)
Miss Lo: le jardin d’enfants
Matilda: en lituanie c’est (.} darjales
Piotr: darjales
Miss Lo: et alors du coup- (.} il y avait pas- il
y avait pas de voisins (.} il y avait pas
d’autres enfants dans l’immeuble?!
(.3)
Miss Lo: non (.} t’avais pas des copines? (.}
t’as pas envie de dessiner des copines à toi?
Matilda: non non
Miss Lo: okay (.} bon ben tu colories
Matilda: maîtresse j’oublie les yeux
Miss Lo: ah ben oui ça c’est embêtant (.} très
bien (.} alors!
--24:31--
Another teacher-led sequence on the book “the cowgirl”.

86. Miss Lo: elle lui donne la nouvelle ‘je vais partir’ (. .) vous comprenez (. .) et elle va partir où (. .) ‘à travers la plaine’ (. .)

89. alors la plaine c’est quoi?

90. Cristina: la plaine c’est: (. .) c’est la plaine
91. Kenji: plaine (. .) euh (. .) plaine
92. Miss Lo: est-ce que c’est- c’est la montagne la plaine?
94. Cristina: non (. .) c’est la (. .) c’est la-
95. Miss Lo: comment on dit en anglais la plaine (. .)
96. comment on dit en espagnol la plaine?
97. (. .)
98. Karen: je sais pas
99. Leila: plena haha ((laughing))
100. Karen: c’est quoi une plaine?
101. Kenji: /plena/
102. ((laughing))
103. ((Kenji and Mi laughing))
104. Miss Lo: une plaine c’est pas une montagne (. .)
105. c’est-
106. Kenji: [toujours (. .) derrière (. .) ‘a’ (. .) /plena/ ((talking with Mi))
107. Miss Lo: [c’est quelque chose qui est (. .) par exemple ((drawing on the board))
108. Leila: [plena ((talking with Kenji))
109. Miss Lo: [ça c’est la montagne
110. Leila: plogna
111. Miss Lo: d’accord?
112. Kenji: una
113. Miss Lo: ça c’est la montagne
114. Kenji: oui (. .) plaine
117. Miss Lo: et (. .)
118. Kenji: [plaine
119. Miss Lo: [quand c’est comme ça et que il y a beaucoup d’espace
120. Kenji: [très grand
121. Miss Lo: et que c’est plat (. .) c’est la plaine
122. (. .)
123. Andrea: ah!
125. Miss Lo: c’est pas la montagne (. .) c’est la plaine
126. Andrea: es como (. .) ( . .) (. .) es como lo que hay en estado unidos que hacen las películas
127. Leila: ( . .) las películas
128. Piotr: [la películas
129. Karen: [en anglais on dit field
131. Talia: [dice planeta ((talking to Se))
132. Miss Lo: [voilà (. .) en anglais on dit field (. .)
133. voilà (. .) hein?
134. Talia: dice [planeta ((talking to Se))
135. Kenji: [field
136. Miss Lo: field
137. Kenji: ah oui
138. Miss Lo: en anglais (. .) en espagnol vous avez trouvé ce que c’est? (. .) pourquoi la plaine? (. .) pourquoi elle va partir (. .)
140. à travers la plaine
142. Kenji: ( . .)
143. Miss Lo: elle veut faire quoi? (. .) elle veut être?
144. Leila: veut être une cow girl
145. Miss Lo: elle veut être une cow girl (. .) donc une
cow girl elle s'occupe de (.) on avait dit toute à l'heure

Andrea: de la vache

Miss Lo: des vaches (.) et donc les vaches il faut qu'elles aient de

Cristina: place

Miss Lo: de la place (.) il faut qu'elles aient de

(.) l'espace hein

Kenji: oui

Miss Lo: Mais (.) il faut qu'elles aient de

Andrea: de la place (.) et donc les vaches il faut qu'elles aient de

à travers la plaine (.) et elle dit qu'elle va dormir à la belle étoile (.) ça veut dire quoi dormir à la belle étoile

Cristina: elle veut dormir:

Leila: qu'elle va dormir à la plaine

Talia: elle va dormir seule

*((many children talking at the same time))*

Leila: dehors

Miss Lo: dehors (.) voilà (.) à la belle étoile

Cristina: [dehors c'est (.) dehors]

Kenji: oui je vois

Miss Lo: après elle dit 'je vais conduire mon troupeau de bestiaux (.) je vais entendre le cri de l'aigle' ça veut dire quoi?

Cristina: [(]

Karen: ça veut dire elle veut entendre le:

Piotr: cri comme euh:

Cristina: le bruit de l'aigle

Piotr: comme un oiseau

Miss Lo: un oiseau (.) voilà

Piotr: euh (.) cri

Miss Lo: le cri [d'un oiseau]

Piotr: [chante (.) chante]

Miss Lo: le cri de l'aigle c'est le cri d'un oiseau

(.) euh (.) l'aigle on le trouve où

Cristina: []

Leila: l'aigle on le trouve euh:

Miss Lo: où est-ce qu'on trouve des aigles en général

Cristina: dans la (.) dans la forêt

Miss Lo: dans la nature (.) on trouve pas des aigles (.) les gens est-ce qu'ils ont des aigles à la maison

C?: non

Miss Lo: vous voyez ce que c'est que l'aigle (.)

Kenji:

C?: oui

Miss Lo: avec un bec comme ça

Karen: c'est le (.) c'est l'oiseau de (.) amarre

Piotr: (.) de états-unis

Miss Lo: oui (.) c'est le- c'est l'oiseau du:

Piotr: [drapeau]

Kenji: [oiseau]

Miss Lo: non

Karen: euh:

Miss Lo: l'oiseau de quoi tu dis Karen

Karen: de:: états unis

Piotr: en pologne c'est-

Miss Lo: c'est l'emblème des États-Unis l'aigle

Piotr: en pologne c'est
Leila: \[ah:: el águila (.). Talia (.). el águila (.). ((29:45))

Talia: (.)

Talia: ((29:45))

Piotr: c’est un aigle là (.). comment ça s’appelle ça?

Piotr: ((Se goes and open the door of the classroom to show the Polish flag attached to the door))

Talia: maîtresse (.). maîtresse

Leila: en (.). le drapeau de Mexique!

Miss Lo: oui sur le drapeau du Mexique effectivement (.). oui c’est vrai (.). voilà c’est ça (.). voilà (.). euh c’est pas tout à fait un aigle

Piotr: en pologne il y a comme ça

Miss Lo: d’accord

Karen: [argentine

Kenji: [États-Unis

Miss Lo: c’est un aigle (.). d’accord

Kenji: c’est quoi?

Piotr: comme ça (.). comme ça

Kenji: peindre?

Miss Lo: d’accord (.). ya un blason (.). ya un blason avec un aigle qui est dessiné (.). d’accord (.). c’est quoi ça exactement en pologne?

Piotr: herb <Polish: Polish national emblem> (.).

Miss Lo: oui mais c’est quoi ce blason là (.). c’est quoi cette euh: (.). c’est quoi ça?

Piotr: c’est herb (30:20)

Miss Lo: oui mais c’est quoi? (.). ça sert à quoi?

Talia: sera el escudo (30:22)

Talia: c’est pour le drapeau (.). c’est quoi?

Talia: [el escudo

Karen: [en états unis

Miss Lo: où est-ce qu’on voit ça?

Miss Lo: [on a de monnaie-

Miss Lo: [ou est-ce qu’on voit ça? (.). attends

Miss Lo: attends (.). ou est-ce qu’on voit ça?

Piotr: en pologne

Miss Lo: oui mais on le voit où? c’est sur les murs (.). c’est sur les musées? (.). c’est où?

Piotr: c’est (.). c’est comme (.)

Karen: mais maîtresse

Miss Lo: chut chut chut

Piotr: [ça s’appelle en pologne

Miss Lo: [Maia reste assise s’il te plait (.)

Merci

Piotr: herb polski <Polish: Polish national emblem> (30:55)

Talia: ( ) al otro lado ( ) yo creo

Talia: ( )

Miss Lo: non mais c’est comme un-

Piotr: c’est pas un drapeau

Miss Lo: c’est pas- c’est un blason

Piotr: oui

Piotr: (.8)

Talia: (((Se goes and open the door again)))

Miss Lo: oui y en a aussi là (.). d’accord

Kenji: roumanie (.). [c’est qui roumanie?

Piotr: [c’est pas un dragon (.)

Kenji: c’est qui roumanie?

Miss Lo: j’ai pas dis un dragon (.). j’ai dis un blason (.). c’est pas- ou alors c’est sur euh: (.). tu as une photo de ça?

Piotr: oui

Miss Lo: dans un livre tu pourras nous l’apporter
(... comme ça on va regarder ce que c’est)

(. hein (. d’accord↑ (. tu n’as pas de
dictionnaire eu:: (. franco-polonais↑

Piotr: oui j’ai
Miss Lo: il est où↑
Piotr: ici
Miss Lo: eh ben regarde dans ton dictionnaire
Piotr

((children laughing))

Piotr: alors eu:: (. ‘je vais entendre le cri de l’aigle’ (. puisque là où elle va (.) dans la plaine (.) il y a des↑
Cristina: des aigles
Miss Lo: [des aigles
Karen: [maîtresse
Miss Lo: oui Karen
Karen: sur le- (. en monnaie qui a l’aigle sur le dos
Miss Lo: d’accord (. il y a une monnaie sur lequel il y a un aigle (. c’est quoi monnaie↑ (. c’est sur un dollar américain↑
Karen: mmm (.2) c’est::
Miss Lo: c’est sur une pièce de monnaie↑
Karen: oui!
Miss Lo: une pièce de monnaie américaine↑
Karen: oui
Miss Lo: et c’est combien (. une pièce de combien↑
Karen: euh (. je sais pas (. on dit (. quarter
Miss Lo: quarter (. ça pourrait être quoi en français quarter↑ (. les grands là vous l’avez fait en maths l’autre jour (.)
Karen: quarter ce serait quoi↑
Cristina: moi j’ai pas fait ça
Talia: je sais pas
Karen: quarters c’est-
Miss Lo: ah!
Karen: c’est une pièce de monnaie en anglais blason! ((found the French translation of the polish word))
Miss Lo: un blason ouais ben voilà c’est ça (.)
Karen: euh:: (. tu en as [à la maison des pièces de monnaie comme ça↑
Kenji: [c’est quoi blason↑ ((speaking to Se))
Karen: oui
Miss Lo: ah ben tu pourras nous en apporter↑
Karen: oui
Miss Lo: d’accord (. très bien
((Miss Lo keeps talking to the children whilst Se spells ‘blason’ to Kenji))
Piotr: quoi↑
Kenji: comment écrire blason↑
Piotr: blason↑ (. euh (. b-
Kenji: b-
Piotr: 1-
Kenji: r-↑
Piotr: 1-
Kenji: 1-
Piotr: a-
Kenji: a-
Piotr: s-
Kenji: s-
Piotr: o- (. o-
Kenji: u-
Piotr: o-! (. o-
Kenji: o-
Piotr: n-
Kenji: ah oui! (. blason! ((reads the
Teacher-led interactions with the whole classroom. Miss Lo asks whether children had some acquaintances in France before moving to France.

---01:00:35---
1. Miss Lo: Leila (.). est-ce que tu connaissais des gens en France quand tu es arrivée?
2. (.)
3. Leila: non
4. Miss Lo: non (.). tu connaissais personne
5. (.)
6. Cristina: maîtresse-
7. Miss Lo: Piotr tu connaissais des gens quand tu es arrivé? (.). tes parents ils connaissaient des gens quand tu es arrivé en France?
8. Piotr: euh:;
9. Kenji: oui
10. Piotr: oui!
11. Kenji: moi aussi
12. Miss Lo: Talia tu-
13. Piotr: et Matilda:;
14. Karen: ma maman oui
15. Piotr: pas oncle (.). euh:;
16. Miss Lo: ta tante
17. Piotr: la tante
18. Miss Lo: ta tante (.). tu avais une tante en France déjà
19. Piotr: et deux
20. Miss Lo: deux tantes ah ben voilà! (.). euh (.).
21. Talia: (.)
22. Leila: si conocia gente cuando veniste a francia
23. (.)
24. Talia: (.)
25. Kenji: /fransje!/ [This seems to be a mispronunciation or a typo.]
26. (.)
27. Miss Lo: ah oui (.). il y avait la cousine de ton papa
28. (.)
29. Miss Lo: l’autre jour vous etes allés chez la cousine de ton papa (.). c’est ça?
30. Kenji: yo vengo francia
31. Talia: ah oui (.). marie
32. Miss Lo: oui oui (.). elle était là
33. Cristina: maîtresse
34. Miss Lo: oui (.). euh (.). Cristina quand tu es arrivée
35. en France tu connaissais des gens toi?
Teacher-led interaction with the whole class about the book “cow-girl”. At the end of the book, T asks children what do they want to do later in life.

1. Miss Lo: plus tard (.) elle sera peut-être (.) une cowg-girl (.) et toi plus tard tu veux être quoi Talia toi plus tard?
2. Miss Lo: je veux
3. Talia: actrice
4. Miss Lo: une
5. Miss Lo: [actrice (.) Piotr tu veux être quoi plus tard (.) et une chanteuse] [actrice et une chanteuse] Miss Lo: je veux être une actrice et une chanteuse d’accord
6. (.)
7. Talia: veux [être plus tard]
8. Miss Lo: [actrice et une chanteuse de ciné-] attends (.) une chanteuse et une actrice de cinéma américain (.) Piotr qu’est-ce que tu veux [être plus tard]
9. Piotr: [je sais pas!]
10. Miss Lo: ben tu dois av- (.) non t’as pas ça tu rêves pas
11. Piotr: architecte
12. Miss Lo: je veux être un architecte
13. Miss Lo: plus tard (.), je veux être un architecte
14. Piotr: [mais n’importe quoi] [Talia (.) arquitecto]
15. Miss Lo: en France ou en pologne (.) chut
16. (.)
17. Miss Lo: en France en pologne (.) aux états-unis:: en asie:: je sais pas
18. Piotr: [je sais pas]
19. Miss Lo: tu ne sais pas d’accord (.) Leila (.) qu’est-ce que tu veux être plus tard?
20. Leila: [infirmière]
21. Piotr: moi footballeur aussi
22. Leila: plus tard je veux être biochimique
23. (.)
24. Leila: biochimique
25. Talia: hein}
26. Piotr: [bioquimica]
27. Kenji: [pic nique]
Miss Lo: attends-attends-attends (.). ah! (.).
Leila: oui
Miss Lo: plus tard je veux être biochimiste
Kenji: [c’est quoi?]
Andrea: [que es eso?]
Kenji: c’est quoi ça?
Leila: biochimiste
Miss Lo: plus tard je veux être biochimiste
Kenji: [c’est quoi ça?]
Andrea: [que es eso?]
Talia: [abogada (01:08:04)]
Miss Lo: [c’est pour euh:: faire quoi biochimiste?]
Leila: je sais pas comment expliquer
Kenji: [
Miss Lo: c’est le travail qui te plait ou c’est le mot bioquímica qui est très beau
Leila: non non (.). c’est le travail
Miss Lo: [ah!]
Leila: je sais pas comment expliquer
Leila: [ah oui!]
Miss Lo: [ah oui!]
Leila: c’est ça
Miss Lo: on regarde
Leila: ah! pero viste cuando te saca sangre
Piotr: pic ((copying Leila gestures))
Leila: eso (.). analizar la sangre
Talia: [ah!]
Piotr: [infirmière]
Leila: ah yo pensé otra cosa
Miss Lo: non mais elle veut pas faire les piqûres
hein (.). elle veut pas faire les piqûres
(.). elle est pas [infirmière (.).] elle veut pas prendre euh non-
Leila: [no me voy a sacar sangre]
Miss Lo: elle veut (.). analyser (.). alors je sais pas moi il faut expliquer en espagnol
parce que là en français c’est compliqué
Leila: je veux
Leila: analizar la sangre
Andrea: si si ya cono- cuando le sacan
(01:08:52)
Piotr: [ah (.).] après-
Leila: [si (.).] t’ sacan y te lo ponen en un tubo
Andrea: si
Piotr: [après (.).] après
Leila: [
Kenji: c’est quoi ça?
Piotr: après (.). après comme [infirmière pique
Miss Lo: ouais
Piotr: elle analyse ça
Miss Lo: ouais
Piotr: ah c’est
Miss Lo: on envoie au laboratoire et là bas au laboratoire il y a des gens (.). qui regardent qu’est ce qu’il y a dans votre sang (.). est-ce que ça va (.). est-ce que ça va pas (.). [ex cætera
Piotr: [c’est toi ça?]
Leila: oui
Piotr: ah!
Miss Lo: biochimiste
Miss Lo: mais est-ce que tu veux être biochimiste
danseuse de tango ou pas?
Piotr: paraparapara ((singing))
Leila: non!
...
Miss Lo: euh Kenji, qu’est-ce que tu veux être
genre danseuse de tango ou pas?
Piotr: judo!
Miss Lo: chut (.) hé!
Kenji: euh: (.) foot!
Talia: je sais-
Miss Lo: hein
Piotr: [foot
Kenji: [foot
(.)
(Talia laughing)
Miss Lo: non ((laughing))
Kenji: [non n’importe quoi
Hakim: [footballeur
Piotr: n’importe quoi
Miss Lo: footballeur! (.) merci Hakim (.) je veux
être (.) footballeur (.) footballeur dans
quelle équipe?
Kenji: euh::
Leila: [liste
Leila: [liste
(.)
Miss Lo: non ((laughing))
Kenji: [non n’importe quoi
Hakim: [footballeur
Piotr: n’importe quoi
Miss Lo: footballeur! (.) merci Hakim (.) je veux
être (.) footballeur (.) footballeur dans
quelle équipe?
Kenji: euh::
Leila: barcelona!
Cristina: barcelona
Talia: oui!
Leila: arigato <thank you>
Piotr: real madrid
Miss Lo: chut!
Kenji: non c’est pas-
Piotr: valence!
Miss Lo: laissez Kenji il peut pas parler
Piotr: lyon
Talia: barcelona
Piotr: paris saint-germain
Kenji: euh:: (.) n’importe
(.)
Miss Lo: dans n’importe quelle équipe
Piotr: bordeaux
Miss Lo: d’accord (.) est-ce qu’il y a des équipes
de football professionnelle au japon?
Kenji: oui (.) d’accord
Piotr: Kenji attaque
Miss Lo: Andrea tu veux être quoi plus tard?
Andrea: vétérinaire
Miss Lo: oui (.) je veux être
Andrea: je veux être
Leila: como Maia
Kenji: [como Maia
Miss Lo: [vete- ri- naire
Andrea: vétérinaire
Miss Lo: vétérinaire vous savez ce que c’est?
Leila: c’est avec le chien
Piotr: [oui (.) avec les animaux
201. Miss Lo: [pas que les chiens
202. [...]
203. Miss Lo: très bien (.) en France ou en equator?
204. Andrea: en France
205. Miss Lo: en France
206. Leila: en France ah!
207. Talia: *( ) mucho dinero porque todo el
208. mundo tiene el dinero (01:11:22)*
--01:11:28--

T2 S1 D4 V14

T2 S1 D4 V14 E1:

Children work in small groups. The microphone is with the more advanced group.

--03:21--
09. Miss Lo: cette vieille (.) ville (.) est ((talking
10. with Ma))
11. Talia: Leila! que cara de animal me ves?
12. Kenji: Talia tu fais ça:!!
13. Leila: no se
14. Piotr: c'est quoi ça? (. ) je vous regarde (.)
15. j'ai fini ça ici
17. Piotr: je veux regarder jouer (.) je veux
regarder jouer c'est derrière ((talking
19. about their exercise sheet))
--04:15--

T2 S1 D4 V14 E2:

Children are still working in small groups. The microphone is still with the more advanced group.

--09:05--
1. Talia: tiene (.) tiene el lápiz?
2. (. )
3. Miss Lo: d'accord ((talking to another child
4. further away))
5. Maia: ya no [se lo presto
6. Miss Lo: [très bien (.) alors tu me colles
7. ça dans le cahier (.) tu sors ton fichier
8. de mathématiques là les grands vous allez
9. à votre place (.) je viens vous voir après
10. Talia: ya no se lo presto
11. Miss Lo: vous attendez deux secondes
12. Leila: c'est quoi ça maîtresse?
13. (. )
14. Matilda: quoi? (talking to her classmate Maia
15. who is sitting next to her))
16. Maia: (
17. Matilda: oui je sais mais j'aime bien écrire parce
18. que j'ai pas de crayon!
19. (. )
20. Talia: no entonces (.) si te quitaba el azul (.)
21. se lo quitabas (09:29)
22. (. )
23. Kenji: fini!
24. (.2)
25. Talia: you wanna another?
26. Matilda: me
27. Miss Lo: ouh la (.) Hakim (.) non non tu vas à ta
28. place
29. Talia: which one? (.2) this? ((Ma is now standing
I transcribe here only the interactions between children in the more advanced group. Note that we hear T talking in the background with children from other groups.

---30:50--
1. Leila: 'esta copiando todo'! {{laughing}}
2. Piotr: elle copie!
3. (.)
4. Piotr: être! (.)) non: (.)) elle copie d'accord
5. Leila: Talia no (.)) être non (.)) ese no
6. Piotr: oui
7. Leila: non
8. Talia: cuáles son!
9. Leila: los que terminan en -e -r y -i -r
10. Piotr: non! c'est encore facile! (.)) être
11. Leila: Talia! hazme caso que vos no entendés nada
12. Kenji: maîtresse! (.)) être aussi!
13. Piotr: maîtresse!
14. Miss Lo: ah non non non (.)) mais moi pour l'instant
15. je- je (.)) je verrai ce que vous avez
16. fait après (.)) là je travaille pas avec
17. vous pour l'instant
18. Leila: ( ) c'est comme ça (.2) et là
19. c'est un 'er' et la c'est en 'ir'
20. Kenji: maîtresse (.)) être aussi!
21. Piotr: seulement deux en 'ir'! (.)) c'est pas
trop
22. Kenji: oui très peu
23. Leila: maîtresse
24. Kenji: maîtresse! (.)) atten...
Leila: je mange à la cantina

Piotr: couler et jouer

Kenji: ( )

Talia: Kenji c'est pas-

Leila: couler ça c'est quoi?

Talia: je mange à la-

Kenji: non!

Piotr: je sais pas

Talia: Kenji! ( .) c'est pas ( .) je mange à la cantina

Leila: Les filles sont drôles.

Piotr: je sais pas

Talia: Kenji! ( .) c'est pas ( .) je mange à la cantina

Kenji: je mange à la cantina

Talia: [en espagnol-]

Andrea: a la cantina

Talia: yo como a la cantina

Leila: el se quiere hacer el chistoso y quiere hacer lo mismo que Kenji ( .) pero no le sale

Kenji: euh- euh ( .) 'agir' est ( .) troisième groupe

Talia: tu parles de quoi?

Piotr: de qui

Kenji: c'est pas chose ( .) ça

Piotr: non

Kenji: oui

Piotr: non

Kenji: oui

Matilda: Kenji qu'est-ce que tu parles?

Leila: Kenji dit que ( .) 'chose' c'est troisième groupe

Piotr: quoi?

Leila: chose

Kenji: non! ( .) chose ( .) non ( .) c'est 'agir'

Troisième groupe

Talia: me da risa cuando hace eso (36:44)

Kenji: je ne sais pas 'agir'

Piotr: moi je sais pas c'est quoi

Kenji: 'agir' ( .) 'cour' et-

Talia: Kenji fait comme ça

( .4)

( .3)

Talia: comme ça

( .5)

Talia: fais comme ça Leila
Kenji: 'chose' non!

Piotr: non

Kenji: 'chose' non et ça et ça et ça et comme ça

(.) 'marcher' (.) 'frapper' (.) oui

Kenji: non!

Leila: (dice) que Kenji es feo (37:22)

Kenji: feo

Leila: feo

Piotr: c'est quoi ça?

Kenji: euh (.) euh Piotr! (.) 'vivre' aussi!

(.) 'vivre'

Kenji: non!

Leila: maîtresse je sais pas de troisième groupe!

Piotr: c'est trop facile

Kenji: 'agir'!

Miss Lo: ceux que vous savez pas vous les mettez à part (.) vous les mettez tout seul

Kenji: 'agir' (.) 'coucher' aussi!

.2

Kenji: Piotr (.) 'couche' aussi!

.1

Piotr: non::!

Kenji: il lui dit 'couche'

Leila: 'couche' aussi!

.2

Piotr: 'coucher'!

Leila: oui c'est bien

Kenji: 'couche' aussi!

Leila: non! mais pas (.) parce que ça c'est couche (.) c'est pas 'coucher'

Piotr: ah!

Leila: pour dire coucher c'est avec un 'r' à la fin (.) c'est pas coucher

Matilda: chut!

Leila: (.) no saben que quieren (.) callarme (.) porque no te pienses que yo me voy a callar por un bobito (south american) como vos (38:47)

Talia: haha ((laughing))

Kenji: euh (.) Piotr! (.) 'écrite' ici (.)

Leila: 'écrite' ici (.) troisième groupe (.) 'ir' (.) 'er'

.13} {(Miss Lo talks with Rs. The bell rings)}
302. Kenji: attends! () attends attends
303. Leila: Kenji
304. Piotr: Kenji! () grand match!
305. Kenji: grand match!
306. Leila: ah oui! () grand match va Kenji
307. Piotr: ()
308. Talia: [van hacer el fútbol mundial otra vez
309. (39:24)
310. Kenji: moi avec () () toi aussi?
311. Talia: tu sabes cuál es el fútbol mundial?
312. Leila: no () ah! el mundial de fútbol?
313. Talia: aquí () siempre lo hacen en la escuela
314. Piotr: regarde () r- e- () j’ai fini!
315. Leila: (esten)?
316. Talia: si () juegan [ellos en el mundial
317. Piotr: [comme ça().] comme ça ()
318. [comme ça! ([talking with Kenji])
319. Leila: () me dan () pena
320. Piotr: comme ça!
321. Kenji: ()
322. Talia: yo ya he visto a Kenji en el mundial
323. Leila: qué boluditos! ((south american expresión))
324. Piotr: ( )
325. Talia: porque Kenji si () está ()
326. Piotr: regarde () ‘heureux’ () ‘heureux’ ()
327. [troisième groupe
328. Leila: [( ] no me impor:ta! () me tienes
329. podría! () no quiero saber más nada del
330. colegio! () callate un poco () no quiero
331. que ()
332. Piotr: ( )
333. Talia: ils parlent en italien
334. Leila: estan loco! ((laughing))
335. Piotr: ( )
336. Leila: copiate Talia () copiate y despues yo me
337. copia de vos () que lo hace bien (40:33)

--40:34--

T2 S1 D5 V15

T2 S1 D5 V15 E1:
Miss Lo explains to Talia that she will now attend Maths lessons in her mainstream classroom. Talia starts crying and Miss Lo explains why she needs to go to her mainstream classroom and relies partly on Leila for translating her explanations.

--00:00--
1. Miss Lo: donc là ils font les fractions donc les
2. fractions c’est un peu compliqué () mais
3. () tu vas essayer de comprendre ce qu’ils
4. font () et si tu comprends pas () tu
5. paniques pas () hein () tu t’énerves pas
6. () tu boudes pas () tu pleures pas ()
7. tu restes tranquille () et moi je
8. t’expliquerai après () comme ça on aura
les feuilles de madame coupa (.) et je
pourrai t’expliquer
Talia: je sais pas faire les fractions
Miss Lo: oui! ben tu vas aller là-bas (.) tu vas
voir ce qu’elle explique (.) il y a des
enfants là-bas qui ne savent pas faire les
fractions non plus hein
Talia no saben nada de fracciones ellos
Miss Lo: d’accord† (.) c’est pas – c’est pas une
evaluation (.) c’est pas une interrogation (.) c’est pas un
cours (.) c’est une maîtresse qui est
là pour apprendre aux enfants donc elle
va- ce qui est bien c’est que tu seras
avec les enfants de Cm1 et vous allez
faire des mathématiques de Cm1 (.3) parce
que moi j’ai peur de faire des choses trop
crises (.) tu comprends† (.) donc je
préfère que vous allez au cm1 (.3) là-bas
vous allez faire les choses de cm1 si vous
ne comprenez pas (.) moi c’est mon travail
de vous aider à comprendre tranquillement
( .) tu comprends†
Leila: comme ça au moins elle te donnera les
devoirs elle te donnera [les feuilles et
puis on fera ensemble hein†
Leila: [aujourd’hui ya
sport†
Piotr: oui
[.
Miss Lo: alors c’est vrai que là c’est les
fractions (.) c’est un peu dommage parce
que les fractions c’est un peu compliqué
mais bon ( .) regarde samba et mélanie ( .)
elle avait beaucoup de problèmes en
mathématiques et maintenant la maîtresse
dit que c’est très bien ( .) pourtant quand
elle a commence c’était difficile mélanie
hein†
Andrea: non
Miss Lo: au début quand tu as commencé ( .) au ce2
c’était pas difficile†
Andrea: non
Miss Lo: ah bon d’accord! ( .) ok (.3) Hakim c’était
difficile ou pas†
[.
Miss Lo: et maintenant ça va† ou ça va pas†
Hakim: ça va
Miss Lo: un petit peu parce qu’elle t’explique ( .)
donc c’est comme ça que ça se passe ( .) tu
comprends† ( .) la première fois
aujourd’hui tu vas trouver que c’est très
difficile ( .) quand tu vas sortir de la
classé madame coupa tu vas dire oh là là
la la la catastrophe ( .) mais après ( .)
tout doucement ( .) ça va venir d’accord
Talia† (.1) hein† (.1) d’accord? (.1)
moi je compte sur toi ( .) il faut que toi
tu sois un peu: ( .) comment on dit
Leila là en espagnol (.3) j’ai besoin de
ton aide là (.3) vas-y (.1) tu lui résumes
là ce que j’ai expliqué
Leila: [tout†
Miss Lo: [il faut qu’elle soit un peu combative (.)
un peu je sais pas moi ( .) il faut pas
qu’elle reste comme ça et puis qu’elle
pleure et qu’elle dise (.3) [oh je
comprends rien c’est trop difficile’
Leila: dijo que

Miss Lo: il faut qu'elle y aille (.) qu'elle essaye de comprendre et ce qu'elle comprend pas moi je vais lui expliquer

Leila: no yo tengo

Miss Lo: hein† (.) vas- y explique lui

Leila

Leila: euh (.) dijo que (.) {{laughing}} que vas y a la clase y no llores si no entende y todo (.) así vos tenes los ejercicios y la maestra te explica

(02:26)

{{Talia blows her nose as she is crying}}

Miss Lo: d'accord† (.) et madame coupa (.) elle parle beaucoup hein (.) c'est un peu:

(.) elle est un peu comme ça (.) donc il faut pas s'inquiéter (.) des fois elle crie (.) c'est pas grave (.) d'accord (.) elle est comme ça (.) c'est sa personnalité (.) mais elle est gentille

(.) c'est une gentille maîtresse

{{Talia keeps blowing her nose}}

--02:40--

T2 S1 D5 V15 E2:

Miss Lo is asking children to change seats within the classroom and one child wants to stay next to her classmate. Miss Lo refuses as those two children seem to talk a lot amongst themselves.

--04:31--

1. Miss Lo: je vais réfléchir (.) laissez-moi

2. Leila: réfléchir (.) d'accord†

3. Leila: d'accord

4. Miss Lo: bon Karen pour l'instant tu te mets ici (.3) et mélanie tu te mets là (.)

5. d'accord†

6. (.3)

8. Miss Lo: on va revoir sur le grand u mais mais (.) c'était quoi le problème (.) quand vous avez commencé à parler vous parliez trop

9. (.)

10. Leila: mais c'est pour apprendre le français!

11. Miss Lo: oui je sais! (.) mais c'était pas mal d'avoir le groupe deux (.) le groupe trois (.) c'était pas mal pour moi (.) et en vous pouvez travailler ensemble tandis que quand vous êtes en grand u vous avez tendance à être moins concentrés (.) on va voir (.) on va voir

--05:17--

T2 S1 D5 V15 E3:

Miss Lo asks the youngest children of the class to describe their weekends.

--29:14--

132. Maia: °j'ai regardé la télévision°

133. Miss Lo: j'ai regardé la télévision (.) en français ou en espagnol†

134. Kenji: français

135. (.)

137. Talia: [anglais

138. Maia: [anglais

139. Miss Lo: ah d'accord!

140. {{children laughing}}
314. Miss Lo: ah ben ça c'est encore plus simple (.) en anglais (.) d'accord! (.) pourquoi vous avez le câble?
315. Talia: oui
316. Miss Lo: oui!
317. Leila: no tienes television españaña! (29:33)
318. (.2)
319. Miss Lo: et pourquoi vous regardez en anglais alors?
320. (.)
321. Talia: parce que en français (.) c'est::
322. (.1) "se escucha rara la voz (.) como dice!" ((speaking to Mi))
323. Leila: mm s'écoute pas bien le (. ) quand on parle
324. Maia: 'pero tambièn no (oye) el francès'
325. (.4)
326. Miss Lo: parce que vous comprenez pas (.) ou vous entendez pas c'est pas pareil
327. Talia: oui on entend (.) [mais c'est (rare qu'on parle)
328. Miss Lo: [ah
329. [...]another teacher walks in...]
330. Miss Lo: et pendant ce temps-là qu'as-tu fais toi Matilda ce weekend?
331. Matilda: moi aussi
332. Miss Lo: ouais
333. Matilda: ma mère ami
334. Miss Lo: oui (.) l'ami de ma maman
335. Matilda: l'ami de ma maman il a fait un gâteau
336. Miss Lo: c'est il ou elle (.) c'est une femme ou un garçon?
337. Matilda: il!
338. Miss Lo: c'est un ami (.) un monsieur?
339. Matilda: oui!
340. Miss Lo: ah d'accord
341. Matilda: il a fait un gâteau (.) 
342. Miss Lo: ouais
343. Matilda: et après il a- (.) il vient avec le- le- le:
344. (.2)
345. Miss Lo: avec le gâteau?
346. Matilda: non! pas (.) il- il vient avec le (.2) le (.2) comment on dit? ((laughing)) je sais pas comment on dit
347. Miss Lo: oui mais moi je sais pas ce que c'est alors tu vois soit tu le dis en anglais [soit-]
348. Matilda: [c'est le enfant de- de l'ami de ma mère
349. Miss Lo: avec son fils?
350. (.3)
351. Teacher : son?
352. (.2)
353. Matilda: no!
354. Miss Lo: ah
355. Matilda: daughter
356. (.)
357. Miss Lo: sa fille!
358. Matilda: oui avec sa fille
359. Miss Lo: avec sa fille d'accord
360. Matilda: avec sa fille elle est grande et on a mangé le gâteau
361. Miss Lo: ouais
362. Matilda: et après on va voir les surprises (. ) on va faire bowling
363. Miss Lo: vous avez été jouer au bowling oui
364. Matilda: oui (. ) et après on a maison
365. Miss Lo: on a été à la maison oui ((background noise 32:10 - 33:52))
366. (.2)
367. Matilda: samedi on (.2) samedi on voit (.1) euh
368. (.3) on voit un film à la maison je- je
Miss Lo: sais pas comment on dit en français (.)
Matilda: j'ai oublié comment on dit (.) moi je sais
Matilda: c'est quoi alors (.)
Matilda: euh (.) je- je sais pas comment on dit en français
Miss Lo: ben dis-le en anglais moi ça ne me pose pas de problème Ma- Matilda
Matilda: hahaha {{laughing}} (.2) c'est comme euh (.) comme euh (.)
Miss Lo: on dit:::
Miss Lo: c'est quoi (.) ah ben tiens Karen tu vas nous traduire le titre là parce que:::
Matilda: lord of the ring!
Talia: ouhh!! I love
Miss Lo: le seigneur
Matilda: [you know]
Karen: mm
Miss Lo: ring c'est quoi
Karen: [ring c'est::]
Leila: [rey león]
Karen: c'est::
Talia: el rey león {{34:42}}
Miss Lo: chut! attendez attendez!
Leila: le roi de les- de (.) ça {{showing a ring on her finger}}
Miss Lo: ah! (.) le seigneur des anneaux!
Leila: [oui c'est ça
Matilda: [oui!
Piotr: oui
Miss Lo: d'accord (.) le seigneur des anneaux
Matilda: bon on a pas fini parce que c'est trop long
Miss Lo: d'accord

In this extract, Miss Lo is starting a new activity based on a book she is going to read them. The book is called “Voyons”.

Miss Lo: alors c'est voyons et puis il y a trois petits points de suspension c'est quoi les trois petits points de suspension (.)
Leila: les trois cochons! hehe {{laughing}}
Piotr: voyons:::
Miss Lo: voilà! (.) non c'est pas voyons mm (.) c'est voyons:::
Piotr: vois
Miss Lo: voyons::: (.) voyons:::
Kenji: voyons::: (.) voyons::: {{singing}}
Miss Lo: (ça veut dire quoi
voyons:::
Leila: que c'est pas fini
Miss Lo: voilà (.) ça veut dire qu'en fait il réfléchit et parce que dans cette histoire comme vous le voyez sur la couverture (.) un cochon et un loup (.) et en fait le cochon va proposer des choses au loup (.) et le loup va réfléchir et va dire (.) voyons::: (.) c'est-à-dire il dit pas sa réponse (.) d'accord? (.) il dit pas oui ou non (.) il- il dit voyons::: (.) il
réfléchit (.) donc c’est pour ça que c’est
pas voyons avec un point d’exclamation (.).
comme ça (.) c’est pas voyons voir! (.)
ou voyons! ((writing on the blackboard))
(. si je fais ça c’est quoi ça)^
PIOTR: voyons!
MISS LO: ça c’est bon! (.) voyons là (.) hop (.)
les mots là est-ce qu’ils sont signés
voyons (. [voyons hop (.] voyez!
LEILA: [c’est quoi voyons] (.) c’est
quoi voyons]
MISS LO: là si je fais ça (.) voyons! allez hop!
voyons! (.2) tandis que là c’est pas ça
c’est (.) comme ça (.) c’est (.) hein
hein hein (.) [voyons:::
PIOTR: [voyons
MISS LO: des fois on dit même (.) voyons voir:::
( .) voyons c’est le verbe voir (.) mais en
faut là ça veut pas dire voir (.) ça veut
dire plutôt réfléchir (.) d’accord! (.)
c’est une expression (.) c’est une
expression (.) faut pas (.) faut pas
chercher le verbe (.) il faut juste
comprendre ce que ça veut dire (.) donc ça
veut dire ça (.) regardez ((shows the
cover page of the book))
LEILA: no verremos
MISS LO: regardez sa tête (.) hein
( .) je vais
décider (.) je vais réfléchir (.) je vais
voir ( .) [c’est ça que ça veut dire
LEILA: [voy a ver=
KENJI: =ça c’est voyons hein
MISS LO: je vous distribue
LEILA: aya (. non:: (.) lire l’histoire
MISS LO: [l’histoire!
Piotr: [l’histoire!
MISS LO: non mais je vais vous la lire l’histoire
là ( .) oh! ( .) là je vous distribue ( .)
la page de titre ( .) avec ( .) le résumé
qu’il y a sur la quatrième ( .) de
couverture
(MISS LO is cutting papers)
( .)
(Children chatting in the background)
MISS LO: comment on dirait tiens d’ailleurs (.)
comment on dirait en anglais (.) voyons
(.) comme ça là (.) voyons avec trois
petits points (. ) comment on dirait?
Talia!
MISS LO: comment est-ce qu’on dirait?
(.2)
PIOTR: Karen!
MISS LO: comment est-ce qu’on [dirait ça en anglais
KAREN:
PIOTR: [Karen!
KENJI: what!
PIOTR: voyons
(.2)
MISS LO: chut! ( .) let us see (.) let us see ça
n’existe pas en anglais (. ) let us see!
Karen: let me! see
MISS LO: let me see voilà (. ) c’est quelque chose
comme ça hein?
KENJI: let me see
MISS LO: euh:: (. ) comment on dirait en espagnol
Talia and Leila are working in pair in a room next to the induction classroom that is usually used for music lessons. Miss Lo asked Leila to explain fractions to Talia. The microphone is with them so their voices are very clear.

---01:05:56---

26. Leila: bueno (.) empecemos
27. Talia: a ver
28. (.)
29. Leila: eso es una fracción!
30. (.1)
31. Leila: mira (.) aquí tenés (.) una torta no?
32. (.2)
33. Leila: tenés dividido en cuatro=
34. Talia: =cuatro (.) por eso (.) por eso son (.) y
35. como están rallados
36. Leila: un cuarto! (.) bueno entonces te voy a hacer fracciones y ahora me las vas a hacer
37. 38.
39. Talia: ay pero haces bien Leila!
40. ((laughing))
41. Leila: oy Talia!
42. (.3)
43. Leila: no soy dibujadora profesional (.) no me salen los círculos
44. 45. ((noises of a pen on a piece of paper))
46. (.5)
47. Leila: hazme fracción
48. (.9)
49. Talia: son (.) cuatro octavos
50. Leila: okay (.) bueno bueno (.) ahora yo te hago-
51. (.3)
52. Leila: haciendo círculos
53. Talia: esta de que es? (.) es que (.) yo no se ve
54. (.)
55. Leila: si esto estaba mal hecho en la fotocopia
56. Talia: son cuatro?
57. (.2)
58. Talia: a lo mejor (.) ah ahora las tengo que hacer
59. 60. Leila: si bueno (.) primero hacés dos (.)
61. Haces la torta Talia (.) hace la torta
62. Talia: mmm ((complaining noises))
63. ((both children laughing))
64. Leila: ese cuatro ( )
65. Talia: dále
66. ((Talia is now drawing a pie chart))
67. 68. Talia: oh oh (.) mejor aquí
69. Leila: que idiota que sos
70. (.2)
71. Talia: que? ((speaking to Maia who is walking towards them))
72. 73. Maia: ( )
74. Talia: ( )
75. Maia: donde está la (topa)↑
76. Talia: uno (.) dos (.) tres (.) cuatro (.) cinco
77. ({children laughing})
78. Talia: cinco (.) seis
79. Leila: no Talia me parece que te pasaste
80. Talia: [no son diez y seis]
81. Leila: [cuatro cinco seis (.) siete (.) [ocho
82. Talia: [ocho
83. (.)
84. Talia: [nueve
85. Leila: [nueve
86. (.)
87. Talia: [diez
88. Leila: [diez
89. (.)
90. Talia: once (.) doce (.) trece (.)
91. Leila: cinco
92. Talia: ay ( )
93. Leila: no
94. (.)
95. Talia: bueno da igual (.) tu sabes que son quince
96. Leila: [cinco
97. ({Talia counting})
98. Talia: ahi van quince!
99. (.)
100. Leila: dies y seis
101. (.)
102. ({Mi counting})
103. (.8)
104. Talia: quince dice si (.) (j’ai termine)
105. Leila: ahora siguiente ejercicio
106. (.2)
107. Leila: decídmelo acá
108. ( )
109. Talia: un tercio
110. Leila: que es un tercio↑
111. Talia: solo tengo que dibujar una
112. Leila: no:: (.) si yo tengo esto (.) te estoy
diciendo un tercio (.) es↑
113. (.2)
114. (.)
115. Leila: la mita (.) como sería la fracción↑ (.)
116. una (.) sobre (.) dos
117. Talia: mm
118. Leila: esto esto
119. Talia: son (la uno) (.) que tengo que dibujar
120. (.2)
121. Leila: lee todo Talia! (.) colorea un tercio uno
122. (.) de drapeaux en verde (.) y el otro
tercio (.) en rojo (.) ’uno y uno’
123. Leila: estoy diciendo (.) Italia
124. 125. (.)
126. Talia: [bueno–
127. Leila: anda colorea
128. Talia: mira (.) si hago esto tengo (.) un tercio
129. (.)
130. Leila: maîtresse!
131. ({they go to seek T’s help in the other room})
132. (.22)
133. ({comes back in the room where the recorded is})
134. Miss Lo: comment on dit un tiers en espagnol↑
135. Leila: uno (.) cuarto!
136. Miss Lo: non pas un cuarto!
137. Leila: oui mais on dit pas comme ça:: (.) c’est
pas (.) c’est ça
138. Miss Lo: oui (.) un sur trois (.) le trois c’est
140. (.) tout (.) et a chaque fois en haut
141. c’est (.) toi ce que tu dois colorier (.)
142. un sur trois donc c’est toi qui dois faire
143. un (.) sur trois (.) y en a trois (.) si
144. c’était un sur cinq ça veut dire que la y
en a cinq et toi tu dois faire un (.) toi
tu regardes ce qu’il y a en haut (.) ça
c’est comme un gâteau (.) il y a trois
morceaux de gâteau et toi tu manges un (.)
sur trois (.) un tiers (.) un sur les
trois morceaux
Talia: regarde maîtresse
Miss Lo: d’accord! (.) alors (.) sortez moi mélanie
et Hakim vos cahiers de lecture
Talia: ça (.) c’est ça
Miss Lo: oui
Talia: ça (.) c’est ça!
Miss Lo: oui
Talia: je colorie seulement la
Miss Lo: oui (.) oui
Leila: non mais-
Miss Lo: en bleu
Miss Lo: [et un tiers en rouge
Leila: [et un tiers en rouge
Talia: les deux seulement†
Miss Lo: oui (.) [un en bleu (.) un en rouge
Leila: [tenés esto (.) te estás diciendo
(.) uno y uno (01:11:38)
Leila: on le fait†
Miss Lo: ouais
Leila: d’accord
Miss Lo: faites-le ensemble
--01:11:50--

T2 S1 D5 V18

Miss Lo is working with the group of children who come once a week to the induction classroom for language support. Miss Lo asks all children from to describe their weekends.

T2 S1 D5 V18 E1:

--09:49--
1. Miss Lo: alors le plat c’était quoi le plat†
2. (.)
3. Miss Lo: le reste c’était du poisson du poulet (.)
4. de la viande
5. Anika: euh:: (. ) de la viande
6. Miss Lo: de la viande (. ) avec quoi†
7. (.6)
8. Anika: euh:: premier repas on a mangé du::
9. Miss Lo: en entrée (. ) alors en entrée
10. Anika: en entrée on mange de: (. ) apéritif†
11. Miss Lo: ah oui alors c’est pas en entrée (. )
12. alors avant le repas
13. Anika: avant le repas
14. Miss Lo: on a mangé::
15. Anika: on a mangé
16. Miss Lo: des apéritifs
17. Anika: des apéritifs (. ) et après on a mangé de
18. la viande
19. Miss Lo: de la viande
20. Anika: et après du gâteau
21. Miss Lo: et du gâteau (. ) mais la viande il y
22. avait pas de légumes avec† (. ) il y avait
23. pas de:
24. (. )
25. Miss Lo: il y avait pas du riz (. ) il y avait pas
26. des pâtes (. ) il y avait pas des::
27. Anika: des haricots verts aussi
28. Miss Lo: ouais
29. (.)
30. Miss Lo: c'était un plat roumain
31. (.6)
32. Miss Lo: c'était un plat roumain
33. (.2)
34. Anika: euh oui
35. Miss Lo: ah(.) chut!
36. Anika: quelque chose comme euh:
37. (.3)
38. Miss Lo: ben dis et les autres ils vont pouvoir t'aider peut-être(.) dis qu'est-ce que tu cherches?
39. Anika: je sais pas comment ça
40. (.)
41. Miss Lo: mais c'est quoi?
42. (.3)
43. Matilda: c'est un raclette euh
44. (.6)
45. Anika: euh:(.) en français je sais pas-
46. Miss Lo: mais c'est de la nourriture?
47. Anika: oui
48. Miss Lo: ah non mais c'est quoi alors?
49. (.6)
50. Miss Lo: en roumain c'est comment alors(.) dis-moi en roumain
51. Anika: euh:(.) usturoi (11:48) et c'est
52. (.)
53. Miss Lo: comment c'est en roumain?
54. Anika: usturoi
55. Miss Lo: usturoi(.) et usturoi ça se mange?
56. Anika: euh(.) ouais
57. Miss Lo: ah
58. Anika: et c'est(.) c'est comme ça ((gets up from her chair to draw on the blackboard))
59. Miss Lo: ah ben voilà!(.) tu nous fais un dessin
60. (.) usturoi ça vous dit quelque chose
61. les autres non.(.) usturoi non?
62. (.8)
63. ((Anika draws on the blackboard))
64. Miss Lo: ah! (.) c'est des oignons?
65. (.2)
66. Anika: non:
67. Miss Lo: c'est un légume?
68. Anika: oui
69. Miss Lo: ah(.) je vais te montrer alors attends
70. ((Miss Lo goes and look for a picture book))
71. Miss Lo: c'est(.) avec des tomates!
72. (.6)
73. Miss Lo: est-ce que c'est(.) est-ce que c'est:
74. (.) est-ce que c'est
75. (.18)
76. ((children chatting in the background))
77. Miss Lo: alors(.) quarante et un(.) quarante quatre(.) quarante cinq(.) voilà(.)
78. alors attendez(.) non non non restez
79. assis restez assis!(.) est-ce que c'est
80. ça?
81. (.2)
82. Anika: euh: oui
83. Miss Lo: c'est ça?(.) des oignons
84. (.)
85. Miss Lo: c'est ça Hein?
86. ((pointing to the picture book))
87. (.2)
88. Miss Lo: et quand on coupe qu-(.) on pleure
89. Anika: non c'est ça!(.) c'est ça ((pointing to another picture on the book))
Miss Lo: ah! (.). de l’ail! (.). de l’ail!

Anika: de l’ail

Miss Lo: d’accord c’est de l’ail (.). avec des
tomates↑

Anika: ouais
tomates↑

Miss Lo: et de la viande↑

Anika: ouais

Miss Lo: et c’est ça usturoi ↑(.).ou usturoi
c’est l’ail d’accord (.). d’accord (.). et
la viande euh:. (.). d’accord (.). donc en
fait c’était l’apéritif (.). l’apéritif
ce’était quoi à manger
d’accord (.). d’accord (.). et
la viande euh:. (.). d’accord (.). donc en
fait c’était l’apéritif (.). l’apéritif

Anika: du saucisson
du saucisson ouais

Miss Lo: du saucisson

---13:42---

T2 S1 D5 V18 E2:

Miss Lo: euh:. (.). Maia et Matilda vous nous avez
déjà dit ce que vous avez [fait ce week-
end-
Matilda: [maîtresse! (.). maîtresse
eraide euh:. (.). tu peux juste aider
Matilda: oui
Matilda: aujourd’hui (.). mon (.). aunt (.). revenir
Miss Lo: mon↑

Matilda: aunt
Miss Lo: aunt↑

Miss Lo: c’est quoi mon aunt↑

Miss Lo: aunty↑

Matilda: c’est- c’est le sœur de ma maman
donc c’est ma↑ (.). quoi↑ (.). Karen tu
peux aider euh:. (.). tu peux juste aider
Matilda (.). elle dit il y a son aunt qui
va venir (.). son aunt (.). c’est quoi son
aunt
Karen: euh:. (.). c’est la sœur de sa maman
Miss Lo: et ça s’appelle comment en français↑
cousin!
Miss Lo: non ça c’est les enfants

Miss Lo: l’oncle et la↑

Miss Lo: tante!

Matilda: tante!

Miss Lo: la tante (.). d’accord↑ (.). il y a ta tante
qui va venir (.). d’accord très bien (.).
a lors euh::
Talia: euh::
Miss Lo: ah oui amelie! (.). pardon ma belle je
t’ai oublié (.). vas-y alors qu’est-ce que
tu as fais ce week-end↑

---16:20---

T2 S1 D5 V18 E3:

Miss Lo is showing a picture of a lady in a hairdresser and is trying to build children’s vocabulary around this situation.

Miss Lo: d’habitude c’est ta maman qui te coupe les
cheveux (.). c’est ça↑

---24:08--
3. Matilda: mais
4. Miss Lo: oui Matilda!
5. Matilda: j’ai déjà coupé (.) mais à belfast j’ai
les cheveux ici (.) et maintenant j’ai
7. coupé
8. Miss Lo: à belfast tu avais les cheveux très longs
9. (Matilda stands up to show she had her hair
10. reaching the bottom of her back))
11. Miss Lo: c’est ça (.) jusqu’aux fesses (.2) longs
12. jusqu’aux fesses
13. Matilda: et (.)
14. Miss Lo: et (.) tu as été chez le coiffeur (.) qui
15. c’est qui-
16. Matilda: non! j’ai pas chez le coiffeur (.) mon
maman amie elle a- (.) pas une amie mais-
18. (.) comment on dit (.)
19. Julia: ta maman (.) a une amie
20. Matilda: non pas ça! (.) elle est une fille et- et
elle est comme euh: (.) je sais pas
22. comment on dit ça (.) je sais pas!
23. (.2)
24. Miss Lo: de quoi (.) explique moi un peu parce que
la j’arrive pas moi je veux bien t’aider
26.-
27. Matilda: c’est comme euh: (.) j’ai comme été un
bébé et comme je fais pour euh:
29. (.)
30. ?: ( )
31. Matilda: non! comme tu fais pour les bébés (.)
32. comme euh: (.) euh: avec la maman et
33. papa et avec les différentes mamans et les
34. euh (.) et les autres papa
35. (.2)
36. Miss Lo: le baptême! (.) non
37. Matilda: non
38. (.1)
39. Miss Lo: dis- (.) dis-le moi en anglais la (.)
40. Karen tu vas me traduire parce que je
comprends pas ce qu’elle raconte euh (.)
42. euh Matilda la
43. Matilda: god mother!
44. (.)
45. Miss Lo: ah! la marraine!
46. Matilda: oui!
47. Miss Lo: le parrain et la marraine! (.) d’accord
48. (.) et donc qu’est-ce qui était le parrain
ou la marraine?
49. Matilda: la marraine (.) elle est une fille et-
51. Miss Lo: ah! (.) la fille de la marraine (.)
d’accord (.) oui la marraine a une fille
52. donc c’est la fille de la marraine (.)
54. [qu’est-ce qui s’est passé-
55. Matilda: [non pas (.) elle est pas! (.) elle
56. c’est une fille mais elle est pas un- un
enfant
58. (.2)
59. Miss Lo: oui je sais (.) j’ai compris (.) mais la
fille de la marraine (.) ta marraine elle
avait une fille
61. Matilda: non
63. Miss Lo: alors c’est quoi alors
64. Matilda: c’est elle qui m’a coupé mon cheveux
65. Miss Lo: mais c’était qui! qui t’a coupé les
cheveux?
66. Matilda: ma marraine
68. (.)
69. Miss Lo: ah! c’est ta marraine! (.) ok (.) oui
70. c’est ta marraine d’accord (.) mais ta
71. marraine elle est coiffeuse!
72. (.2)
73. Matilda: non!
T2 S1 D5 V18 E4:

Same topic of conversation as in extract 3. T is now asking what is shown on the picture itself.

--28:27--
56. Miss Lo: et là qu’est-ce qu’elle fait la coiffeuse
57. à la maman de david et suzanne
58. Matilda: elle (.) euh-
59. Julia: mm!
60. Miss Lo: oui
61. Julia: elle lave les cheveux
62. Miss Lo: elle lui lave les cheveux (.) elle lui
63. fait un↑ (.) comment on dit ça↑
64. (.2)
65. Julia: elle frotte
66. Miss Lo: ouais (.) elle lui frotte la tête (.) avec
67. quoi comme- est-ce que c’est du savon
68. qu’elle lui met sur la tête?
69. ?: non!
70. Miss Lo: du↑
71. Julia: shampooing
72. Miss Lo: du↑
73. Julia: shampooing
74. Miss Lo: du shampooing: (.) du shampooing
75. (.1)
76. Miss Lo: comment on dit shampooing en espagnol
77. Maia↑
78. Maia: sha(
79. Miss Lo: ah ben d’accord et:: (.) en- en
80. lituanien↑
81. Matilda: (shampounes) (29:27)
82. Miss Lo: shampounes (.) et en espagnol shampoo (.)
83. et en:: polonais↑
84. Julia: shampol
85. Miss Lo: shampol! (.) ah ben dis-donc c’est rigolo
86. ça!
87. Anika: et en roumanie shampoo {((laughing))}
88. Miss Lo: shampoing! ah ben (.) et en:: en anglais↑
89. Matilda: japonais (.) non:: pas japonais (.)
90. japonais
91. Miss Lo: en japonais↑ (.) tu sais dire shampooing en
92. japonais amelie↑
93. Amelia: mm
94. (.2)
95. Miss Lo: non (.) mais en tous cas ce qui est rigolo
96. c’est que- alors on redit (.) en roumain
97. Anika: shampoo
98. Miss Lo: shampoo (.) en:: lituanien↑
99. Matilda: shampooing
100. Miss Lo: shampooing (.) en anglais↑
101. Matilda: euh (.) shampoo
102. Miss Lo: ouais (.) en espagnol↑
103. Maia: shampoo
104. Miss Lo: et en:: polonais
105. Julia: shampoo
106. Miss Lo: ah ben dis-donc! (.) c’est rigolo hein↑
107. (.2) et en français shampooing! (.) alors
108. ça ressemble alors quand même hein↑ (.)
109. shampooing!
110. Class: shampooing!
Teacher-led interaction on how to construct negation.

--02:05--
1. Miss Lo: alors (.) j’aimerais bien maintenant (.)
2. que (.1) qu’on travaille un petit peu sur
3. la phrase négative (.1) euh::
4. ?: (          )
5. Miss Lo: chut!
6. (.4)
7. Miss Lo: et donc j’aimerais bien (.) que vous (.1)
8. que les enfants du groupe trois avec
9. lequel on a commence à travailler là-
10. dessus (.) expliquent aux enfants du
11. groupe deux (.) qu’est-ce que c’est qu’une
12. phrase négative (.) pour cela il faudrait
13. que les enfants du groupe deux ferment
14. leur cahier (.) rapidement
15. (.3)
16. Miss Lo: et (.1) écouter (.) les explications
17. (.6)
18. (children whispering!)
19. Miss Lo: alors (.2) Leila (.) qui c’est qui se
20. sent d’expliquer ça (.) c’est quoi une
21. phrase négative (.2) à la forme négative
22. Kenji: chut!
23. Talia: maîtresse!
24. (.4)
25. Talia: à la forme néga-
26. Miss Lo: attendons (.) on va attendre que nos enfants
27. là-bas soient près (.) ça y est samba? (.)
28. on va pas mettre une heure pour coller ça
29. la (.) vite!
30. Kenji: "dictée!"
31. (.)
32. Piotr: chut!
33. (.)
34. Kenji: "dictée"
35. (.}

--30:20--
36. Miss Lo: bon (.) ça commence à me fatiguer (.)
37. alors hop hop hop hop (.) je vais le faire moi-même
38. (Miss Lo cleans samba's desk))
39. (.)
40. Miss Lo: samba (.) est-ce que tu sais ce que c'est qu'une phrase a la forme négative?
41. est-ce que ça te dit quelque chose ce mot la (.) forme négative (.) est-ce que t'as déjà entendu ça au Sénégal comme tu as été à l'école (.) est-ce que vous avez déjà fait ça (.) la forme négative?
42. ?: "j'ai oublé"
43. Miss Lo: t'as oublé (.) et ça te: (.) tu veux pas chercher un peu dans ta tête la?
44. Kenji: tête!
45. Miss Lo: qu'est-ce que c'est une- (.) donne moi une phrase à la forme négative
46. (.3)
47. Miss Lo: tu pourrais m'en donner une (.) une phrase à la forme négative (.) à- à propos du livre qu'on a lu hier par exemple on pourrait dire quoi?
48. Miss Lo: alors les grands (.) c'est quoi (.)
49. Leila: donne moi en exemple (.) vous me donnez des [exemples en fait]
50. Leila: [je ne peux pas lire
51. Miss Lo: [ne veux pas lire
52. Matilda: [ne veux pas lire
53. Miss Lo: je ne veux pas lire (.) oui (.) c'est une phrase à la forme négative (.) pourquoi ça c'est à la forme négative?
54. Kenji: euh:: [(.) je veux-
55. Leila: [parce que à- à la forme affirmative c'est (.) je veux lire
56. Miss Lo: voilà (.)à la forme affirmative c'est?
57. Kenji: euh:: [(j'ai un pas]
58. Matilda: [je veux lire
59. Miss Lo: je (.) veux (.)
60. ((Miss Lo writes on the board))
61. Piotr: [veux
62. Miss Lo: [veux
63. Cristina: pas
64. Miss Lo: [pas
65. Kenji: [pas (.) être
66. (.2)
67. Miss Lo: d'accord (.2) donc (.) tu pourrais dire quoi alors Karen (.) tu pourrais faire deux phrases comme ça (.) une phrase à la forme affirmative et une phrase à la forme négative?
68. Miss Lo: écrit hier qui dit ça (.) je veux manger un
Piotr: je veux pas manger
Karen: et (.) je (.) ne veux pas manger
Miss Lo: je ne veux pas manger (Miss Lo writes on the board)
Miss Lo: très bien
Piotr: je ne-
Miss Lo: d'accord (.2) est-ce que vous avez ça dans vos langues?
Talia: [oui!]
Miss Lo: [je ne sais pas]
Miss Lo: très bien (.2) est-ce que vous avez des phrases
Leila: [oui]
Talia: [oui]
Miss Lo: [oui] (.2) alors par exemple (.) comment
vous dites en espagnol alors (.2) tu vas écrire parce que là je vais pas écrire en espagnol (.2) alors on va écrire (.) sur un côté du tableau (.) on va écrire (.) des phrases (.) affirmatives
Miss Lo: oui (.2) alors attends (.) on va on va le- donc tu vas venir l'écrire parce que là je vais pas écrire en espagnol (.) alors on va écrire (.) sur un côté du tableau (.) on va écrire (.) des phrases (.) affirmatives
Kenji: tu vas écrire
(Talia is standing near the blackboard)
Talia: [je écrais!]
Miss Lo: ici là (.) voilà toi aussi! (.2)
Miss Lo: [et sur l'autre côté]
Talia: [je écrais]
Miss Lo: [quoi moi!]
Miss Lo: [quoi moi!]
Kenji: [tu écrais je ne veux pas (.2) elle elle a écrit je veux]
Leila: [mais je sais pas la maîtresse]
Miss Lo: alors ici affirmative (.2) ici négative
Miss Lo: alors vas-y (.) en espagnol (.) alors tu as dis quoi (.2) je veux manger
Miss Lo: [je veux manger]
(Talia and Se laughing)
Kenji: [tu écrais je ne veux pas (.2) elle elle a écrit je veux]
Leila: [oh elle écrit comme ça ( .)]
Miss Lo: [yo quiero]
(Talia and Se laughing)
Leila: [chut! (.) laissez-la faire]
Miss Lo: [yo quiero ( .5)]
Kenji: [yo quiero comme]
Talia: [je veux manger]
Miss Lo: [ouais et là-bas je ne veux [pas manger]
Kenji: [yo quiero]
Talia: [je veux manger]
Miss Lo: [alors tiens on va mettre deux chaises]
Piotr: [yo (.) yo [quie-] yo quier (.) yo-
176. Kenji: [yo!]
177. Leila: elle écrit mal yo (. ) c'est comme ça yo
178. Miss Lo: yo quiero comer je veux manger
179. (.12)
180. Piotr: "ch la la"°
181. Kenji: "ch la la"°
182. Piotr: "ch la la"°
183. Kenji: "non Talia (. ) yo!"
184. (.2)
185. Leila: al[e!]
186. Miss Lo: [d'accord
187. Leila: esta mal escrito yo
188. Miss Lo: ok
189. Leila: es con- con igriega
190. Kenji: [yo!
191. Piotr: [igrec
192. (.2)
193. Leila: elle écrit mal yo
194. Piotr: yo (. ) haha ((laughing)) (. ) yo
195. (.)
196. Talia: écrites (. ) jo (.3) comme se escribe la igriega°
197. Leila: la igriega [Talia! 05:04
198. Piotr: [igrec
200. Kenji: [igrec!
201. Piotr: [igrec
202. Leila: igrec
203. Kenji: elle a oublié!
204. ((children laughing))
205. Miss Lo: elle a oublié°
206. Leila: oui:°
207. Miss Lo: Talia t'as oublié l'espagnol°
208. Leila: [oui maîtresse
209. Talia: [oui
210. Miss Lo: ah c'est fantastique [alors
211. Leila: [c'est pour ça que je
212. ( ) mieux Talia
213. ((children's chatting in the background))
214. Miss Lo: [ah d'accord
215. Karen: [parce que-
216. Karen: parce que (. ) elle apprend le français (. )
217. elle peut l'ang- (. ) lei:
218. Kenji: [écris japonais!
219. Miss Lo: ouais mais en français (. ) en français yo
220. c'est pas avec je hein
221. Kenji: très différent-
222. Leila: =mais l'espagnol c'est avec [je
223. Karen: [yo
224. (.)
225. Miss Lo: non mais elle a écrit yo (. ) et en
226. français ça écrit comme ça aussi
227. Leila: oui mais en espagnol non
228. Miss Lo: en espagnol ça écrit comment° (. ) vous
dites jo°
229. Leila: comme ça (. ) yo
230. Miss Lo: ah! parce que vous dites yo d'accord ok
231. (. ) je comprends (. ) d'accord (. ) elle a
mis la lettre française
232. Leila: oui
233. Miss Lo: d'accord ok (. ) très bien! (. ) alors en
234. polonais maintenant (. ) vas-y Piotr
235. (.2)
236. Piotr: euh::
237. Leila: mmm ((laughing)) hijo!
240. Piotr: euh:: je veux (. ) lire!
241. Miss Lo: non la même chose (. ) on va prendre la
242. même phrase comme ça on va voir un peu ce
243. qui se passe
244. Leila: Talia
245. Kenji: tu écris (. ) polonais
246. Matilda: en polonais hein
247. Kenji:  /tʃing/ /
248. (.2) ((Se writes on the board))
249. Kenji:  ja
250. Leila:  ja
251. Kenji:  ja
252. Leila:  ja
253. Kenji:  ja
254. Leila:  ja
255. (.)
256. Kenji:  ja chassu
257. Leila:  ja-
258. Leila:  ja chasse (.) chasse
259. Talia:  ja chasse↑ (.) jesse
260. Miss Lo:  ouais
261. Kenji:  fini!
262. Miss Lo:  c'est donc c'est (.) je veux manger (.)
263. c'est pareil d'accord (.) et là-bas↑ (.)
264. je ne veux pas manger↑
265. Kenji:  jesse jesse
266. Piotr:  non c'est (.) je (.) euh:: (.) ne
267. Miss Lo:  ouais
268. Piotr:  veux manger
269. Miss Lo:  vas-y alors (.) mais ça veut dire je ne
270. veux pas manger
271. (.4) ((Se writes on the board))
272. Leila:  ( ) te das cuenta (06:22)
273. (.8)
274. ((Children trying to read what Se is writing))
275. Miss Lo:  d'accord (.) merci Piotr! (.) euh: (.)
276. en anglais↑
277. (.2)
278. Kenji:  Andrea::!
279. (.)
280. Leila:  en japonais::!
281. Miss Lo:  on va laisser après japonais [et peul (.)
282. peul vous allez-
283. Kenji:  japonais↑ [tu lire pas
284. Kenji:  sait pas ça
285. Miss Lo:  non je vais écrire moi
286. Kenji:  mmm
287. Miss Lo:  mais il va falloir que vous me [disiez (.)
288. à l'oral
289. Kenji:  [écrire (.)
290. m- e-
291. (.)
292. Kenji:  tu écris (.) m- e-
293. Miss Lo:  on va essayer écrire
294. (.)
295. Leila:  I am (.) mmm ((laughing))
296. Piotr:  I'm
297. Kenji:  I'm sorry
298. ((Br writing on the board))
299. Miss Lo:  I want c'est ça↑ (.) tu écris [I want
300. Talia:  I want it
301. (.)
302. Kenji:  I'm sorry
303. (.)
304. Kenji:  tout le monde sait l'anglais
305. (.3)
306. Leila:  euh: japonais (.2) /tʊŋdʒə/ /ding/ /ɔməni:/
307. Talia:  euh: japonais (.2) /tʊŋdʒə/ /ding/ /ɔməni:/
308. Leila:  prezento
309. Piotr:  prezento
310. Leila:  prezento (.) regalo
311. Miss Lo:  chut!
312. Piotr:  "prezento"°
313. Kenji:  "je vais te manger { ___ }
314. Miss Lo:  [I want to eat okay
315. Piotr:  manger↑
Miss Lo: et après en: . je ne veux pas manger
Kenji: quoi↑
Piotr: jëôô
Kenji: iest↑ (. ) [iien↑
Talia: [I don't wanna eat
Kenji: [je veux iest
Piotr: [comment (. ) manger (. ) japon
Kenji: taberu (07:25)
Piotr: taberu↑
Kenji: non taberu!
Piotr: taberu!

(.2)
Kenji: comme ça (. ) taberu!
Piotr: taberu!
Kenji: e-
Piotr: taberu ( {laughing} ) taberu
Kenji: quoi↑
Piotr: taberu
(.3)
Kenji: "comme ça (. ) taberu" Leila: qu'est-ce que [tu fais↑
Piotr: [moi écris taberu (. )

(taberu)
(.2)
Piotr: ["t- (. ) a" Kenji: ["c'est pas alphabet" (.3)
Leila: il écrit (. ) [et même pas qui se corrige Miss Lo: [i don't want Piotr: taberu Kenji: tu écrire japonais Piotr: taberu (. ) haha ( {laughing} )
(.3)
Miss Lo: très bien!
(.4)
Leila: japonais!
Miss Lo: alors main{tenant
Kenji: [après!
Piotr: japonais= Kenji: "après! {(. ) sénégal Miss Lo: dit je veux manger (. ) pas je mange hein mais je veux manger en fait (. ) j'ai envie de manger Kenji: watashi ( ) <I ( )> (08:07)
(.4)
Miss Lo: comment on dit je veux manger et je veux [pas manger Karen: [c'est trop↑ Miss Lo: chut!
Karen: trop↑ Miss Lo: attendez (.4)
Piotr: /mekemo/
(.3)
Samba: m- i-
Miss Lo: m- i-↑
(.2)
Piotr: oui::
Samba: a-
Kenji: mi pas
Piotr: mia Miss Lo: ah non tu me dis- non mais tu me- d'accord (. ) est-ce que tu peux l'écrire euh:
samba (. ) en peul Samba: "non"
Miss Lo: non↑ (. ) et comment est-ce qu'on dit alors
(.4) comment on dit je veux manger en peul
--08:32--
387. Samba: "muniam"
388. Miss Lo: att- att- attends
389. Kenji: jumbiam
390. Samba: lu
391. Miss Lo: ouais
392. Samba: lu
393. Miss Lo: ouais
394. Samba: niam
395. Kenji: lu lu jubiam
dice hambre más o menos (08:38)
397. Miss Lo: alors (.) mais tu peux pas l’écrire↑ (.)
398. [essayer de écrire euh
399. Kenji: [/næm/ lubiam manger
400. Piotr: pourquoi il [écrit pas!
401. Miss Lo: [chut! (.) ah! (.) mais
402. (2)
403. Samba: ( .)
404. Miss Lo: il y a des mots que tu peux pas écrire (.)
405. mais est-ce que il y a des mots qu’on
406. pourrait essayer écrire avec- au moins
407. qu’il y a combien de mots (. ) alors-
408. Piotr: écrire
409. (.)
410. Miss Lo: [je veux manger
411. Talia: [écrit en sénégal!
412. Miss Lo: alors c’est quoi le:: (.) redir le moi je
413. ne veux manger
414. (.3)
415. Miss Lo: vas-y (.) j’écoute
416. (.2)
417. Samba: mi
418. Miss Lo: [mi↑
419. Talia: [mi
420. (.1)
421. Kenji: mi (.) Leila::
422. Miss Lo: les autres vous vous taisez s’il vous
423. plaît parce que là on a besoin de- c’est
424. pas des langues qu’ont écrit (. ) alors il
425. faut qu’on écoute comment ça se prononce
426. ( .) pour essayer de les écrire d’accord
427. donc il faut-
428. Karen: maîtresse!
429. Miss Lo: non chut! ( .) je veux le silence (.1) mi↑
430. (.3)
431. Miss Lo: je veux manger ( .) comment tu dis
432. Amkoulel je veux manger
433. Amkoulel ( .)
434. Miss Lo: redis-moi
435. Amkoulel ( .)
436. Miss Lo: boli↑
437. (.)
438. Miss Lo: non vas-y redis-moi redis-moi
439. Amkoulel con di niam
440. Kenji: /polin'/
441. Miss Lo: redis-le plus fort
442. Amkoulel con li niam
443. Miss Lo: ok et je ne veux pas manger
444. Amkoulel ( .)
445. Kenji: /næm/ /næm/ [][] /polin'/
446. Miss Lo: [ah d’accord (. ) boli quelque
447. chose comme boli niam de (. ) c’est ça↑
448. Kenji: boliniame
di niam
di niam
di niam
di niam
di niam
di niam
di niam
di niam
450. Amkoulel bou bou (. ) c’est bou
451. Miss Lo: hein↑
452. An: bouliniamde
453. Miss Lo: mi↑
454. Kenji: bouliniamde
455. Miss Lo: chut! ( .) mi
Amkoulel mi
Miss Lo: mi (.) c’est séparé ou c’est ensemble?
Amkoulel séparé
Miss Lo: ah (.) mi (.) après
Amkoulel i
Miss Lo: i
((Miss Lo writes on the board))
Amkoulel di
Miss Lo: séparé di
Amkoulel oui
Miss Lo: c’est séparé ou c’est ensemble
Amkoulel séparé
Miss Lo: ah (.) mi (.) après
Amkoulel i
Miss Lo: mi i (.) di (.) niamde
Amkoulel oui
Miss Lo: quelque chose comme ça (.) après on va lire et on va voir si c’est ça
((Miss Lo writes on the board))
Amkoulel séparé
Miss Lo: oui
((laughing)) ((Miss Lo writes on the board))
Piotr: niambe
Kenji: niambe
Miss Lo: di
Amkoulel niambe
Miss Lo: da
((Miss Lo writes on the board))
Amkoulel [iam
Miss Lo: [iamde
Amkoulel[Piotr:
Miss Lo: di
Miss Lo: [iamde
Amkoulel[Piotr: [niambe
Miss Lo: da ((Miss Lo writes on the board))
Amkoulel mi
Miss Lo: alors si je dis par exemple (.) euh-
Leila: [sénégalais
Miss Lo: [je veux (.) chut! je veux dormir
Miss Lo: ça va être mi i di (.2)
Miss Lo: dormir† (.2)
Samba: oui
Miss Lo: c’est comment dormir†
Samba: ( )
Kenji: anada
(.2)
Miss Lo: anade
Amkoulel danade
Miss Lo: danade† (.2) donc ça sera mi i danade†
Amkoulel oui
Miss Lo: et je ne veux pas dormir (.2) ça sera mi i†
Samba: mi yi (.2) daa
Miss Lo: daa
Samba: daanoode
Miss Lo: ah! (.2) alors mi (.2) yi (.2) daa (.2)
Samba: [nood
Miss Lo: mi yi (.2) daa (.2)
Miss Lo: danade† (.2) donc ça sera mi i danade†
Miss Lo: c’est d’accord (.2) donc je veux dormir (.2)
Leila: [sénégalais
Miss Lo: [je veux (.) chut! je veux dormir
donc ça sera mi i danade†
Miss Lo: et je ne veux pas dormir (.2) ça sera mi i†
Samba: [daa
Miss Lo: daa
Samba: daanoode
Miss Lo: ah! (.2) alors mi (.2) yi (.2) daa (.2)
Samba: [nood
donc ça sera mi i danade†
Miss Lo: c’est d’accord (.2) donc je veux dormir (.2)
Miss Lo: c’est ‘pas’ en fait (.2) et je veux dormir
c’est mi yi†
Amkoulel ça c’est di
Miss Lo: di! (.2) ok (.2) mi yida daanoode c’est je veux
Miss Lo: daanoode c’est je ne veux pas dormir
Amkoulel: oui

Piotr: "c’est trop difficile"

Miss Lo: et c’est toujours comme ça\(^1\) si je dis (.\) je veux (.\) partir (.\) j’en ai marre je veux partir

Talia: [mi yi [di

Miss Lo: [chut!

Samba: [(

Miss Lo: mi yidi

Samba: ( )

(.2)

Samba: iam

(.2)

Amkoulel mi yidi ( )

Miss Lo: [dialogue en japonais! (.) Kenji

Talia: [en japonais! (.) Kenji

Miss Lo: mi yida [dialogue en japonais! (.) c’est ça\(^1\) et je ne veux pas partir (.\) laisse-moi Amkoulel tu vas me dire si c’est juste

Kenji: [yo no quiero (.\) comer

Miss Lo: [mi yida [dialogue en japonais!

Amkoulel ( )

Miss Lo: et ben voilà! (.\) je parle peul ça y est!

Kenji: [yo no quiero comer

Miss Lo: [dialogue en japonais!

Talia: vas-y

Miss Lo: alors (.\) en japonais (.\) alors maintenant en japonais ça va être [encore une autre histoire la

Leila: [oui!

Talia: vas-y

Miss Lo: alors (.\) en japonais (.\) alors maintenant en japonais ça va être [encore une autre histoire la

Leila: [en japonais! (.) Kenji

Miss Lo: [en japonais! (.) le même alphabet (.\) a- b- comme ça tu écris pas en-

Kenji: japonais

Miss Lo: non en français

Leila: non! (.\) en japonais! (.\) maîtresse!

Miss Lo: après après en japonais (.\) déjà en français

Karen: les lettres (.\) en français mais pas en japonais (.\) en espagnol

Talia: maîtresse! (.\) en espagnol

Miss Lo: chut chut chut

[Kenji writes on the blackboard]

Miss Lo: on va essayer de comprendre

(.2)

Leila: ha: ((reading the words as Kenji writes them on the board))

Miss Lo: parce que je vais vous montrer quelque chose

Leila: [hata (.\) non hata

Piotr: [hata

Miss Lo: chut! (.\) laissez-le parce qu’il va nous-

hatashi hatashi! Q>

Miss Lo: chut! (.\) donc là c’est je veux on a dit euh\(2\) (.\) c’était quoi! (.\) je veux\(2\) (.\) manger manger

Leila: c’est moi (.\) atashi Q>

Miss Lo: oui

Piotr: atashi c’est moi
Miss Lo: ah ben oui (.) tu parles japonais Leila? ((laughing))
Leila: oui
Miss Lo: ah d'accord (.) [je savais pas ((laughing))
Talia: [moi aussi (.) non c'est moi [qui sais et après tout le monde
Miss Lo: [chut!
Miss Lo: hatashi:: <I>
Piotr: non c'est Kenji
Talia: oui
Miss Lo: ha::
Leila: ha::
Piotr: mmm {((laughing))
Matilda: [tabe- tabe taberai!: {{(trying to read on the blackboard))
Miss Lo: [donc ça c'est quoi↑ (.) c'est je::↑ (.) veux manger
Talia: atashi ha <I>
Piotr: atashi [ha <I>
Leila: [tabe ha ta-
Miss Lo: chut! (. ) attendez
{(.)
Kenji: je [{(pointing to the blackboard)} (. ) veux manger
Miss Lo: d'accord (.) et le 'ha' c'est quoi↑
Kenji: euh: 'ha' est::
Talia: veux!
Miss Lo: chut! (. )
Piotr: atashi ha <I> (. ) veux↑
Miss Lo: okay alors (. ) je ne veux pas manger maintenant on va voir qu'est-ce qui se passe
Piotr: atashi (hada) {14:07}
( (.8)
( (Kenji writes on the board)
Piotr: atashi <I>
Piotr: (.12)
Piotr: c'est la même chose!
Piotr: (.6)
Piotr: c'est la même ch- (. ) non c'est- (. ) ya pas (. ) ya pas i- (. ) tabetakun
Leila: tabetakun <want to eat>{14:39)
Piotr: [tabe {
Leila: [en japonais maintenant!
Miss Lo: alors!
Piotr: tabetakun <want to eat
Miss Lo: dis-nous le- (. ) dis-le nous Kenji (. )
Miss Lo: dis-le nous (. ) prononce le nous
Piotr: dis
Leila: {dis en japonais!
Miss Lo: [{ ici que tu as écrit
Kenji: euh:: (. ) watashi wa! tabetakunai <I don't want to eat>
Miss Lo: et là-bas↑
Kenji: watashi wa tabetai <I want to eat> (. ) ah non ça marche
Miss Lo: [changes a letter on the board]
Kenji: ah! d'accord (. ) alors là-bas c'est atashi a (.) tabetai! <I want to eat>
Kenji: oui
Miss Lo: et là-bas c'est atashi a tabetai!
Piotr: tabetai=
Leila: =kunai
Miss Lo: [kunai
Piotr: [kunai
( (. )
Leila: [en japonais]

Miss Lo: [et le 'ai' là-bas c'est quoi le- chut!]

(. c'est quoi le 'ai'!]

Kenji: çd

Miss Lo: tabetai ça veut dire quoi?

(.

Miss Lo: çd c'est manger

Kenji: ça

Miss Lo: tabetai ça veut dire quoi

Kenji: [manger (...) taberu <to eat>

Miss Lo: d'accord

Kenji: euh: (...) manger (.). euh (.). manger plus

Miss Lo: ouais (.). je veux manger!

Kenji: je veux manger est (...) tabetai (15:39)

Miss Lo: d'accord (...) et là-bas (.) je ne veux pas

(. c'est comment (.) il est ou le je ne

veux pas là-bas!

Piotr: tabetakunai <dont want to eat>

Miss Lo: chut!

Kenji: euh: (...) tabeta et kunai

Miss Lo: kunai (.) et c'est le- le pas il est ou

alors! (.) le pas là-dedans il est ou!

Kenji: ici

Miss Lo: là-dedans d'accord (.) donc vous avez vu

ce qu'il dit la (.). c'est intéressant

parce qu'il dit qu'en japonais (.) ça

c'est pas- ça c'est pas manger en japonais

(.) ça c'est (.) veux manger (.) et la

c'est (.). veux pas manger (.) il y a un

mot pour- (.) la en espagnol ya (.) veut

manger (.) en polonais ya (.) veut manger

(.) comme en français hein (.) en (.)

anglais ya (.) veux (.) manger (.) a

l'infinitif (.) to eat comme en français

(.) en peul (.) euh::

Piotr: oui (.). oui c'est-

Miss Lo: je veux! (.) di (.) c'est ça hein (.)

namde manger (.) hein (.) donc c'est

pareil (.) mais en japonais (.) en

japonais

Piotr: c'est tout-

Miss Lo: veux manger c'est dans le (.) un seul mot

Piotr: je veux manger

Miss Lo: c'est je (.) et veux manger (.) et le 'ha'

la↑

Leila: on ne sait pas

Kenji: euh::

Miss Lo: on ne sait pas ce que c'est (.). c'est quoi

Kenji: euh::

Miss Lo: ça sert à quoi (.) est-ce qu'on pourrait

l'enlever↑

(1.1

Kenji: non

Miss Lo: ah non

(2.

Kenji: ça c'est très bizarre

Miss Lo: c'est très bizarre si on l’enlève

( [children laughing])

Miss Lo: et qu’est-ce que ça veut dire! (.) tu peux

pas le traduire! (.) ou bien c’est parce

que c’est le mot quand- quand on dit- on

dit- je veux! (.) c’est pour ça ou!

Kenji: non

Miss Lo: non
Kenji: non

Miss Lo: il sert à quoi alors ce ‘ha’ là ?

Piotr: [je sais pas!]

Kenji: [le ‘ha’ est::

Piotr: c’est rien

Miss Lo: si si c’est quelque chose mais—

Kenji: [

Miss Lo: ah voilà! {,} c’est comme euh:: dans (.)

to it {,} c’est comme une particule c’est

comme une prep— une particule qu’on

utilise avec le mot (. )veux manger

Piotr: ah oui

Miss Lo: d’accord {,} comme une préposition (. ) un

petit mot (. ) c’est un petit mot

Piotr: oui (. ) Kenji!

Leila: maîtresse (. ) ça donne en (. ) japonais!

Miss Lo: par exemple en anglais (. ) Karen on

pourrait dire en anglais (. ) I want eat {,}

Miss Lo: non on pourrait pas (. ) donc le to là (. )
on peut pas le traduire mais on en a

besoin (. ) très bien (. ) alors maintenant
ce que je voudrais que vous regardiez

Leila: [oh::

Piotr: [oh non

Miss Lo: c’est que (. ) euh:: (. ) Talia tu

viens entourer entre je veux manger et je

ne veux pas manger (. ) tu viens entourer
cé qui a change

Talia’s chair makes a noise when she gets

up)

Miss Lo: en rouge (. ) tu vas m’entourer les mots

qui ont changé entre les deux phrases

(.)

Miss Lo: est-ce que tu as bien compris la consigne ?

(.)

Leila: [oh:: (Laughing)

Miss Lo: alors vous allez voir ce qu’elle va faire

(.) entre je veux manger et je ne veux pas

manger qu’est-ce qui change ?

Piotr: ah ça ?

Miss Lo: là on a mis

(.)

Talia: no

Miss Lo: no (. ) très bien (. ) entre euh:: (. ) donc

tu vas continuer (. ) en polonais {,} (. )
qu’est-ce qui change ?

Talia: nie

Piotr: oui::

Miss Lo: oui (. ) en:: anglais qu’est-ce qui

change ?

Talia: don’t

Miss Lo: don’t (. 2) en:: peul

(.3)

Talia: da

Miss Lo: euh:: c’est le da à la place du di

d’accord (. ) euh:: (. 2) et là c’est le

kunai à la place du— (. ) d’accord c’est

entre ça et ça (. ) donc

( .2)

Piotr: tabetakunai <want to eat>

Miss Lo: on va prendre une autre couleur parce que

il y a deux cas (. ) il y a deux situations

(.4)

Miss Lo: il y a deux situations (. ) il y a une

situation ou il y a un mot (. ) en:

( .2)

Miss Lo: en plus ! (. ) là il y a un mot en plus

mais là il y a pas de mot en plus (. ) là

c’est juste que le mot a change (. ) en
peul était *di* (.*) et là c’est (*.) da (*.)
mais quand on compte le nombre de mots il y en a combien là en espagnol (*.) un deux trois (*.) je veux manger (*.) comme en français (*.) et il y en a combien là!

Leila: *quatre*
Piotr: *quatre*
Miss Lo: *quatre parce que il y a ça qui est en plus*

(*) d’accordführer

Miss Lo: en polonais (*.) je veux manger il y en a
Piotr: trois
Leila: trois
Miss Lo: et je ne veux pas [manger il y en a]
Leila: [quatre]
Piotr: quatre
Miss Lo: quatre (*.) en anglais† (*.) *I want* (*.) *to eat* (*.) on va compter un-
Piotr: quatre
Miss Lo: trois (*) et *I don’t want to eat=
Cristina: =*quatre*

Miss Lo: *quatre* il y en a quatre
Karen: mais il y a trois là- quatre là parce que I- c’est- c’est moi
Miss Lo: un deux trois (*.) un (*) deux (*) trois (*.) quatre (*) donc il y en a un en plus
(... en: peul (*) c’est différent en peul (*) un deux trois quatre (*) et là un deux trois quatre (*) mais quand même il y a quelque chose qui n’est pas pareil (*.)
hein† (*) parce que était *di* et là ça devient† (*) *da* (*) et en:: japonais (*)
atashi *wa* tabetai *<I want to eat>*
Piotr: c’est- c’est là même
Miss Lo: ça fait deux parce que le ‘*ha*’ il a dit que c’était comme le *to* donc ça fait deux
(.2) et là il y en a†
Piotr: deux!
Miss Lo: encore deux (*) donc il y a pas de mots en plus mais il y a quelque chose qui s’est passé quand même (*) on a rajouté quand même ((drawing on the board))
Piotr: kunai!
Miss Lo: si il y a quand même un morceau de- quelque chose en plus là-bas (*) parce que là c’était *tabetai* *<want to eat>* et maintenant c’est *tabetakunai* *<don’t want to eat>* c’est quand même
Piotr: il y a pas- (*) il y a pas
Miss Lo: [plus long
Piotr: il y a pas *tabetai* (*) il y a pas i-
(.2)
Miss Lo: voilà il a quand même changé et c’est quand même plus long (*) donc qu’est-ce qu’on peut dire:: (*) par rapport (*.) euh (.*) au français (.*) je vais mettre le français là-haut
Cristina: il!
((Miss Lo writes on the board))
Miss Lo: je veux (*.) manger (*.) pourquoi je vais va† (*) parce que à l’oral vous faites pas de fautes mais à l’écrit vous faites des fautes (*) je ne (*.) veux (*.) pas
Kenji: manger
Piotr: qu’est-ce qui se passe en français par rapport à toutes ces langues [là]*
Piotr: [il y a deux mots!~21:26--
Miss Lo: oui Piotr
Piotr: on ajoute deux mots
Miss Lo: on ajoute des deux mots.
Miss Lo: deux mots (.1) on en ajoute pas un seul on ajoute deux.
Piotr: ne et pas
(Miss Lo writing on the board)
Miss Lo: et donc ça va t’asseoir Talia
(.3)
Miss Lo: on ajoute deux mots et vous avez vu que dans beaucoup d’autres langues on en ajoute qu’un seul ça suffit! mais en français c’est deux. quand on parle on dit- on dit pas (.).
je ne veux pas manger à la cantine on dit (.2) j’veux pas manger à la cantine (.1) le petit ne là (.2) on l’entend pas très bien (.1) je ne veux pas manger à la cantine (.)
je ne veux pas- (.1) [vous voyez on l’entend pas
Talia: [je n’veux pas
Miss Lo: donc (.4) Amkoulel (.3) ce qu’il faut faire (.3) c’est que en français il faut se rappeler que il y a deux mots (.2) et il ne faut pas oublier (.1) le ne qui est ici (.4) d’accord]
Piotr: c’est facile
(.2)
Miss Lo: alors (.1) pourquoi on dit le ne qui est ici (.1) il y a quand même quelque chose qui est pareil avec vos langues (.2) qu’est-ce qui est pareil?
Leila: le je
Miss Lo: ouais (.2) mais je (.1) et après qu’est-ce qu’on met (.1)
Leila: vous
Miss Lo: le ne (.1) tout de suite le ne ah oui!
Miss Lo: comme en espagnol (.2) tout de suite le ne (.3) en polonais (.2) tout de suite le ne (.4) donc le ne il est tout de suite après le sujet comme dans d’autres langues
Talia: I don’t
Leila: non en peul non
Miss Lo: ah non pas en peul (.1) le peul et le japonais c’est très différent
Leila: mm ((laughing))
Miss Lo: d’accord! (.1) mais (.2) peut-être que les enfants qui parlent peul et japonais (.2) ils auront pas de problème (.2) parce que c’est très différent (.2) tandis que vous (.2) si vous [faite-
(?
Miss Lo: Leila (.2) si vous faites comme en espagnol (.3) qu’est-ce que vous allez faire (.1) vous allez oublier (.1) un des deux mots (.2) et c’est ça que j’ai vu quand j’ai corrigé vos devoirs (.1) c’est que vous avez toujours oublié un des deux mots
Piotr: moi non
(.2)
Miss Lo: si Piotr aussi
Kenji: toi dis (.2) haha ((laughing)) (.1) je veux pas manger
438.

Miss Lo: je veux pas manger vous écrivez souvent

(alors que c'est je (.1) ne! veux pas manger d'accord!)

Talia: [je ne veux pas

().]

487. Miss Lo: donc ce qu'on peut voir c'est que toutes

les langues de la classe (.1) tout le monde a une forme affirmative (.1) une forme négative (.1) dans toutes les langues ça existe (.1) mais selon les langues c'est pas tout à fait pareil (.1) et en français au lieu d'avoir un mot (.1) euh:: qui exprime la négation (.1) on en a deux (.1) et les deux mots ils se mettent autour du (.1) verbe (.1) le ne (.1) il est avant le verbe et le pas il est tout de suite derrière le verbe (.1) d'accord (.1) alors par exemple (.1) je dors (.1)

Leila: [je ne dors pas

C?: [

Miss Lo: non (.1) j'ai pas dis (.1) je veux dormir

(...) j'ai dis je dors

Leila: je ne- je ne dors pas

Miss Lo: je ne dors pas (.1) je parle!

Leila: je ne parle pas

Talia: [je ne parle pas

Miss Lo: Cristina (.1) je:: regarde la télévision (.1) alors chut! (.1) je regarde la télévision

Cristina: je (.1)

Miss Lo: je:

Cristina: ne regarde pas la télévision

Miss Lo: je ne regarde pas la télévision (.1) Karen (.1) je:: parle avec mon frère

Karen: je (.1) ne parle pas avec mon frère

Miss Lo: samba (.1) je:: (.1) regarde le match de foot a la télévision

---24:46---

Leila: [je ne dors pas

C:?:

Miss Lo: non (.1) j'ai pas dis (.1) je veux dormir

(...) j'ai dis je dors

Leila: je ne- je ne dors pas

Miss Lo: je ne dors pas (.1) je parle!

Leila: je ne parle pas

Talia: [je ne parle pas

Miss Lo: Cristina (.1) je:: regarde la télévision (.1) alors chut! (.1) je regarde la télévision

Cristina: je (.1)

Miss Lo: je:

Cristina: ne regarde pas la télévision

Miss Lo: je ne regarde pas la télévision (.1) Karen (.1) je:: parle avec mon frère

Karen: je (.1) ne parle pas avec mon frère

Miss Lo: samba (.1) je:: (.1) regarde le match de foot a la télévision

---30:05---

1. Miss Lo: alors on va juste terminer comme euh::

2. Hakim est arrivé (.1) est-ce que Hakim tu sais dire en kabyle (.1) réfléchis hein (.1) réfléchis (.1) est-ce que tu sais dire en kabyle (.1) je veux manger et je ne veux pas manger (.1) est-ce que tu sais le dire en kabyle

7. (.1)

9. Miss Lo: maman j'ai faim (.1) je veux manger (.1) je veux manger alors juste (.1) et je ne veux pas manger

10.

11.

12.

13. (.1)

14. Miss Lo: alors comment on dit (.1) je écoute (.1) écoute (.1) je veux manger

15.

Hakim: (.1)

16.

Miss Lo: c'est juste pour voir si ça change entre les deux (.1) quand on dit je veux manger et quand on dit je ne veux pas manger (.1) qu'est-ce qui est pas pareil et qu'est-ce qui est pareil

19.

20.

21.

22. (.2)

23. Miss Lo: comment on dit en algérie (.1) je veux manger

24.

25. (.)

26. Miss Lo: alors attendez (.1) écoute

T2 S1 D6 V20 E2:

Hakim and Andrea come back to the classroom and Miss Lo is summarising the activity.

---30:05---

1. Miss Lo: alors on va juste terminer comme euh::

2. Hakim est arrivé (.1) est-ce que Hakim tu sais dire en kabyle (.1) réfléchis hein (.1) réfléchis (.1) est-ce que tu sais dire en kabyle (.1) je veux manger et je ne veux pas manger (.1) est-ce que tu sais le dire en kabyle

7. (.1)

9. Miss Lo: maman j'ai faim (.1) je veux manger (.1) je veux manger alors juste (.1) et je ne veux pas manger

10.

11.

12.

13. (.1)

14. Miss Lo: alors comment on dit (.1) je écoute (.1) écoute (.1) je veux manger

15.

Hakim: (.1)

16.

Miss Lo: c'est juste pour voir si ça change entre les deux (.1) quand on dit je veux manger et quand on dit je ne veux pas manger (.1) qu'est-ce qui est pas pareil et qu'est-ce qui est pareil

19.

20.

21.

22. (.2)

23. Miss Lo: comment on dit en algérie (.1) je veux manger

24.

25. (.)

26. Miss Lo: alors attendez (.1) écoute

---24:46---
27. Hakim: ( )
28. Miss Lo: tu me dis si je me trompe (.) vas-y
29. Hakim: "vrer atchar"
31. Miss Lo: (et je ne veux pas manger
32. (.)
33. Hakim: euh:
34. Kenji: "tcha"!
35. Miss Lo: (.)
36. Hakim: ( )
37. Piotr: "vrer ne tcha pas (.) haha"
38. (.)
39. Hakim: ( )
40. Miss Lo: ah! alors (.) euh euh euh (.)
41. vrer (.) ça écris pas comme ça je sais
42. mais j'essaie juste de faire avec (.)
43. vrer (.) atchar (.) c'est du kabyle
44. ça↑
45. Hakim: oui
46. Miss Lo: d'accord (.) vrer atchar c'est je veux manger (.) ça c'est je veux et ça c'est manger↑
47. Hakim: oui
48. Miss Lo: et je ne veux pas manger↑
49. Hakim: ( )
50. Miss Lo: rer↑ (.) ah là c'est pas
51. [(children whispering)]
52. Miss Lo: chut! (.) écoutez Hakim là (.) c'est intéressant
53. Hakim: o (.) vrer
54. Miss Lo: vrer
55. Hakim: rar
56. (.)
57. Miss Lo: verera (.) c'est vrer↑ (.) vrer ra↑
58. Hakim: ra
59. Miss Lo: non mais vient me l'écrire alors Hakim peut-être (.) non (.) tu sais pas (.) vrer ra
60. Hakim: ra ça n'existe pas en français
61. Miss Lo: oui ra ça n'existe pas en français je sais
62. (.) c'est pas là même euh (.) les même sons (.) mais-
63. Hakim: c'est ra
64. Miss Lo: ra (.) d'accord (.) mais comme on peut pas écrire (.3) moi ce que je veux savoir c'est entre euh (.) Karen! (.) entre je veux manger et je ne veux pas manger
65. (.) comment ça se passe
66. (.)
67. Miss Lo: je veux manger c'est vrer atchar c'est ça↑
68. Hakim: oui
69. Miss Lo: et je ne veux pas manger↑
70. Hakim: vrer rar ratchar
71. Miss Lo: alors (.) redis-moi (.) re↑
72. Hakim: vrer ra ratchar
73. Miss Lo: ah ya un ra en plus
74. Kenji: /vrer/ /stʃən/ /tʃə/ /kə/ /stʃə/
75. Miss Lo: vrer ra ((writing on the board)) (.)
76. atchar (.) vrer ra ratchar (.) vrer ra
77. Hakim: ou↑
78. Miss Lo: vrer ra
79. Miss Lo: vrer ra (.) d'accord (.) qu'est-ce que
80. alors- (.) euh Amkoulel tu dis c'est même (.) ça veut dire↑ (.) c'est pareil
81. que quoi↑
82. Amkoulel vrer ra
83. Miss Lo: par rapport à ce qu'on a vu dans les
autres langues (...) qu’est-ce que vous en pensez les autres ?

Leila : c’est pareil en..

Piotr : oh non ! (...) c’est pas pareil parce que

Miss Lo : ouais

Piotr : vrer c’est deux mots

Hakim : maîtresse !

Miss Lo : attendez (...) écoute là

Piotr : vrer et atchar c’est deux mots

Miss Lo : c’est deux mots

Piotr : et il y a pas (...) euh : :

Kenji : comme en japonais deux mots

Miss Lo : oui

Piotr : il y a pas veux

Miss Lo : voilà (...) c’est comment en japonais deux mots (...) mais qu’est-ce qui est pareil par rapport aux autres langues (...) entre la phrase affirmative et la phrase négative

Kenji : vrer-

Leila : que on ajoute un autre mot

Miss Lo : exactement ! (...) et que ce mot là on l’ajoute où ?

Leila : au milieu (...) après de vrer

Kenji : vrer vrer

Miss Lo : après le ↑

Kenji : atcha!

Miss Lo : chut !

Piotr : yo

Miss Lo : Kenji (...) où est-ce qu’on ajouté le mot qui veut dire pas ?

Piotr : je (...) je

Leila : après le verbe (...) après le che

Miss Lo : après le premier mot

Leila : oui

Miss Lo : donc quand même c’est intéressant parce que le kabyle (...) le kabyle qui est une langue qui n’est pas du tout pareil que l’espagnol (...) que le polonais (...) que l’anglais (...) c’est encore une autre langue (...) et ben le kabyle il fait un petit peu la même chose puisque regardez (...) c’est comme en- en (...) c’est comme en français : (...). c’est comme en espagnol (...) en polonais (...) en anglais

Kenji : en japonais

Miss Lo : on a (...) le deuxième mot de la phrase qui veut dire (...) quelque chose à la forme négative (...) qui veut dire pas ou non ou [quelque chose comme ça]

Kenji : [japonais (...) aussi]

Talia : japonais non :

Kenji : si !

Miss Lo : on a le deuxième mot (...) puisque c’est vrer atchar (...) et après c’est vrer ra !

atchar (.) comme en (...) yo quiero (.) yo no! quiero (.) ça ressemble un peu quand même hein (...) donc c’est intéressant donc tu vois Hakim ce qu’on a vu (...) Andrea on a fait aussi toute à l’heure en espagnol

Kenji : japo ! (...) je ne veux pas manger

Miss Lo : on a fait en espagnol toute à l’heure (...) le fait que (...) quand on dit je veux manger et je ne veux pas manger (...) en espagnol vous ajoutez un mot (...) le mot no

Kenji : yo quiero comer

Miss Lo : et en français on en ajouté

Kenji : yo quiero comer

( . )

Miss Lo : regardez (...) en français on dit je veux
manger et après on dit je ne veux pas manger. on en ajoute combien en français de mots. Hakim: euh:: deux.Miss Lo: deux! voilà alors que dans les autres langues on en ajoute un seul en français on en ajoute deux donc il faut pas oublier ces deux la d'accord donc il faut y penser alors maintenant avant la récré je vous donne un petit exercice pour voir si vous avez compris.
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--35:52--

1. ((Miss Lo talks to other groups in the background))
2. Kenji: toujours travail
3. Piotr: oui toujours
4. (.2)
5. Kenji: travailler c'est quoi l'hôpital ah oui
6. (.4)
7. Piotr: c'est toujours le
8. (.2)
9. Kenji: quoi
10. (.3)
11. Kenji: toujours travailler
12. Piotr: oui toujours c'est quoi (.2) travail (.2) travail
13. (.16)
14. Leila: est-ce que l'infirmière travaille dans un métro
15. Kenji: oh! très vite toi
16. (.2)
17. Piotr: c'est facile ça
18. (.4)
19. Kenji: toujours travail
20. Piotr: oui
21. (.8)
22. Leila: maîtresse! j'ai fini!
23. ((Miss Lo continues talking with other groups))
24. Piotr: tout
25. Kenji: tout
26. Leila: ça je sais pas
27. (.3)
28. Kenji: très vite toi
29. Leila: maîtresse! ça je sais pas c'est quoi
30. (.2)
31. ((Miss Lo comes to their group))
32. Miss Lo: alors 'non le bijoutier ne travaille pas a hôpital 'ne travaille pas a la boulangerie' 'ne travaille pas a l'école' 'ne travaille pas dans un bureau' 'ne travaille pas dans le métro' super tu m'entoure les tu euh v les mots de la phrase négative les mots négatifs d'accord
33. Leila: oui
34. Miss Lo: et-
35. Piotr: est-ce que-. Kenji: très vite
36. Miss Lo: et devine où il travaille le bijoutier travaille à la. (.2) il travaille à la.
ça c’est un exercice de vocabulaire plutôt.

Leila: je sais pas

Miss Lo: ben à la bijouterie (.) en fait c’est des mots avec le- ((Miss Lo walks away))
Piotr: il ne travaille pas
Leila: tu as fini Kenji

Kenji: oui mettro
Piotr: moi aussi

Kenji: c’est fin!
Piotr: fini toi!

Leila: (.) le bijoutier travaille à la bijouterie

Talia: ah!

Kenji: pourquoi fais ça toi?

Leila: parce que la maîtresse a dit que entoure

Leila: ne pas
Leila: oui

Kenji: ne et pas
Leila: oui

Kenji: moi j’ai oublié ‘pas’

Leila: mais pourquoi en vert Kenji?

((Miss Lo comes back to the group and sorts out papers))

Kenji: ah! (.) la maîtresse travaille:
Piotr: dans (.) école!

Leila: ( ) (.) le bijoutier travaille à la bijouterie

Kenji: c’est quoi?

Leila: je sais pas

Kenji: maîtresse travaille

Piotr: dans: (.) un école

Kenji: dans un! école

Piotr: non!

Kenji: travaille

Piotr: à école

Kenji: dans à école

Piotr: à école! (.) école!

Leila: non

Kenji: dans un école

Piotr: regarde ici (.) ici (.) oh là la Kenji

Kenji: elle travaille dans un école aussi

Piotr: non!

Kenji: oui:

Piotr: regarde (.) ici écrit

Kenji: bijoutier (.) c’est quoi?

Leila: je sais pas

Kenji: maîtresse travaille

Piotr: dans: (.) un école

Piotr: non!

Kenji: travaille

Piotr: à école

Kenji: dans à école

Piotr: à école! (.) école!

Leila: non

Kenji: dans un école

Piotr: regarde ici (.) ici (.) oh là la Kenji

Kenji: elle travaille dans un école aussi

Piotr: non!

Kenji: oui:

Piotr: regarde (.) ici écrit

Kenji: bijoutier (.) c’est quoi?

Leila: je sais pas

Kenji: maîtresse travaille

Piotr: dans: (.) un école

Piotr: non!

Kenji: travaille

Piotr: à école

Kenji: dans à école

Piotr: à école! (.) école!

Leila: non

Kenji: dans un école

Piotr: regarde ici (.) ici (.) oh là la Kenji

Kenji: elle travaille dans un école aussi

Piotr: non!

Kenji: oui:

Piotr: regarde (.) ici écrit

Kenji: bijoutier (.) c’est quoi?

Leila: je sais pas

Kenji: maîtresse travaille

Piotr: dans: (.) un école

Piotr: non!

Kenji: travaille

Piotr: à école

Kenji: dans à école

Piotr: à école! (.) école!

Leila: non

Kenji: dans un école

Piotr: regarde ici (.) ici (.) oh là la Kenji

Kenji: elle travaille dans un école aussi

Piotr: non!

Kenji: oui:

Piotr: regarde (.) ici écrit

Kenji: bijoutier (.) c’est quoi?

Leila: je sais pas

Kenji: maîtresse travaille

Piotr: dans: (.) un école

Piotr: non!

Kenji: travaille

Piotr: à école

Kenji: dans à école

Piotr: à école! (.) école!

Leila: non

Kenji: dans un école

Piotr: regarde ici (.) ici (.) oh là la Kenji

Kenji: elle travaille dans un école aussi

Piotr: non!

Kenji: oui:

Piotr: regarde (.) ici écrit

Kenji: bijoutier (.) c’est quoi?
120. Kenji: le docteur travaille
121. (.5)
122. Piotr: le bouch--
123. (.11)
124. Kenji: tout écrire travaille travaille travaille
125. Leila: c’est quoi routier?
126. (.6)
127. Talia: c’est infirmière qui travaille dans le
128. hôpital
129. (.)
130. Piotr: c’est docteur aussi!
131. Leila: el doctor tambien (43:47)
132. Talia: c’est infirmière=
133. Kenji: =docteur
134. Piotr: docteur aussi!
135. Leila: Talia donde trabaja (el doctor) (. en el
136. hospital también
137. Kenji: c’est quoi ça (. docteur
138. Talia : oui je sais
139. (a whole segment is inaudible)
140. [...] (45:20)
141. Leila: ah! bijoutier c’est
142. Kenji: oui je sais moi!
143. (.)
144. (.)
145. Piotr: c’est:: (. ce qui fait le-
146. Kenji: comme ça (. shhhhh
147. Miss Lo: c’est ça (. les bijoux
148. Piotr: oui c’est ça
149. Miss Lo: il travaille à la bijouterie
150. Piotr: comment écrit?
151. Miss Lo: ben (.), bijou- (.), comme on l’entend
152. (.), bijouterie
153. Leila: Talia (.), joyero es <jeweller it is>
154. Miss Lo: bijouterie
155. Kenji: bijoutier
156. (.)
157. Talia: maîtresse c’est comme ça!
158. Miss Lo: bijouterie (.), oui avec un e- à la fin (.)
159. très bien
160. Kenji: bijouter- (.), bijouterie

T2 S1 D6 V20 E4:

Miss Lo comments on the session with Rs.

--50:12--
1. (background noise of children chatting))
2. Miss Lo: allez! (. on:: y va (.), alors normalement
3. j’aurai du le faire sur une autre phrase
4. parce que la il y a les histoires de
5. vouloir (.2) vouloir manger (.), donc euh
6. (.), j’aurai dû faire sur euh (.), je marche
7. (.), je ne marche pas
8. Researcher: ouais
9. Miss Lo: mais euh la-
--end of recording--

T2 S1 D6 V21

Miss Lo is helping children from Group 3 (lowest level) and is here talking with Maia. Children are given a series of sentences where words are all written one after the other. T explains to Maia that for the French negation, the negative words are separated from other words in the sentence. Note that all the languages are still written on the blackboard.
--11:20--
1. Miss Lo: alors (.4) euh: (.4) Maia (.4) on (.4) dort
2. (.4)
3. Cristina: pas
4. Miss Lo: on (.4) ne (.4) dort (.4) pas (.4) on mange
5. (.4) on (.4) ne (.4) mange (.4) pas (.2)
6. regarder en espagnol tu dis comment?
7. (.2)
8. Miss Lo: yo no quiero comer
9. (.3)
10. Cristina: yo no quiero
11. Miss Lo: [no (.2) le no la (.2) il est- il
12. est (.2) il est avec le y- le- le (.2) c'est
13. comment?
14. Cristina: [yo quiero (south american accent)]
15. Miss Lo: [yo]
16. Cristina: yo
17. Miss Lo: yo no quiero comer (.2) le no en espagnol
18. il est avec le yo ou il est séparé?
19. (.2)
20. Maia: le yo est (6)
21. Miss Lo: oui ben voilà (.2) tu as compris (.4) on
22. (.2) ne (.1) c'est comme le no (.2) c'est
23. tout seul
24. Hakim: maîtresse!
25. Miss Lo: d'accord? (.4) ouais
26. (Miss Lo moves on to another child)}

--12:15--

T2 S1 D7 V25

At the start of the day, a child writes on the blackboard the different times when children have to go to their respective mainstream classroom. At the same time, a child fills in the sheet for the canteen and the after school study period. Today, Talia fills the form and asks her classmates whether they are staying to eat at school for lunch and to study in the evening. Piotr writes on the board the time table of the day.

--02:10--
1. Miss Lo: euh:: rapidement (.2) qui c'est qui écrit
2. l'emploi du temps [au tableau]
3. Leila: [oui c'est deux personnes restent ici
4. (.)
5. Talia: pero [(
6. Miss Lo: [chut! (.2) Kenji! (.2) oh! oh! ça se
7. passe ici là maintenant (.2) qui est-ce
8. qui écrit l'emploi du temps au tableau†
9. Leila: moi!
10. Miss Lo: vas-y Leila alors (.1) rapidement hein
11. Leila: donc moi non parce que je suis très lente
12. Talia: maîtresse! (.1) je peux faire la cantine?
13. Miss Lo: allez (.1) la cantine
14. (A gets up to pick up the form)
15. Miss Lo: alors (.2) est-ce qui va au tableau (.2) Piotr vas-y (.1) rapidement
16. Leila: parce que moi c'est très long maîtresse
17. Miss Lo: parce que je suis très lente! on dit
18. Talia: aussi Piotr (.2) maîtresse! (.1) avec
19. le stylo:: bleu†
20. Miss Lo: chut!
21. Leila: si (.2) azul (.2) Leila que yo soy relenta
22. para escribir
23. (02:57)
24. (.2)
25. Miss Lo: euh:: (.1) Leila (.1) maintenant
26. Tranqu~ (.2) de côté (.1) parce que (.1)
27. Talia: maîtresse je dis rien pour Amkouel†
28. (.1)
29. Miss Lo: pardon†
30. Talia: je fais quoi avec Amkouel†
31. Miss Lo: Amkouel tu lui demandes si il mange à
32. la cantine
33. Leila: maîtresse il y a une ligne pour Amkouel
34. (.1) comme ça (.1) crayon à papier comme ça
35. (.1) chhhht (.1) et Hakim aussi
36. (.3)
37. Miss Lo: parce que c'est marqué "à partir de mars"
38. (.3) donc euh là pour l'instant ils ne
39. mangent pas (.1) à partir de mars c'est-à-
40. dire après les vacances (.1) au mois de
41. mars Amkouel va manger à la cantine à
42. partir du mois de mars et Samba va rester
43. à l'étude (.1) parce que leur papa a fait
44. la démarche (.1) donc c'est très bien on
45. est très contents (.1) Amkouel était
46. très content de ça
47. Samba: samba (.1) est-ce que tu manges à la
48. cantine†
49. Miss Lo: parce que c'est marqué "à partir de mars"
50. (.3) donc euh là pour l'instant ils ne
51. mangent pas (.1) à partir de mars c'est-à-
52. dire après les vacances (.1) au mois de
53. mars Amkouel va manger à la cantine à
54. partir du mois de mars et Samba va rester
55. à l'étude (.1) parce que leur papa a fait
56. la démarche (.1) donc c'est très bien on
57. est très contents (.1) Amkouel était
58. très content de ça
59. Samba: oui
60. (Miss Lo walks in the background)
61. Talia: Leila
62. Leila: oui je mange à la cantine
63. Talia: Andrea (.1) elle mange†
64. Leila: samba!
65. Talia: Karen (.1) est-ce que tu manges à la
66. cantine†
67. Karen: oui
68. Talia: oh Hakim
69. (.
70. Leila: no Hakim tiene una línea
71. Talia: no
72. Leila: no (.1) mira (.1) solo hay una para abajo
73. asi
74. (04:18)
75. (.8)
76. Talia: euh (.1) Anika elle reste†
77. Matilda: à étude!
78. Leila: non:: à la cantine
79. (.6)
80. Talia: Cristina (.1) est-ce que tu manges à la
81. cantine†
82. Cristina: oui
83. (.4)
84. Talia: Leila (.1) Talia oui (.4) Matilda (.1) est-ce
Matilda: mais je mange à la cantine!
Talia: but your house is over there!
Matilda: I eat at my house ((laughing))
Leila: à treize heure trente j'ai maths maîtresse!
Miss Lo: chut! (.). chut!
Leila: à treize heure trente (.). j'ai aussi maths
Talia: [pourquoi tu manges à la cantine]
Matilda: parce que euh::
Talia: you can eat at your house over there
Matilda: non mais je reste à le cap (.). après j'ai faim!
Talia: à le cap
Miss Lo: elle reste au cap euh:: Matilda (.).
Matilda tu t'assoies correctement sur ta chaise merci (.). elle reste au cap (.). le cap ce n'est pas dans cette liste là
Talia: julia!
Miss Lo: julia et Anika elles mangent à la cantine
Talia: sebastien!
Piotr: oui
Talia: Kenji!
Leila: oui
Talia: non (.). Kenji (.). est-ce que tu manges à la cantine?
Kenji: mm
Talia: (tu dis) oui je mange à la cantine
Leila: [pas]
Piotr: [pas!]
Miss Lo: à étude mais alors (.). il ne reste (.).
comment on pourrait dire (.). il ne reste-c'est-à-dire que (.).
Leila: il ne [reste pas tout
Miss Lo: [même pas une seule fois (.). il ne reste]

Miss Lo explains other negative words like never and any longer.

--06:37--
1. Talia: Cristina
2. Cristina: non
3. Piotr: toujours non
4. (.7)
5. Talia: catherine-rose
6. (.4)
7. Miss Lo: comment euh::
8. Talia: Piotr
9. Piotr: étude non!
10. Miss Lo: pas étude non Piotr (.). non (.). je ne reste pas à étude
11. (.4)
12. (.4)
13. Talia: pourquoi il n'y a pas personne qui écrit ici!
14. (.).
15. (.).
16. Miss Lo: parce que samba ne reste!
17. Leila: [pas
18. Piotr: [pas!]
19. Miss Lo: à étude mais alors (.). il ne reste (.).
comment on pourrait dire (.). il ne reste-c'est-à-dire que (.).
20. (.2)
21. Leila: il ne [reste pas tout
22. Miss Lo: [même pas une seule fois (.). il ne reste]
26. Miss Lo: même pas une seule fois (.) c'est-à-dire
27. qu'il ne reste↑
28. Cristina: [jamais
29. Leila: [pas
30. Miss Lo: très bien! Cristina (.) on écoute ce qu'a
31. dit Cristina
32. Talia: maîtresse il y a jamais-
33. Miss Lo: il ne reste (.) jamais! à étude (.)
34. alors (.) il ne reste (.) (writing on the
35. blackboard) jamais à étude (.) alors
36. que par contre (.) par contre (.) il ne
37. reste jamais à étude (.) samba ne reste
38. jamais à étude (.) par contre euh:: (.)
39. Karen
40. Cristina: elle reste tout le temps à étude
41. Talia: maîtresse! (.) maîtresse!
42. Miss Lo: chut! ((writing on the board))
43. (.2)
44. Miss Lo: elle reste toujours! à étude Karen (.)
45. elle reste toujours! à étude (.) et
46. puis alors il y a des enfants (.) qui
47. restent↑
48. Cristina: des fois à étude
49. Miss Lo: des fois (.) alors il y a un autre mot en
50. français (.) ils restent↑
51. Cristina: un petit peu
52. ?: des fois
53. Miss Lo: des fois (.) voilà (.) des fois (.) qui
54. restent des fois à étude↑
55. Cristina: catherine rose
56. Miss Lo: donc parfois! (.) il y a un mot en
57. français (.) parfois (.) catherine elle
58. (.) elle reste↑
59. Cristina: beaucoup à étude=
60. Miss Lo: =parfois! à étude (.) alors samba (.)
61. là c'est samba (.) j'arrive Talia hein
62. (.) euh là c'est Karen {{writing on the
63. board} (.) et là c'est↑ (.) catherine (.)
64. elle reste↑
65. Karen: parfois (.) à étude
66. Miss Lo: parfois! à étude {{writing on the board}}
67. (.)
68. Miss Lo: Karen en:: anglais (.) tu dirais comment
69. ces mots là ↑ (.) les mots là que j'ai (.)
70. ces mots là (.) jamais (.) toujours (.) et
71. parfois↑
72. Talia: moi je sais!
73. Miss Lo: comment tu dirais en (.) anglais
74. Leila: [jamais!
75. Matilda: [never!=
76. Miss Lo: =chut!
77. Karen: never
78. Miss Lo: ouais
79. Karen: always (.) et (.) euh (.) sometimes
80. Miss Lo: très bien (.) en espagnol c'est quoi↑
81. Leila: jamas
82. Talia: jamas=
83. Leila: =to[do el tiempo
84. Talia: [todos los días |(.) a veces
85. Miss Lo: y::
86. Leila: a veces
87. Miss Lo: d'accord
88. Piotr: a veces
89. Miss Lo: donc euh:: (.) vous avez vu là (.) il
90. ne! reste jamais à étude
91. Talia: el nunca se va a queda a (.) estudiar
92. (09:40)
93. Miss Lo: c'est quoi ça?
94. Leila: négation!
95. Miss Lo: la négation (.) voilà (.) alors la
négation (.) c'est pas toujours ne pas (.)
c'est pas ne pas (.) ça peut être (.)
ne:: (.) jamais (.) si je dis (.) il ne
reste plus! à étude
Cristina: il reste jamais à étude
Leila: que (.) que avant il reste mais maintenant
[i]le reste plus
Talia: [mais maintenant il reste pas
Miss Lo: [volâ (.) avant il restait! (.) avant il
restait mais maintenant il ne reste plus!
(.)
[i]Miss Lo: donc ne plus (.) il y a ne pas ((writing
on the board)) il y a ne plus (.) il ne
reste plus (.). euh:: (.) on pourrait
pas à l'étude
Leila: c'est quoi presque?
Miss Lo: presque pas
Leila: [mas o menos]
Talia: casi nunca
(.2)
[i]Miss Lo: hein (.) il ne reste presque pas à étude
(.2) ça veut dire que vraiment de temps en
temps il reste mais bon (.) presque
jamais
Leila: un jour sur-
[i]Miss Lo: euh (.) il y a ne pas (.) ne plus
(.1) ne jamais ((writing on the board))
Talia: maîtresse!
[i]Miss Lo: euh (.) chut! (.) attends Talia je
vais vous donner une petite feuille sur ça
(.3) ah et aussi euh:: (.) si tout d'un
coup (.) j'ai (.) quelque chose
((imitating an action)) on m'a envoyé de
l'eau dans les yeux (.) j'ai mal et je
dis (.) ah! je ne vois (.)
[i]Leila: [rien!
Piotr: [rien!
[i]Miss Lo: rien (.) je ne vois [rien
Cristina: [rien
[i]Miss Lo: d'accord! (.) je ne vois pas (.) je ne
vois plus! parce qu'avant je voyais (.)
j'ai (.) je ne vois plus et aussi je dis (.) oh la
la je ne vois rien! rien du tout
Leila: no veo nada
[i]Miss Lo: donc [ne rien aussi c'est une]
Talia: [(11:33)
[11:38]
[i]Miss Lo: maîtresse je peux fermer la fenêtre!

---11:38---

**T2 S1 D7 V25 E3:**

T asks the youngest group to describe their weekends. Maia is lacking a word and turns to her sister to talk to her in Spanish.

---21:15---

((children from other groups chatting in the
background))

[i]Miss Lo: je suis allée (.) alors (.) où ça?
(.10)
[i]Miss Lo: je sais pas moi (.) au parc (.) au
magasin (.) [au cinéma]
Leila: [à la forêt]
[i]Miss Lo: chez une copine!
Maia: mais (.) no se como se dice [(al cinema)
[i]Miss Lo: [tatatatata (.)
31. pas de traduction!
32. Talia: cinéma
33. Miss Lo: non! (.) Talia
34. Talia: cinéma
35. Miss Lo: elle me- elle me (.) c'est moi qui lui dis
36. (. ) Maia! (. ) tu es allée où (.) au cinéma!
37. Maia: oui
38. Miss Lo: voilà au cinéma (. ) je suis allée au
39. cinéma ((writes on the blackboard)) (. )
40. Matilda (. ) qu'est-ce que tu as fais toi!
41. (. ) euh (. ) samedi ou dimanche

--25:00--

T2 S1 D7 V25 E4:

Miss Lo is revising the notions of subject and verb. The oldest group has to find the subject and verbs of these sentences.

--39:41--

1. Miss Lo: alors (. ) 'le samedi je regarde la télé'
2. (. ) euh:
3. Leila: moi maîtresse!
4. Miss Lo: Talia!
5. Piotr: facile
6. Talia: euh: (.2) le samedi (. ) je!
7. Miss Lo: ouais
8. Talia: c'est le (. ) sujet
9. Miss Lo: ouais
10. Talia: je regardais
11. Kenji: regarde!
12. Piotr: regarde
13. Miss Lo: okay (. ) alors (. ) 'Amkoulel et samba'
14. dimanche ont été chez Kenji' euh: (. )
15. Kenji
17. Miss Lo: c'est quoi!
18. Kenji: sujet
19. Miss Lo: c'est le sujet
20. (.2)
21. Piotr: et 'Kenji'!
22. (.3)
23. Kenji: ont été
24. Miss Lo: ont été
25. Leila: verbe
26. (.3)
27. Talia: et 'Kenji'
28. Kenji: non!
29. Leila: oui 'Kenji'
30. Miss Lo: alors! (. ) Talia elle dit 'Kenji'
31. aussi c'est un sujet
32. Leila: [non Talia!
33. Piotr: [non!
34. Miss Lo: chut! (. ) alors-
35. Talia: oui
36. Leila: non!
37. Miss Lo: chut! (. ) vous lui dites non mais
38. pourquoi alors! (. ) pourquoi!
39. Talia: mais c'est un nom!
40. Leila: parce que c'est Amkoulel et samb- parce
41. qu'on parle d'Amkoulel et samba pas de
42. Kenji!
43. Talia: c'est pas grave!
44. (.3)
45. Kenji: euh: (. ) cinéma et télé aussi alors
46. [(Laughing)]
47. Talia: non!: la télé c'est pas un s-
48. Miss Lo: alors on arrête maintenant! (. ) alors
49. attendez d'accord
50. [(children keep chatting in the background)]
51. Miss Lo: Kenji il dit (. ) si on- si vous prenez
"chez Kenji" si vous dites que "chez
Kenji" c'est le sujet alors pourquoi
(télé' aussi c'est un sujet et
cinéma c'est un sujet mais sont-
donc ça ne marche pas alors si on
dit (.) 'la télé' maintenant (writing on
the board)) 'est' (.) 'allumée'

Piotr: est allumée c'est::
Karen: [la télé!
Leila: [la c'est sujet! (.) allumée c'est-
Miss Lo: alors qu'est-ce qui est le sujet là
Talia: 'la'
Leila: 'la'
Karen: c'est 'la'
Miss Lo: 'la' c'est sujet!
Talia: et la 'télé'
Leila: et 'est'! (.) 'est'! (.) c'est le verbe
Kenji: ['allumée!
Talia: [et 'allumée
Kenji: et 'allumée!
(2)
Leila: non c'est 'est'!
Talia: et 'la télé'-
Kenji: pourquoi?
Leila: parce que c'est 'est'!
Kenji: 'allumée aussi!
Talia: en espagnol c'est totalement (.) différent
Kenji: []
Miss Lo: [alors en espagnol c'est totalement
différent dit Talia (.) donc
j'aimerais bien que vous m'expliquiez la
(.) qu'est-ce qui est totalement
différent Talia
Leila: Talia me parece que no eh? (41:50)
Piotr: pourquoi?
Leila: pour moi c'est pas différent maîtresse!
Piotr: ['télé' sujet!
Miss Lo: [chut!
Talia: ['télé' es el su- el sujeto
Miss Lo: [tout m'intéresse (.) tout intéresse
(.) alors Talia me dit (.) en
espagnol c'est totalement différent donc
qu'est-ce que (.) qu'est-ce qui est
différent (.) non vas-y ça intéresse
Talia (.) vas-y qu'est-ce qui est
différent!
Talia: parce que en espagnol (.) 'la télé' (.)
en espagnol (.) 'télé' c'est le sujet
Miss Lo: voilà
(.)
Kenji: oui
Leila: moi je crois pas
Talia: en espagnol (.) esta
Miss Lo: ouais
Talia: esta (.) sujeto
Piotr: oh!
(42:34)
Miss Lo: chut! Non non (.) esta c'est le verbe
C'est ça?
Kenji: esta sujeto ((Kenji and Se laughing))
Talia: esta (escondida)
Pero Talia (entonce) no es diferente
Miss Lo: alors en espagnol! (.) je suis d'accord
avec Talia voyez (.) je suis d'accord
avec Talia (.) parce que 'la' tout
seul (.) c'est 'la télé' le sujet (.)
c'est pas 'la' tout seul
122. Kenji: 'la télé'! (.) 'la télé'!
123. Talia: oui: (.) 'la télé' c'est le sujet
124. Miss Lo: chut! (.) Talia (.) assieds-toi (.)
125. parce que en espagnol pour trouver le
126. sujet vous faites comment (.) vous posez
127. pas des questions pour savoir! (.) comment
128. vous faites pour trouver le sujet↑
129. Leila: je sais pas (.) on sait!
130. Miss Lo: vous savez comme ça↑
131. Leila: oui!
132. Miss Lo: on vous met une phrase n’importe laquelle
133. vous savez tout de suite c’est quoi le
134. sujet↑
135. Leila: oui!
136. Miss Lo: comment vous le savez↑
137. Talia: parce que:
138. Miss Lo: je sais pas
139. Talia: euh:: (.) c’est le- (.) c’est l’anaîmus
140. (.) le personne et le-
141. Miss Lo: c’est un animal (.) une personne (.) une
142. chose
143. Leila: oui!
144. Miss Lo: oui mais alors pourquoi pas alors ça
145. marche pas euh:: (.) 'Amkoulel et samba
146. ont été chez Kenji’ (.) pourquoi ça
147. marche pas pour Kenji (.) Kenji c’est
148. une personne↑
149. Talia: oui!
150. Leila: parce que maîtresse! (.) c’est tout le
151. temps le sujet [c’est la personne dont on
152. parle
153. Piotr: [Amkoulel et samba ont fait:: quelque
154. chose
155. Leila: on parle d’Amkoulel et samba on parle
156. pas de Kenji!
157. Miss Lo: ah si (.) quand on dit ils ont été chez
158. Kenji on parle de Kenji↑
159. (.)
160. Miss Lo: c’est pas tout à fait la personne dont on
161. parle (.) c’est la personne qui↑
162. (.)
163. Leila: bat↑
164. Miss Lo: non
165. Kenji: bat↑ {{laughing}}
166. Miss Lo: je! suis allé (.) nous! avons vu (.)
167. je! regarde (.) Amkoulel et samba ont!
168. été (.) qu’est-ce qu’on pourrait poser
169. comme question↑
170. (.)
171. Leila: qui
172. Miss Lo: qui (.) voilà (.) qui est allé au cinéma↑
173. Leila: c’est
174. (.)
175. Miss Lo: c’est ‘je’ (.) c’est moi
--44:11--

T2 S1 D7 V26

T2 S1 D7 V26 E1:

--09:50--
1. Leila: maîtresse (.) où est Jessica↑
2. (.)
3. Miss Lo: yessica (.) elle est à la danse

451
4. Kenji: danse
5. Andrea: danse de quoi?
6. Miss Lo: euh (.) les points sur les 'i' euh:: (.)
7. Leila: (.) c'est pas en option (.) c'est obligatoire (.) ya pas de points sur les 'i' en espagnol
8. Andrea: la cabeza ((laughing))
9. Leila: super marché!
10. Miss Lo: ben oui donc†
11. Leila: avec un 'e'
12. Miss Lo: un quoi†
13. Leila: un accent!
14. Miss Lo: voiture (.) un [accent
15. Talia: asesinó
16. Miss Lo: restaurant ou un [ fleuriste (.)
17. ok
18. Andrea: ( ) (10:21)
19. Miss Lo: 'pour acheter de la [ viande on va à la boucherie' ou (.) chez! le boucher (.) on va [à l'école à l'hôpital ou chez! le docteur chez! chez le dentiste! chez le fleuriste (.)
20. Talia: [cye (.) el sábado vi una película de acción y (.)
21. Miss Lo: [quand est-ce qu'on met chez quand est-ce qu'on met à†
22. Andrea: ( )
23. Kenji: [à moi toute à
24. Miss Lo: pourquoi on dit à! la boucherie et on dit chez! le boucher†
25. Leila: [parce que il y a la (.) et quand il y a le c'est chez?
26. Talia: [en el recreote lo contamos (.) como era ( )
27. Miss Lo: ah ben non (.) [ah ben non (.) parce que [si on dit on va euh:: (.) au magasin (.)
28. on va pas dire on va chez le magasin†
29. Maia: [le mordió una cosa ( )
30. Miss Lo: c'est quoi la différence entre boulangerie et boucher† (.) c'est quoi la différence entre boucher [et boucher†
31. Maia: ( )
32. Leila: ça c'est la maison de de::
33. Miss Lo: la différence entre boulangerie et boulanger (.) entre boucherie et boucher†
34. Leila: boulanger c'est la personne qui fait le:: pain†
35. Miss Lo: non boulangerie c'est le [magasin ou on fait le pain
36. Maia: [le ( )
37. Talia: [ice ( )
38. Leila: oui mais boulanger! c'est la personne [voilà boulanger c'est la personne (.) donc là on va dire [chez! la personne (.)
39. quand c'est le nom d'une personne on va chez (.) c'est comme si on allait
40. Andrea: [si pero ( )
Leila: à la maison
Miss Lo: voilà chez lui (.). mais [en fait on va pas chez lui hein] mais on va dans le magasin (.). mais [quand c'est le magasin on dit on va à ou on va au]
Maia: [o waw es el más interesante]
Leila: d'accord
Miss Lo: mais pas pour tous les mots (.). mais pour ceux-la oui (.). mais pas pour tous les mots parce que par exemple on va pas dire (.). on va chez la maîtresse (.). parce que si on va chez la maîtresse (.). c'est chez moi (.). pas à école (.). mais c'est que pour certains mots par exemple pour les commerces souvent c'est comme ça...
---11:52---

**T2 S1 D7 V26 E2:**

Miss Lo asks Maia to leave the classroom and to finish her exercise in the corridor as she is being too talkative with her classmate.

---13:17---
25. Miss Lo: Maia tu sors! (.). tu prends tes affaires et tu vas travailler dans le couloir puisque tu (.2) voilà hop! (.). tu prends ton cahier et tu vas dans le couloir j'en ai marre la (.). ça y est c'est bon çả va (.). ça suffit (.). je rigole pas hein (.). tu vas là-bas (.). tu t'assoies (.). tu travailles dans le couloir
26. (.2)
27. Talia: j'ex-
28. Miss Lo: comme çả tu vas pouvoir euh:: parler avec le mur
29. (.)
30. Maia: no entiendo nada (13:37)
31. Talia: que te- (.). que te vayas allá donde està-
32. Miss Lo: elle a compris! euh:: Talia elle sait très bien (.). çả fait trois fois que je lui dis de se taire et:: elle arrête pas de discuter
33. (.2)
34. Talia: elle a dit qu'elle comprend pas qu’est-ce que tu veux
35. Miss Lo: elle a très bien compris (.). la preuve elle s'est levée avec son livre de maths et son stylo (.). hein (.). alors çả va (.2) tres bien Amkoulel (.). tres bien
---14:01---

**T2 S1 D7 V26 E3:**

Maths exercise. Small group.

---14:30---
1. Miss Lo: non! Tu te trompes là Matilda là (.). huit plus sept çả fait pas- (.). çả fait pas quatorze† (.). huit plus sept çả fait combien†
2. Matilda: (.12)
3. Miss Lo: en anglais c’est quoi† (.). huit plus sept. Matilda: (.8) en anglais!
4. Miss Lo: ouais
5. Matilda: euh (.4) eight plus
6. Miss Lo: oui mais çả fait combien† le résultat (.).
11. c'est le résultat qui m'intéresse
12. (.)
13. Miss Lo: alors (.) remplace les mots soulignes par les pronoms compléments qui conviennent et recopie le texte (.) "le cochon s'adresse au loup et il demanda au loup ce qu'il faisait sous sa fenêtre" (.) pour ne pas dire deux fois au loup au loup (.) c'est ce qu'on a fait la semaine dernière (.) qu'est-ce qu'il faut faire ⟩
14. (.5)
15. Miss Lo: alors (.) remplace les mots soulignes par les pronoms compléments qui conviennent et recopie le texte (.) "le cochon s'adresse au loup et il demanda au loup ce qu'il faisait sous sa fenêtre" (.) pour ne pas dire deux fois au loup au loup (.) c'est ce qu'on a fait la semaine dernière (.) qu'est-ce qu'il faut faire ⟩
16. (.5)
17. Miss Lo: alors (.) remplace les mots soulignes par les pronoms compléments qui conviennent et recopie le texte (.) "le cochon s'adresse au loup et il demanda au loup ce qu'il faisait sous sa fenêtre" (.) pour ne pas dire deux fois au loup au loup (.) c'est ce qu'on a fait la semaine dernière (.) qu'est-ce qu'il faut faire ⟩
18. (.5)
19. Miss Lo: alors (.) remplace les mots soulignes par les pronoms compléments qui conviennent et recopie le texte (.) "le cochon s'adresse au loup et il demanda au loup ce qu'il faisait sous sa fenêtre" (.) pour ne pas dire deux fois au loup au loup (.) c'est ce qu'on a fait la semaine dernière (.) qu'est-ce qu'il faut faire ⟩
20. (.5)
21. (.5)
22. Talia: lui s'adresse
23. (.)
24. Miss Lo: non (.) le cochon non
25. Talia: le cochon s'adresse au loup et (.) il demande (.) et [lui demande
26. Matilda: [quinze!
27. Miss Lo: voilà très bien (.) et il lui demande quinze!
28. Matilda: quinze!
29. Miss Lo: c'est ça d'accord
30. Talia: et il lui demande ce qu'il fait sous sa fenêtre
31. Miss Lo: voilà (.) tout a fait Talia
32. Matilda: c'est quinze!
33. (.3)
34. Miss Lo: voilà (.) quatre plus un ça fait cinq plus un ça fait pas sept Matilda!
35. --15:58--
36. --25:10--
37. T2 S1 D7 V26 E4:
1. Miss Lo: euh:: (.) Leila et Talia (.) et (.) comment- (.) [e- t- la (.) comment on
2. prononce ça
3. et
4. Talia: [et
5. Miss Lo: et (.) pas ette (.) et
6. Leila: et♦
7. Miss Lo: oui (.) mais quand vous lisez vous dites ette (.) c'est et (.) e- t- c'est et
e- t- c'est et
8. Talia: oui c'est difficile
9. Miss Lo: la- (.) parce que en espagnol (.) mais on prononce tous! Les lettres
10. Leila: la- (.) parce que en espagnol (.) mais on prononce tous! Les lettres
11. Miss Lo: je sais bien que c'est ça votre problème (.) ça je le sais (.) mais moi quand je remarque une chose (.) je vous le dis (.) pour que vous essayez d'y penser (.) hein
12. Leila: d'accord
13. Miss Lo: parce que vous connaissez les règles mais que vous les appliquez pas parce que en fait vous n'y pensez pas (.) hein
14. (.3)
15. Leila: oui
16. Maia: [que paso
17. Leila: que dic- que Talia dice ette mais c'est et
c'est et
18. Miss Lo: [c'est un peu complique parce que c'est pas! comme en [espagnol (.) c'est ça qui est un peu dur
19. Talia: [no no (.) yo no!
20. Leila: tambien
21. Maia: et
tambien
22. Leila: decimos 'ette' y dice 'et'
23. Miss Lo: très bien (.) alors après et la marre c'est quoi la marre (Miss Lo keeps talking to other groups)
24. Maia: la 'e' y la 'c'
25. (.3)
26. (.3)
27. (.3)
28. (.3)
29. (.3)
30. (.3)
31. (.3)
32. (.3)
33. (.3)
34. (.3)
35. (.3)
36. (.3)
Talia: cuando decimos 'y' (.) decimos 'ette' (.)
siento que algo falta (.) no me gusta
decir 'et' (.) 'et' (.) prefiero 'ette'

Andrea: ( ) c'est 'et'
si me lo ya he dicho (.) me lo aprendi

Talia: (.) pero-

Matilda: maîtresse c'est comme ça!

Miss Lo: de quoi Matilda!
54. Leila: des animaux
55. Miss Lo: les gens qui élèvent les animaux (. des
56. fois ils vont sur le- ils vont vendre des
57. choses sur les marchers (. qu'est-ce
58. qu'ils peuvent vendre par rapport a leur
59. ferme (. il y a pas ça en argentine↑
60. Talia: [mira
61. Leila: [non
62. Miss Lo: il y a pas des gens qui vendent des œufs
63. (. qui vendent du poulet au marché↑
64. (.2)
65. Leila: oui mais pas trop
66. (.1)
67. Miss Lo: ya pas des marchers↑ (. t'as jamais vu
68. des marchers↑ (. au Mexique Talia il
69. y a des marchers dehors↑
70. (.)
71. Talia: euh j'ai oubli
72. Miss Lo: des gens qui vendent des choses dehors (.)
73. c'est pas comme le supermarché avec la
74. caisse (. avec le-
75. Leila: oui! oui il y a
76. Talia: je crois que-
77. Kenji: japon non!
78. Talia: il y a (. des-
79. Miss Lo: on vend des fruits on vend des légumes on
80. vend des poulets la tout ça la
81. Talia: c'est en-
82. Leila: mais c'est l'infirmière↑
83. Talia: avec la- (. va comme ça dans la ([walks
84. away from her chair])
85. Miss Lo: ah mais non moi je parle de-
86. Leila: avec le vélo
87. Miss Lo: ah oui d'accord (. non moi je parle
88. plutôt d'un endroit ou il y a beaucoup de
89. vendeurs [et c'est dehors
90. Hakim: comme euh: (. le marcher de::
91. Miss Lo: comme le marcher de marcel samba oui mais
92. euh::
93. Hakim: mais il y a un marcher ici la (. a cote
94. (. ici a cote de l'école
95. Miss Lo: il y a pas des endroits ou on vend la
96. nourriture dehors↑ (. pour acheter
97. Leila: oui
98. Miss Lo: on va avec un panier
99. Leila: oui
100. Miss Lo: et on va acheter ça (. il y a ça en
101. Argentine↑
102. Leila: oui
103. Kenji: [japon non
104. Miss Lo: [il y en a beaucoup↑=
105. Leila: =Talia (. como ferias!
106. (.1)
107. Kenji: [/purias/
108. 109. Leila: [Talia si
110. Talia: como↑
111. Leila: ferias (. los pestitos esos fuera donde
112. venden comida (. comida [ropa (. lo que
113. rieras (29:36)
114. Hakim: [maîtresse en algerie
115. il y a ça
116. (.)
117. Hakim: maîtresse (. en algerie c'est [comme en-
118. (. ici
119. Talia: [je crois oui
120. Miss Lo: voilà
121. Talia: j'ai oubli
122. Leila: [mais donc c'est la fermeière↑
123. Hakim: [il y a aussi des (          )
124. Miss Lo: ah d'accord (. ) ou Leila?
125. Leila: donc c'est la fermière!
126. (. )
127. Miss Lo: c'est ?
128. Leila: la fermière
129. Miss Lo: fermier ya pas marqué (. ) il y a marqué
130. l'infirmière ou la fermière
131. Leila: la fermière
132. Hakim: l'infirmière!
133. Leila: c'est ça?
134. Miss Lo: au marcher qui ça qui va aller vendre les
135. choses au marcher (. ) c'est l'infirmière
136. ou la fermière
137. Hakim: l'infirmière
138. Miss Lo: elle va aller vendre quoi l'infirmière?
139. Hakim: l'infirmière
140. Miss Lo: elle va aller vendre quoi l'infirmière?
141. ( . ) des piqûres?
142. Hakim: non
143. Miss Lo: tu te trompes de mots Hakim ( . ) la
144. fermière! ( . ) la fermière! ( . ) elle va
145. aller vendre des œufs ( . ) des poules des-
146. ( . ) tout ça ( . ) non mais je sais que tu as
147. raison Hakim mais c'est que tu ne me dis
148. pas le bon mot ( . ) tu me dis infirmière
149. ( . ) infirmière ( . ) moi c'est la fermière
150. 
151. ((knocks on the door))
152. Kenji: entrez!
153. Leila: entrez!
154. ((Cristina comes in the classroom))
155. Miss Lo: Cristina
156. Andrea: que si yo ( fuera ) mas tarada! (30:57)
157. Talia: y con qué hiciste danza? ( . ) abajo ( . )
158. ( . )
159. Maia: de que danza?
160. (. )
161. Cristina: euh:: danse ( . ) euh:: ( . ) hip hop( . )
162. ( . )
163. 
164. ((children then go back to the exercise))
165. Talia: 'a la fin ( . ) sa mere appelle les cochons
166. a table ( . ) et elle demande ( . ) et ( . )
167. lui demande de fermer la fenetre'
168. (.7)
169. Miss Lo: a vos places! ( . ) vous allez a vos
170. places! ( . ) non! Je suis en greve ( . ) vous
171. allez a vos places

**T2 S1 D7 V27**

**T2 S1 D7 V27 E1:**

This extract is taken from a teacher-led sequence with the children from the support group.

--22:13--

1. Miss Lo: de quoi on peut avoir peur?
2. Julia: de un monstre
3. ?: des monstres
4. Miss Lo: des monstres
5. Leila: d'un voleur?
6. Miss Lo: d'un voleur
7. Amelia: des méchants?
8. Miss Lo: des méchants

--31:17--
9. Leila: des loups!
10. Miss Lo: des loups voilà on peut avoir peur des
11. loups (. ) bon là c’est en afrique alors il
12. y a pleins de loups là mais il y a quoi
13. comme animaux (. ) il pourrait y avoir
14. quoi comme animaux?
15. Matilda: la panthère noire
16. Miss Lo: la panthère noire (. ) qu’est-ce qu’il
17. pourrait y avoir d’autres?
18. Maïa: lions
19. Amelia: des fantômes!
20. Miss Lo: les lions voilà (. ) les lions
21. Amelia: des tigres
22. Miss Lo: des tigres
23. Julia: des fantômes
24. Miss Lo: des fantômes
25. Talia: ça n’existe pas! (speaking from another
26. group)
27. Matilda: le éléphant
28. Miss Lo: les éléphants
29. Maïa: les serpents
30. Miss Lo: les serpents
31. (.2)
32. Matilda: les scorpions
33. Miss Lo: des scorpions ouais!
34. Maïa: comment on dit euh:
35. Talia: [serpents!]
36. Amelia: [des innoceros
37. Miss Lo: des rhinocéros
38. Amelia: des [rhinocéros
39. Maïa: [Talia ias arañas (22:56)
40. Talia: [araigne
41. Miss Lo: [il pourrait y avoir aussi euh:
42. (. )
43. Maïa: [les araigne
44. Amelia: [un géant
45. Miss Lo: hein!
46. Amelia: un géant
47. Miss Lo: un géant!
48. Maïa: maîtresse! (. ) les:: (. ) araigne
49. (.2)
50. Miss Lo: seringues↑
51. Talia: spider!
52. Miss Lo: qui piquent↑
53. Matilda: araignées oui
54. Miss Lo: des araignées oui (. ) ou alors un serpent↑
55. Matilda: non! araignée
56. Miss Lo: araignée (. ) elle a dit seringue (. ) tu
57. sais pas seringue c’est quoi↑
58. (.1)
59. Miss Lo: c’est comment en espagnol↑
60. Talia: aragna!
61. Miss Lo: ah d’accord (. ) c’est ça que tu voulais
62. dire↑ (.1) quand t’as dit seringue c’était
63. araignée↑
64. Maïa:
65. Miss Lo: ah d’accord (. ) amélie↑
66. Amelia: des- des crocodiles!
67. Miss Lo: ah ben bien sur des crocodiles

--23:33--
Talia, Maia and Matilda are sitting around the same table and drawing using water colours. The three girls are telling each other what to draw as well as guessing what the other person is drawing.

---00:00---
1. Miss Lo: tu prends tes affaires Cristina (.) tu
2. prends ça et ça tu colles ça [dans le
3. cahier de grammaire
4. ] [anyone here]
5. (.)
6. Maia: Talia que es lo que le estás diciendo
7. a ella?
8. (.2)
9. Matilda: gaga {noises}
10. (.2)
11. Matilda: ha;;; {(screaming)}
12. (.)
13. Talia: heart
14. (.)
15. Maia: what is heart?
16. Talia: corazon
17. Maia: ( )
18. Matilda: mm (.) un chat
19. (.)
20. Matilda: petit chaperon rouge
21. (.)
22. Matilda: petit! chap-
23. Talia: that's not good (.). cool cool cool
24. Matilda: un chat† (.). aou:::
25. Talia: what†
26. (.)
27. Talia: hmmhhh {laughing}) (.). aou::
28. (.)
29. Matilda: un chat comme ça†
30. (.1)
31. Talia: no:: (.). do a- a heart
32. Matilda: non::
33. Maia: Talia ella va a colorear lo que ella
34. quiere (00:38)
35. (.2)
36. Talia: that’s not cool (.). cool cool cool cool
37. (.2)
38. Matilda: attends
39. (.)
40. Talia: {singing})
41. Maia: pues es que se me hace más fácil hacer
42. una:: señora (00:50)
43. Matilda: une petite fille
44. Talia: que tiene
45. (.2)
46. Talia: that’s not cool
47. (.)
48. Matilda: une indien!
49. (.)
50. Talia: that’s cool!
51. Matilda: ouais!
52. Talia: but it’s not easy
53. Maia: que es Indian?
54. Matilda: it’s easy
55. (.)
56. Talia: indio†
57. (.3)
58. Maia: non
59. (.2)
60. Maia: c'est pas difficile (.). je sais! Comment
61. Matilda: dessiner
62. Talia: and- (.). the colours
63. (.2)
65. Maia: yo digo— (01:15)
66. Matilda: [comme ça!
67. (...) 
68. Matilda: [comme ça!
69. Maia: [dijo la maestra
70. (...) 
71. Talia: ( ) {{singing}}
72. (...) 
73. Maia: que es esa canción que todos andan
74. cantándola† (01:21)
75. Talia: cual!
76. Maia: esa
77. Talia: yo soy la única que la he cantao
78. Maia: ah (...) es que sólo la estoy oyendo
79. (...) 
80. Matilda: c’est pas difficile (.) je sais! C’est pas
81. difficile
82. (...) 
83. Talia: in the ocean (singing)
84. (...) 
85. Matilda: tu veux voir après
86. (...) 
87. Maia: que es eso?
88. (...) 
89. Matilda: c’est une- (.) [robe
90. Talia: [c’est- that’s an Indian
91. (...) 
92. Matilda: that’s a- (.) une robe
93. (...) 
94. Matilda: tu connais†
95. (...) 
96. Talia: but- we want (.) an Indian (.) [we—
97. Matilda: [yeah (.)
98. I’ll draw it (.) le premier†
99. Talia: in- in the-
100. Matilda: oui (.) je dessine après
101. (...) 
102. Talia: oh Matilda: 
103. Matilda: what†
104. (...) 
105. Talia: mm
106. (...) 
107. Matilda: quoi: (.) qu’est-ce que j’ai [fait†
108. Talia: [oh:!! Loo:k!
109. {{(showing her drawing to Matilda)}
110. Matilda: parce que t’as fait ça
111. Talia: i know:
112. (...) 
113. Talia: oh Matilda (02:22)
114. Matilda: Matilda
115. Talia: I like say{ing} Matilda
116. (...) 
117. Matilda: Tali::a
118. (...) 
119. Talia: Tali::i: (.) no::
120. (...) 
121. Talia: Taliai
122. Matilda: eh tu dessines ou pas†
123. Maia: ay no se como dibujar! (02:32)
124. Talia: she don’t know (.) but (.1) sh- she can
125. (...) paint (.) I wanna paint (.) this
126. (...) 
127. Talia: mmmm {{(laughing)}
128. Maia: voleo colorear un japonesa (02:48)
129. Talia: ah!
130. Matilda: hahaha {{(laughing)}
131. Maia: voy a sacar punto <to sharpen a pencil>
132. Matilda: hahahah {{(laughing)}
133. Talia: that’s not cool (.) cool cool cool
134. Matilda: hahahaha {{(laughing)}
135. Talia: what?
136. Maia: se- (.) se rompió el corazón (03:00)
137. (.)
138. Matilda: hahhaa ((laughing))
139. Maia: te esta diciendo loca (03:12)
140. (.)
141. Talia: shut up
142. Matilda: mmm ((laughing))
143. Talia: close your mouth
144. (.)
145. Talia: looo:k! (.) [that’s cool]
146. Matilda: [pas beau
147. (.)
148. Matilda: hahha ((laughing))
149. (.)
150. Talia: lo[ok (.) this is cool
151. Maia: [((clicks her tongue))
152. (.)
153. Talia: cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool cool
154. Matilda: chocolat
155. Talia: now (.) I’m going to eat (.) a blue car
156. (.)
157. Maia: que color ( )
158. Talia: ( ocean) ((singing))
159. (.)
160. Maia: c’est quoi ça?
161. (.)
162. Matilda: [mais attends! (.) tu vas voir après!
163. Talia: [I don’t know what it is
164. Matilda: parce que je vois ça à le musée
165. Talia: tout est (différent) (.) look this
166. Matilda: c’est femme
167. Talia: look (.) this (.) and after (.) you do this
168. (.)
169. (.)
170. Matilda: avec le pinceau (je fais) cheveux
171. ((laughing))
172. Talia: yeah (.) that’s it ((laughing))
173. Matilda: hahahaha ((laughing))
174. Maia: hahahaha ((laughing)) (.) lo dice todo en
175. (frances
176. (04:24)
177. (.)
178. Talia: why you speak with me in (.) in French (.)
179. I speak English
180. Matilda: no you’re not (allowed???) (04:34)
181. (.)
182. Maia: que te dijo
183. Talia: no se
184. Maia: hahahahaha ((laughing))
185. Talia: hahahah ((laughing))
186. (.)
187. Talia: you don’t know speak English
188. Matilda: I do:
189. Talia: no
190. Matilda: I do:!!
191. Talia: hahahah ((laughing))
192. (.)
193. Matilda: avec- (.) with the hair
194. Talia: no look (.) do this
195. (.)
196. Matilda: ça c’est pas (.) le crayon
197. (.)
198. Talia: what’s the difference
199. (.)
200. Maia: [es este Talia (04:58)
201. Talia: [look! (.) no
202. (.)
203. Talia: este si es
204. (.)
205. Matilda: de-sse-ne!
Maia: mais je sais pas que couleur
Talía: ça s'appelle
Maia: ((clicks her tongue))
Talía: de la peinture (.2) ça c'est la peinture (.2) this is my card of- (.2) of (.2) how do you say (.2)
Talía: valentine
Matilda: valentine
Matilda: un peu de l'eau (.2)
Talía: no but look (.2) this is pinceau pour le cheveux
Matilda: hahahaha ((laughing))
Maia: (    ) que estás haciendo aqui↑ (05:50)
((speaking to Andrea))
Andrea: (          ) ((from another group))
Matilda: (       )
Maia: non (.2) pas moi (.2)
Matilda: c'est quoi c'est quoi c'est quoi c'est (.) c'est toi↑
Maia: non (.2) pas moi (.2)
Talía: c'est qui↑ (.2) c'est Talía↑
Maia: ahhhh!
Talía: shut up
Maia: no (.2) que tea (    ) (.2) me la prestas↑
(.2) porque:: como muy bien (06:20)
Maia: el café!
Matilda: ahora no estamos solos
((Ma and So numbering the song))
Talía: ah (.2) this is a song (.2) a que sale (.2)
el train↑ (.2) a quelle heure (.2) oye que es esto↑
Maia: que es↑
Talía: a que hora sale el tren (.2) a quelle heure part le train (.2) a quelle heure part le train pour l'espagne (.2) a deux heures
Maia: colorier
Matilda: c'est ce que je fais (.2) colorier
Maia: qué coloreo::
Talía: that's in Spanish (.2) this for you (.2)
Talía: no:: (.2) really (.3)
Matilda: attends avec une peinture
Talia: this is forbidden
Matilda: thank you!
Talia: no
Talia: look
Cristina: maitresse j’ai trouve un noir
Matilda: (speaking across the room)
Maia: pero Talia lo esta haciendo ella
(Maia speaks across the room)
Cristina: j’ai trouve un noir (coming into the group)
Maia: donne
Cristina: (08:09)
Maia: que hago:
Cristina: une robe
Cristina: j- j’ai fait
Maia: que es una robe
Cristina: c’est un sac (.) une valise peut-être
Maia: tu sais pas c’est quoi une robe
Cristina: et va (.) dis- donc
Cristina: c’est pas un cartable ça

1. Cristina: on colorie et après on met de l’eau
2. Andrea: ah yo se como dibujar
3. Maia: coloreo:: un::-
4. Matilda: dessine en française!
5. Maia: ( ) frances=
6. Matilda: -fr::ances!
7. Maia: ( )
10. Maia: pas cool
11. (.3)
12. Matilda: je sais pas comment on dessine!
13. Andrea: moi je suis forte et ça marche pas
14. (.19)

--11:38--

**T2 S1 D7 V28 E3:**

--17:43--
1. Maia: je vais colorier le (.) indien
2. (.2)
3. Matilda: garçon (.) pas- (.) mais ça c’est pour les filles!
4. (.2)
5. Matilda: oui (.) c’est une robe
6. Maia: je vais colorier garçon pas::-
7. Matilda: mais comme tu sais pour les garçons (.)
8. Matilda: dress (.) ça c’est pour les filles ça
9. (.19)
10. (.)
11. Maia: je (.) veux pas (.) colorier ça!

--18:13--

**T2 S1 D7 V28 E4:**

--19:11--
1. ?: t’as fini↑
2. Andrea: Cristina tu has visto las pinturas↑ (.) yo
3. la- yo las metí en un papel (. ) y la
4. cerraba y después yo las hacía /vert/ (. ) y
5. de que las abría y me salía una mariposa
6. (.) y a me salía cualquier dibujo
7. Cristina: moi aussi je sais faire ça
8. Andrea: acaso que te pregunte!
9. Cristina: mais moi j’ai à la maison ça
10. Andrea: se ( ) te pregunte
11. (.)
12. Cristina: ça vient de Chine
13. (.)
14. Maia: mas grande!
15. (.)
16. Andrea: si Cristina porque te metes porque no te elija a ti
17. Cristina: et alors↑
18. Andrea: porque te metes
19. Cristina: [la la la la la la ((singing))
20. Matilda: [non!
21. Andrea: oui
22. (.)
23. (.)
24. Matilda: vert ça!
25. Andrea: (les boules↑)
26. (.)
27. Matilda: oui d’accord ( . ) parce que ya pas de rouge
28. c’est rouge mais maintenant on va faire
29. vert
30. Andrea: ya pas↑
31. Matilda: non
32. Andrea: attends je vais ((leaves the group to look
33. for a red pencil))

--19:58--

**T2 S1 D8 V29**
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--04:10--
1. Miss Lo: quels sont les mots que vous avez pas
2. compris dans la lecture (.) après on va
3. revenir dessus mais là je voudrais savoir
4. Maia: mimer
5. Miss Lo: hein↑
6. Maia: ça
7. Miss Lo: ah oui (.) elle (.2) zoé mime une statue
8. c’est comme ça (.1) il y a une statue (.1)
9. vous savez ce que c’est qu’une statue (.1)
10. voilà une statue (.2) hein (.1) voilà une
11. statue ((pointing at the book)) (.2) zoé
12. mime une statue (.1) elle fait comme ça
13. ((Miss Lo imitates the character in the
14. book))
15. (.4)
16. Miss Lo: zoé (.) hein↑ (.) alex et zoé (.) zoé la
17. petite fille (.) elle mime (.) elle mime
18. (.1) mime
19. (.5)
20. Miss Lo: d’accord↑
21. (.2)
22. Miss Lo: je mime par exemple si je veux mimer euh:
23. (.1) un éléphant (.3) ((Miss Lo imitates an
24. elephant)) mimer c’est imiter (.1) elle fait
25. comme si elle était une statue (.1) comment
26. on dit en espagnol mimer euh:. Leila
27. (.1)
28. Miss Lo: elle mime une statue (.) ça veut dire
29. (elle mime une statue en fait
30. Talia: [imitar (.)] esta posando=
31. Leila: [imita=
32. Talia: esta imitando Leila=
33. Miss Lo: = [d’accord (.1) elle mime (.1) elle fait
34. comme si elle était une statue d’accord↑
35. Kenji: [imita aussi (.1) imita
36. Miss Lo: d’accord↑ (.2) alors (.1) voilà une
37. salle avec des statues (.1) cette statue
38. n’a pas de bras (.) regardez elle n’a pas
39. de bras

--05:23--
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--08 :00--
1. Miss Lo: je vois que il y a des mots que tu as
2. entouré là (.) ’c’est le bal du musée’
3. (.4) ((children from other groups are talking
4. in the background))
5. Matilda: c’est quoi le bal↑
6. Miss Lo: le bal c’est quand on danse (.) là là là
7. la la ((singing and imitating someone
8. dancing)) (.) on danse à plusieurs (.) il
9. y a plusieurs personnes et puis on danse
10. (.1)
11. Miss Lo : c’est comme une fête mais euh:: mm
12. (.2)
13. Miss Lo: c’est une fête où les gens dansent
14. (.6)
15. Miss Lo: Matil- et comment on dit bal en anglais
16. euh:: Karen↑
17. Karen: a (.2) ball
18. Miss Lo: ah (.2) oui tu connais↑ (.2) ok
19. Cristina: comment on dit en anglais?
Karen: [(a ball)]

Miss Lo: [Karen tu t’assois à ta place s’il te plait merci (.).] très bien (.) donc euh (.) voilà vous avez compris (.) qui est-ce qui a été faire cette visite au louvre† (.). ce sont† (.) c’est qui ça !

---08:08---

T2 S1 D8 V30

---09:30---
1. Miss Lo: nous fini (.) [ssons
2. C?: [ssons
3. Miss Lo: vous fini (.) [ssez!
4. C?: [ssez!
5. Miss Lo: ils finissent
6. Karen: oui
7. Miss Lo: [tu vois Karen
8. Kenji: [ils finissent
9. Miss Lo: choisir (.).] est-ce qu’il fait [comme
10. finir]
11. Kenji: [choisissons
12. Miss Lo: [nous choisi
13. Kenji: [vous choisissez
14. Miss Lo: [ssez
15. C?: [ssez
16. Miss Lo: ils (.).] [choisissent
17. C?: [choisissent
18. Leila: oui
19. Miss Lo: donc ça (.2) euh ça (.).] je vais regarder
dans mon dictionnaire des verbes
21. (.).
22. Talia: ayer me quite el culito[y traía (09:53)
23. Miss Lo: alors ça (.).] euh:
24. Talia: horrible
25. Kenji: il tu (.) il tue
26. Talia: algo:: (.).] [feo
27. Miss Lo: [par exemple (.).] je vais vous donner des
28. verbes qui se terminent pas ‘ir’ (.).] et
29. vous allez me dire si c’est à votre avis
du deuxième groupe ou du premier groupe
30. (.).] par exemple (.).] rire (.).] qui c’est qui
31. veut essayer de conjuguer rire
32. Kenji: rire rire
33. Piotr: deuxième=
34. Miss Lo: =Cristina

---10:20---

T2 S1 D8 V30 E2:

---14:55---
1. Kenji: tu (.).] est toujours derrière ‘s’
2. Miss Lo: oui (.).] très bien Kenji (.).] a tu (.).] pour
3. tu (.).] on va toujours trouver un ‘s’ à la
fin (.).] tu joues tu dors tu pars tu
4. [prends tu parles tu cours-
5. Leila: [maîtresse (.).] on aller (.).] troisième
groupe (.).] va (.).] c’est il va (.).] c’est
6. pas avec un ‘t’ à la fin
7. Miss Lo: voilà (.).] ben parce que (.2) pour la
8. troisième personne on va pas trouver des

---10:20---
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---09:08---
11. (.) on va pas trouver toujours la même
12. chose (.) on va trouver pour la première
13. (.) personne (.) pour la deuxième personne
14. on va toujours trouver le 's' (.) pour le
15. nous on va toujours trouver 'ons' (.) pour
16. le vous [on va trouver 'ez'
17. Talia: maîtresse!
18. Piotr: [et pour ils
19. Talia: [et pour le ( )
20. Miss Lo: chut!
21. Piotr: [ont
22. Talia: [on va trouver le (.) 't'
23. Piotr: ont
24. (.)
25. Talia: non 't'
26. Piotr: [ont
27. Miss Lo: [pour]
28. Talia: il
29. (.)
30. Piotr: non c'est pas toujours-
31. Miss Lo: pourquoi euh:: Talia?
32. Talia: le deuxième groupe
33. Miss Lo: le deuxième groupe?
34. Leila: non Talia (.) fijate
35. Piotr: non:: regarde!
36. Kenji: fijate
37. (.)
38. Miss Lo: pour le deuxième groupe?
39. Piotr: un 't'?
40. Talia: finit en 't'
41. (.)
42. Miss Lo: mais pour quelle personne?
43. Talia: il
44. Miss Lo: oui

--16:12--

T2 S1 D8 V32

Kenji asks Miss Lo the difference between 'garçon' and 'fils'.

--00:00--

1. Kenji: onna
2. Piotr: o-
3. (.)
4. Kenji: n-
5. Piotr: n- a-
6. Miss Lo: ça
7. Piotr: ça oui
8. Kenji: o- non
9. Miss Lo: vient alors
10. Kenji: on- (.) n'! deux (. ) [deux n-
11. Miss Lo: [onna
12. Kenji: onna
13. Miss Lo: onna
14. Kenji: onna
15. Miss Lo: ça c'est fille↑
16. Piotr: [onna
17. Kenji: [oui
18. ((Miss Lo writes on the board))
19. Miss Lo: et garçon↑
20. Kenji: hotoko
21. Piotr: [otoko
22. Miss Lo: [otoko
23. Leila: haha ((laughing))
24. ?: otoko
25. Miss Lo: otoko |
26. Kenji: onsi (. ) oui
27. Miss Lo: otoko garçon (. ) ok
28. ((Miss Lo writes on the board))
29. Miss Lo: ça c'est fille et garçon
30. Piotr: onna (. ) otoko
31. Kenji: oui
32. Miss Lo: et (.) j'ai une fille (. ) ça c'est comment
33. j'ai une fille↑
34. (2)
35. Kenji: euh:: (.) atashi wa <I>
36. ?: ( )
37. Miss Lo: alors j'ai [une fille (. ) fille c'est
38. quoi↑
39. Leila: [non non pas j'ai
40. Piotr: atashi- atashi onna
41. Leila: c'est comme ça (. ) j'ai (. ) c'est ça
42. Miss Lo: j'ai un fils (. ) comment c'est j'ai (. )
43. non pas j'ai (. ) le fils (. ) le fils (. )
44. comment c'est le fils↑
45. Piotr: fils
46. Kenji: euh:: (. ) musuko
47. Miss Lo: comment↑
48. Leila: [musuko
49. Kenji: [musuko
50. (. )
51. Miss Lo: [musuko
52. Piotr: [musuko
53. (. )
54. Piotr: musuko (. ) haha ((laughing))
55. Leila: c'est comme l'italien (. ) musuko!
56. Miss Lo: musuko (. ) comme ça↑ ((Miss Lo writes on the
57. board))
58. Cristina: italiano
59. (. )
60. Miss Lo: hein↑ (. ) [ça c'est le garçon↑
61. Matilda: [Cristina (. ) mon papa qui est
62. allé en Italie
63. Miss Lo: ça c'est le fils
64. Piotr: musuko (. ) /porita/ (. ) /porita/ {(making
65. words up that sound like Italian)}
66. Miss Lo: c'est ça (. ) et ça c'est la fille (. ) et
67. la fille euh:: (. ) le féminin de musuko
68. c'est quoi le féminin de musuko↑
69. Kenji: oublie
70. Miss Lo: comment↑
71. Kenji: ah ah ((laughing)) (. ) oublie
72. Miss Lo: bli- comment↑
73. Kenji: non oublie (. ) j'ai oublie!
74. Leila: oublie (. ) il a-
Miss Lo: comment-
Kenji: [non j’ai oublié!]
Miss Lo: [prend ton dictionnaire
\(\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\;
Kenji: mais prends ton dictionnaire alors
Miss Lo: comment on dit fille
Kenji: euh
Miss Lo: alors voilà tiens (.) prends ton
dictionnaire (.) comment on dit fille en
japonais (.) mets-moi fille (.) le mot
fille [on va voir
Kenji: [fille est onna
Piotr: onna
Miss Lo: ouais mais la fille (.) j’ai une fille
Piotr: fils (.) fils
Miss Lo: j’ai une fille (.) mon bébé c’est pas un
garçon c’est une fille (.) j’ai une fille
j’ai un fils
Piotr: [eum
Kenji: [mm
Miss Lo: ça c’est français et quoi français
Kenji: çà c’est français et quoi français
Leila: en espagnol aussi c’est différent
Kenji: en pologne aussi
Miss Lo: [ouais
Leila: [c’est–
Leila: c’est fille garçon (.) et après–
Kenji: français écrite
Miss Lo: on peut écrire en français†
Kenji: oui
\(\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\;
\{Miss Lo writes the french word on Kenji’s digital
dictionary\}
\{the school bell rings, marking the end of the
lesson\}
Miss Lo: f- (.1) i–
Leila: 1–
Piotr: [l–
Kenji: [l–
Leila: 1–
Piotr: 1– e–
Leila: e–
Kenji: ah oui musume!
Miss Lo: Hein†
Kenji: (.)
Miss Lo: [musume
Piotr: musume
Miss Lo: alors fais voir (.) fille (.) daughter (.)
voilà daughter (.) okay (.) daughter
c’est†
Kenji: c’est quoi†
Miss Lo: comment c’est en japonais [daughter†
Kenji: [ou† (.) ou
daughter
Miss Lo: la (.) en anglais (.) daughter (.) fille
( .) comment- qu’est-ce qui est marque la†
( .) en caractère
Kenji: dau- ghter
Miss Lo: musume (.) d’accord
Miss Lo: [non mais qu’est-ce qu’est marque en
japonais
Kenji: euh (.) euh (.) musume
Miss Lo: musume (.)
Miss Lo: restez à vos places la s'il vous plait

Kenji: ça c'est fille!

Miss Lo: chut!

((children chatting))

Miss Lo: v

((Miss Lo writes on the board))

Miss Lo: chut!

((Miss Lo writes on the board))

Miss Lo: chut!

Leila: nena!

Leila: nena

Miss Lo: nena

?: non!

Leila: ou niña (.). niña!

Kenji: niña! niña! niña!

Miss Lo: niña

Kenji: niña

Leila: n-

((Miss Lo writes on the board))

Miss Lo: niña

Leila: oui

Andrea: non maîtresse!

Leila: niño! (.). avec un o-

Miss Lo: niño c'est le garçon d'accord

Leila: le puede decir como vos queres

Miss Lo: alors (.). et après

Leila: hijo (.). c'est garçon c'est hijo

Cristina: hijo

Leila: h- i-

Kenji: c'est comme française

Leila: hija

Cristina: hija c'est la même chose

Leila: comme ça

Miss Lo: donc (.). chut! (.). en- en espagnol quand

Leila: oui
Miss Lo: c’est- c’est pas (.) comme (.) euh (.)
Leila elle est hija (.) non (.) on dit
[c’est une niña]
Cristina: [niña]
Leila: oui (.) oui
Miss Lo: voilà
(.)
Miss Lo: alors vous avez vu (.) vous vous avez (.) c’est logique (.) ça veut dire que (.) vous avez un mot (.) vous avez deux mots différents (.) vous avez niña et niño et vous avez hija et hijo en espagnol (.) en anglais on a
(knocks on the door)
Miss Lo: en anglais on a (.)
C?: entrez
(The door opens)
Miss Lo: girl (.) and [boy
Matilda: [boy
Miss Lo: daughter and [son
Matilda: [son
Miss Lo: voilà (.) en espagn- en (.) en japonais on a (.) onna otoko (.) et (.) musume et musuko
(.). en français! (.) c’est ça qui est difficile (.) en français le mot fille ((circling on the board)) c’est le même pour dire ona et musume (.) et c’est le même pour dire niña et hija (.) c’est le même (.) c’est un seul mot (.) par contre pour garçon (.) il y a deux mots (.) il y a garçon et fils (.)
Talia: mais je suis la fille de ma- (.) de ma-
Leila: [no (.) no porque fille es- o sea (.) está diciendo yo (.) yo soy la hija (.) yo soy el hijo (.) de mi mama (.) entendes!
Leila: para decir hija en francés tienes que decir fille (.) y para decir hijo tienes que decir fils (.) [((ese está diciendo)
Miss Lo: [c’est-à-dire qu’en français on va dire (.) je suis une fille
Kenji: c’est quoi ce champignon?
Miss Lo: et aussi je suis la fille de ma mère
Piotr: Kenji ( )
Miss Lo: mais- (.) Piotr chut! (.) on écoute
la (.) chut!
Piotr: oui
Talia: et au pluriel?
Miss Lo: en français on va dire je suis une fille
et je suis la fille de ma mère=
Talia: =maitresse
Miss Lo: et par contre vous vous allez dire les garçons (.) je suis un garçon et je suis le↑
Piotr: [fils de ma mère
Miss Lo: [fils de ma mère (.) et on peut aussi dire je suis le garçon [de ma mère mais c’est encore compliqué’
Talia: [mais maîtresse
Miss Lo: comment on dit au pluriel?
Miss Lo: chut!
Talia: fille!
Miss Lo: alors (.) est-ce que en:: polonais c’est:: (.) pareil (.) il y a un mot pour
T2 S1 D9 V33
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T is asking whether children are going to get to speak French during the holidays.

---01:50---

1. Miss Lo: j’aimerais bien que vous partiez en
2. vacances avec ça qui soit bien clair dans
3. votre tête (. ) parce que je sais
4. qu’après vous allez aller en vacances et
5. que vous allez plus parler français! (. )
6. qui c’est qui va parler français pendant
7. les vacances (. )
8. Talia: je crois que oui
9. Miss Lo: Talia tu vas parler français avec qui (. )
Talia: avec (.) (.) je peux parler
Miss Lo: ah tu peux (.) ça va (.) euh:: Piotr
tu vas parler français en pologne↑
Piotr: non {((laughing))}
Miss Lo: pas tellement hein (.) Leila tu vas parler français↑
Leila: non
Miss Lo: non pas pendant deux semaines (.) Kenji
tu vas parler français à la maison↑
Kenji: non
Miss Lo: non (.) Karen tu vas parler français
Karen: euh oui parce que j'ai-
Miss Lo: ah
Karen: mes demi-frères et ma demi-sœur
Miss Lo: ah! (.) et eux ils parlent pas euh:: demi anglais↑ (.) non
Karen: non
Miss Lo: ils parlent français↑ (.) français↑ (.) mais ce sont des américains↑ (.) des franco-américains↑
Karen: des français
c'est les enfants de ton papa↑ (.) de ton beau-père↑
Karen: oui
Miss Lo: mais ton beau-père il est pas américain↑
Karen: non (.) français
Miss Lo: il est français (.) et il est pas moitié américain↑
Karen: non
Miss Lo: mais il parle bien anglais parce que je l'ai entendu
Karen: ah ben oui parce que sa maman c'est (.) c'est américaine
Miss Lo: ah oui! c'est ce qu'il me semblait! (.) j'avais bien compris qu'il y avait [quelque chose-]
Karen: [et:: l'anniversaire de ma mamie et c'est sa maman
Miss Lo: la maman de ta mamie qui est sa maman (.) mais avec ta mamie tu parles en français ou en anglais?
Karen: anglais et français
Miss Lo: oui donc c'est ça (.) et avec ton beau-père↑
Karen: en français
Miss Lo: voilà c'est bien ce qu'il me semblait (.) j'étais pas- (.) ok (.) samba tu vas parler français pendant les vacances
Karen: non↑ (.) un petit peu (.) tu vas pas aller au centre aéré↑ (.) ah non pas pendant les vacances
Samba: hier
Miss Lo: hier tu as été au centre aéré↑ (.) vous allez me dire après ce que vous avez fait pendant les vacances↑
Miss Lo: oui (.) oui (.) dis-moi oui
Karen: moi je vais aller au-
Miss Lo: dis-moi oui parce que là (.) alors Hakim tu vas parler français pendant les vacances↑
Hakim: oui
Miss Lo: oui (.) euh:: Amkoulel tu vas parler français
79. Amkoulel: (un peu)
80. Miss Lo: un peu (...) Andrea tu vas parler français
81. Talia: ah le mercredi
82. Andrea: oui (...) je vais faire le sport
83. Miss Lo: [merci me-
84. Miss Lo: ah! (...) tu vas faire du sport et là-bas
85. tu vas parler français
86. Matilda: [non:::
87. Miss Lo: [Mais! (...) tu vas parler français
88. pendant les vacances
89. Maia: non
90. Miss Lo: [non
91. Talia: [oh maîtresse!
92. Miss Lo: [Matilda
93. Matilda: oh à la maison oui parce que:: (. ) mon
94. (. ) papa il est française
95. Miss Lo: il est
96. Matilda: française
97. Miss Lo: française (...) c'est une femme ton papa
98. Matilda: haha ((laughing))
99. Miss Lo: c'est une dame ton papa
100. Matilda: français
101. Miss Lo: français ah d'accord (...) ok (...) donc euh
102. (...) y en qui vont quand même un peu parler
103. (...) heureusement (...) je dis heureusement
104. parce que c'est bien que vous parliez
105. votre langue mais (...) c'est pour moi que
106. je dis heureusement parce que je me dis
107. que quand vous allez revenir (...) j'espère
108. que vous allez encore vous rappeler (...) de
109. toutes les histoires que je vous raconte
110. (...) [euh: (. )] à l'école
111. Amkoulel: maîtresse!

--04:24--
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--04:34--

1. Amkoulel: maîtresse!
2. Miss Lo: chut!
3. Amkoulel: elle a dit un gros mot (...) j'ai dis
4. ()
5. Miss Lo: donc toi tu as dis un gros mot ou pas
6. Amkoulel: non
7. Hakim: si il a dit un gros mot
8. Miss Lo: il t'a dit quel gros mot
9. Hakim: casse-toi
10. (.2)
11. Miss Lo: t'as dit ça Amkoulel
12. Amkoulel: non
13. Hakim: [si
14. Leila: [c'est quoi ça maîtresse! ((pointing to
15. her exercise))
16. Miss Lo: bon moi j'ai pas entendu (...) j'ai pas
17. entendu
18. Talia: ni lo aprendés (04:55) <you don’t learn
19. it either>
20. Miss Lo: casse-toi ça veut dire (...) casse-toi ça
21. veut dire (...) va t'en (...) d'abord ça veut
22. dire (...) va t'en (...) donc déjà dans la
23. classe on peut pas dire va t'en parce que
24. l'enfant il peut pas sortir de la classe
25. (...) donc déjà on peut pas dire va t'en à
26. quelqu'un dans la classe
27. Talia: ah (...) lárgate tipo (05:06) <bugger off
28. man>
29. Miss Lo: et ça veut dire va t'en et ça veut dire
30. (...) euh: (...) casse-toi c'est une façon
31. méchante de dire à quelqu’un de partir
32. Talia: en espagnol c’est largate (05:14)
33. 
34. Miss Lo: c’est pour ça qu’on dit que c’est un gros
35. mot (.) un gros mot c’est (.) c’est (.)
36. vous savez ce que c’est que les gros mots?
37. Leila: oui oui
38. Miss Lo: c’est les mots qui sont (.) que
39. normalement on ne dit pas (.) parce que
40. c’est pas poli (.) c’est pas gentil (.) et
41. que on peut dire les choses euh (.) de
42. plusieurs façons (.) et il y a des façons
43. qui sont des insultes et il y a des façons
44. qui sont polis (.) et donc on appelle ça
45. (.) des gros mots (.) ils sont pas gros
46. mots en fait hein!
47. ((children laughing))
48. Miss Lo: donc (.) des mots grossiers (.) si on dit
49. des mots grossiers (.) qu’est-ce que vous
50. connaissez en français comme gros mots?
51. Piotr: ch là là
52. Miss Lo: ah non mais (.) vous allez loin là
53. Talia: y en a jusqu’où
54. Miss Lo: alors chut! (.) Andrea
55. Andrea: ta gueule
56. Miss Lo: ta gueule voilà (.) pourquoi on peut pas
57. dire ta gueule? (.) parce que ta gueule
58. (.) qui est-ce qui a une gueule on a dit
59. l’autre jour?
60. Andrea: le chien
61. Miss Lo: c’est le chien
62. ((children laughing))
63. Miss Lo: donc quand on dit à quelqu’un ta gueule
64. (.) chut! quand on dit à quelqu’un ta
65. gueule c’est comme si on considère que
66. c’est pas un (.) un-
67. Leila: perro Talia
68. Miss Lo: [que c’est un animal hein
69. Talia: [{ } puta
70. Miss Lo: Leila là vous avez pas à traduire (.1)
71. on considère que comme si c’était un
72. animal (.) donc ça c’est pas bien (.)
73. c’est un être humain comme nous
74. Andrea: un garçon m’a dit hier!
75. Miss Lo: un garçon t’a dit ça hier?
76. Andrea: il ma dit:: ta gueule
77. Miss Lo: ta gueule voilà (.) ben ta gueule c’est
78. (.) c’est un gros mot (.) donc si
79. quelqu’un dit ça à la récréation (.)
80. vous dev- vous allez voir la maîtresse et
81. vous allez dire voilà il m’a dit ça (.) et
82. vous vous devez pas dire ça non plus (.)
83. hein? (.) qu’est-ce qu’il y a comme autre
84. gros mots? (.) donc ta gueule ça veut dire
85. tais-toi en fait hein? (.) tais-toi (.)
86. donc autant dire tais-toi (.) euh:: il y
87. a quoi comme autre gros mots? (.) Hakim
88. t’en connais des gros mots (.) t’as l’air
89. tout timide là oui
90. (.) ((children laughing))
91. Miss Lo: non mais soyez pas timide là (.) là on est
92. en train de voir si vous savez ce que ça
93. veut dire
94. Leila: maîtresse! (.1) pétasse!
95. Miss Lo: pétasse
96. Leila: "hija de puta"
97. Talia: [ch!
98. Miss Lo: [pétasse (.1) pétasse ça veut dire euh::
99. Kenji: c’est quoi pétasse?
100. ((Mi and Talia laughing))
Miss Lo: c'est ce qu'on dit à une fille euh:: (.)
mais vraiment comme si c'était une fille qui était euh (. . .) vulgaire (. .)
c'est pas gentil de dire pétasse (. .) c'est vraiment euh:: (. .) effectivement c'est un gros mot
Maia: que lo dijo
Miss Lo: c'est comme si on dit que c'est une fille vraiment euh:: (.)
Talia: sur le trottoir
Miss Lo: oui c'est ça ( . . .) une fille bête (. . .) voyez (. . .) vulgaire (. .) c'est pas poli bon qu'est-ce qu'il y a d'autre? (. . ) pétasse (. .) ta gueule (. .) après? (. . ) casse-toi (. .) donc on peut dire pousse-toi (. .) pousse-toi c'est pas gentil mais c'est pas une:: (. .) une insulte
Andrea: merde
Miss Lo: ah oui alors
Talia: [merde
Andrea: [merde
Miss Lo: ouais
Talia: [merde
Piotr: euh (. .) caca
Miss Lo: voilà!
((children laughing)) (.3)
Miss Lo: c'est un mot qui (. .) alors voilà (. .) et merde puisque merde c'est un gros mot?
Talia: caca!
?: zut!
Talia: ah c'est (. .) je fais (. .) mier-
Miss Lo: chut! (. .) zut (. .) c'est c'est (. .) ah!
exprès
Talia: c'est caca!
((children laughing))
Andrea: mierda!
Leila: Talia (. .) Talia como se diciendo oy!
(08:31)
Miss Lo: [voilà
Talia: [je fais (. .) merde
Miss Lo: mais ça veut dire (. .) le sens du mot ça veut dire caca mais quand on dit merde en fait on pas dit pas caca on dit (. .) on se trompe (. .) ou bien voilà (. .) je prends un verre d'eau (. .) je prends un verre d'eau et hop! je le renverse (. .) ben je vais dire (. .) ah! merde! (. .) et donc c'est sans faire suivi de colère contre moi-même
Talia: c'est (. .)
Miss Lo: zut il faut dire zut et c'est pas un gros mot (. .) et toi t'as dit quoi?
Matilda: putain
Miss Lo: putain c'est pareil (. .) on dit oh!
putain!
Matilda: je sais comment on dit en anglais ((laughing))
Miss Lo: [voilà (. .) mais c'est pas un gros mot ça hein
Talia: c'est quoi?

Andrea: [puta

Miss Lo: [c'est comme quelqu'un qui fait la prostitution

Talia: oh

Piotr: [puta!

Miss Lo: [le mot putain ça veut dire prostitution (.1) mais c'est pas un mot (..) quand on dit putain en fait (..) parce que on peut dire [zut à la place

Maia: [he aprendido bastantes cosas

(09:14) <(you have) learned so may things>

Miss Lo: donc quand on dit putain (..) c'est- c'est une insulte aussi (..) si on dit ça à quelqu'un on dit ça c'est une très grosse insulte (..) on peut pas dire ça à quelqu'un (..) mais si on dit pour soi-même (..) ah putain ça m'énerve! (..) vous voyez (..) mais c'est pas un gros mot

Kenji: mais des fois on le dit (..) des fois on le dit (..) mais on peut pas le dire à l'école (..) c'est surtout ça (..) on a pas le droit de le dire à l'école (..) là l'école si on dit ça c'est grave (..) parce que à l'école (..) ces mots là (..) on a pas le droit de les utiliser

Andrea: mon père aussi dit que si pour une chose ah m-

Miss Lo: voilà tout le monde à la maison va dire ah merde! (..) ah putain! (..) [même en:: espagnol-

Andrea: [la maîtresse (..) la maîtresse

Talia: oh oui [(laughing)]

Andrea: la maîtresse l'autre jour elle a dit aussi

Miss Lo: la maîtresse de ce2 elle a dit ça aussi

---09:56---

Leila: c'est quoi kuso

Miss Lo: mais est-ce qu'il y a des mots comme ça qu'on a pas le droit de dire (..) qui sont pas beau

Kenji: oui

Miss Lo: ah oui!

Talia: en espagnol beau coup

Kenji: [pas le droit

Piotr: [kuso (.) kuso!

Miss Lo: [en espagnol beaucoup d'accord

Miss Lo: ça ce sont des mots en fait qu'on apprend pas en- dans la classe (..) ce sont des mots qu'on apprend

Kenji: oui japon:: (..) dire

Miss Lo: y en a (..) vous en dites mais vous en dites à [l'école]

Piotr: [/kusa/
Kenji: euh:: à l'école dire euh (..) maîtresse dit non
Miss Lo: ah oui (..) la maîtresse elle- voilà (..) si on le dit la maîtresse elle est pas d'accord
Talia: Kenji (..) c'est quoi /kuso/↑
Miss Lo: chut!
Miss Lo: o kuso!
Miss Lo: non mais euh:: Talia (..) le but du jeu là c'est pas de les apprendre dans différentes langues
{{children laughing}} (.4)
Miss Lo: ce qui est sur (..) ce qui est sur et certain avec un gros mot c'est quoi↑ (.)
c'est que quand on le dit qu'est-ce qui se passe derrière↑
Karen: après (..) euh::
Andrea: on le dire à la maîtresse↑
Miss Lo: non mais quand on dit un gros mot qu'est-ce que (.-) est-ce qu'on dit un gros mot et puis voilà ça y est (..) on dit un gros mot ben on dit j'ai froid et puis après on dit putain (..) après on dit j'ai fain merde (..) est-ce qu'on dit des gros mots et il se passe rien↑
Matilda: maîtresse! (.-) maîtresse!
Miss Lo: qu'est-ce qui se passe quand on dit un gros mot↑
Karen: euh:: (..) tu peux:: (.2)
Talia: [aller avec jésus (.-) pardon
Miss Lo: ah
talia: on dit ça
Miss Lo: chut! (.-) non non qu'est-ce qui se passe quand on dit un gros mot:. euh:: (.)
même à la recrée avec des enfants (.)
Karen: [je sais pas comment on dit (.-) en anglais mais:
Miss Lo: ben dis-le moi en anglais Karen
Karen: euh:: (..) euh (..) you can get in trouble!
Miss Lo: voilà! (..) et ben oui (..) oui
Leila: c'est quoi↑
Miss Lo: elle a bien (.-) bien compris (.-) elle a dit que- (.-) ce qui est sur c'est que quand on dit un gros mot (.1) tu vas avoir des problèmes (.2) il va y avoir des problèmes (.-) c'est ça qui- (.-) c'est comme ça parce que des fois on apprend une langue
Kenji: après peur
Miss Lo: on sait pas que ce mot là c'est un gros mot (.-) mais si vous le dites vous allez voir (.-) vous dites à un enfant à la récréation (.-) ta gueule (.-) il y a deux solutions (.-) soit il vient vite voir la maîtresse et il va dire maîtresse
maîtresse! (.-) il m'a dit ta gueule et la maîtresse elle va dire qu'est-ce que c'est que ça ta ta ta ta (.-) t'es puni! (.-) donc ça ça fait un problème (.-) vous êtes puni
Kenji: qu'est-ce que tu fais↑
Miss Lo: donc vous allez voir que oh là (.-) c'est un mot qu'il fallait pas dire (.-) soit l'enfant (.-) il va être encore plus fâché contre vous (.-) et il va y avoir une
bagarre (.) donc les gros mots ce qui est
sur (.) c'est que les gros mots à l'école
ça fait des grands problèmes (.) si vous dites ça à la maîtresse (.) vous allez vous retrouver chez la directrice

Miss Lo is correcting children's exercises and highlighting the common mistakes.

--01:07:20--
1. Miss Lo:  et sinon (.1) euh:: (.2) donc le cheval
2. Cristina: =la [(.] euh::
3. Leila:  [che- jument! (.3) jument!
5. Miss Lo:  [jument
6. Cristina:  [jumelle!
7. Miss Lo:  jumelle†
8. (.3)
9. {(children laughing)}
10. Piotr:  jument
11. Miss Lo:  jument! (.2) jument (.) c'est quoi la
12. jumelle†
13. Cristina:  c'est la femme-
14. Karen:  jumelle c'est- c'est- c'est-
15. Piotr:  c- c- c- c'est {(laughing)}
16. {(children laughing)}
17. Cristina:  c'est la femme (.) de- de:
18. (.3)
19. Miss Lo:  c'est quoi la jumelle† (.) les sœurs
20. jumelles†
21. Karen:  c'est la femme de l- l- (.2) la-
22. Cristina:  ah! c'est
23. Karen:  cheval?
24. Piotr:  ah c'est les deux qui::
25. Cristina:  ( ) jumelles que ça euh::
26. Piotr:  [ils sont-
27. Miss Lo:  [la sœur jumelle
28. Piotr:  ils sont:: [nés:: (.3) en même temps†
29. Leila:  [(.] que c'est que:: (.3)
30. quand elle naît (.) elles sont bébés (.)
31. elles sont les deux avec le même age et
32. ils sont pareils pareils (.) tout tout
33. pareil
34. Miss Lo:  voilà
35. Leila:  [les mêmes yeux (.1) la même (.) tout
36. pareil!
37. Karen:  [c'est la sœur!
38. Miss Lo:  au lieu d'avoir- (.3) comment on dit en
39. anglais†
40. (.3)
41. Miss Lo:  les enfants [jumeaux† (.3) twins†
42. Karen:  oui!
43. Miss Lo:  voilà (.) et comment on dit en espagnol
44. les jumeaux†
45. (.3)
46. Leila:  [gemela!
47. Talia:  [gemela
48. Andrea:  [gemela
49. Cristina:  ah!
50. ?:  /gemedz/!
51. Cristina:  gemelos!
52. Karen:  /te-tetərə/ =
53. Leila:  =gemela!
54. Cristina:  ()
55. Piotr:  /gemerə/
56. Leila: gemela
57. Miss Lo: ou sinon aussi il y a un autre mot aussi
e en français les jumelles (.) c'est ce
58. qu'on prend comme ça pour regarder (.)
pour voir loin (.) les jumelles
59. Leila: ah oui (.) euh los los ()
60. Miss Lo: mais ça n'a pas de- (.) jumelle ça n'a pas
de [rapport avec jument attention
61. Andrea: [cómo]
62. (.)
63. Leila: non:
64. Miss Lo: jument (.) [cheval
65. Leila: [jument [c'est la- ((writing on
66. the board))
67. Talia: [cómo le llaman]
68. (.)
69. Leila: [c'est la femme du cheval
70. Andrea: [yo no sé (.) yo me olvidé
71. Leila: et jumelle c'est (.) [c'est les deux
72. filles pareil (.) ou deux personnes
73. Talia: [binoculares!
74. (.)
75. Cristina: maitresse!
76. Miss Lo: chut! (.) oui
77. Cristina: maitresse! on peut manger [un film
78. Talia: [eye (.) la
79. niña del pelo negro [con rosa] [01:09:04]
80. Miss Lo: [chut chut!
81. Cristina: ( ) en fait il y a une fille qui se
82. [connaît pas (.)
83. Talia: [el pelo asi (.) el bien chiquito (south
84. American] <her hair are like that (.) her
85. hair is really short>
86. Cristina: et en fait il y avait une moitié de:: (.)
de (.) de (.) photos (.) en fait était
87. des jumelles
88. Miss Lo: voilà d'accord
89. Cristina: et après
90. Miss Lo: et elle a cherché sa sœur oui d'accord
91. Cristina: et après voilà (.) et après
92. ( )
93. Miss Lo: très bien
94. (Miss Lo moves on and works with another child))

--01:09:30--

T2 S1 D9 V33 E4:

T writes on the board the time table of the day for every children.

--37:19--
1. Miss Lo: voilà (.) alors (.) très bien (.) alors
2. justement (.) on va c'est bien (.) parce
3. que ça fait- c'est:: (.) on va marquer
4. après qui est-ce qui sort le jeudi ya
5. quoi↑
6. (.)
7. Leila: moi [je sors à- à:::
8. Miss Lo: [ehh:: (.) Hakim
9. Leila: [dix heures Leila:
10. Piotr: [moi est-ce qu'on a (.) [escalade
11. Talia: [dix heures quinze
12. Leila: oh oui::! escalade! (.) trop bien
13. Miss Lo: alors c'est l'après-midi alors parce que
14. le matin ya escalade
15. Piotr: alexandre (.) c'est pas bien (.) alexandre
16. (.) moi (.) arrête
17. Leila: moi je veux pas avec alexandre
18. Piotr: moi non
19. (Miss Lo writing the time table in the background))
20. Talia: que paso?
21. Leila: ay! que hay uno (.) que subía dos pies y se caía (.) después cuando vos escalaste ( ) subir con la cuerda y no lo sabe
22. Piotr: ( ) casi lo tira! (37:52) <there is one guy (.) who climbed up a few feet up and then fell (.) then when you want ( ) to climb with the rope and he doesn’t know how to do it (.) he almost pushed him off!>
23. Miss Lo: chut!
24. Cristina: maîtresse!
25. Talia: mm†
26. Leila: casi lo tira porque necesita la soga para que él suba (.) vaya subiendo con la soga y casi lo tira! [a Sebastián]
27. Miss Lo: [quién!]
28. Leila: el pibito que no sabe (south american) <the guy that doesn’t know how to climb> oh!
29. Talia: [laughs]}
30. Miss Lo: ya qui† donc ya euh (.) Cristina:
31. Piotr: como (.) comme alexandre (.) comme ça
32. Miss Lo: [chambara aujourd’hui†]
33. Talia: [y que paso
34. Miss Lo: le- le (arise) la cuerda y ves↓
35. Leila: como (. ) comme alexandre ([joining in the conversation with Talia and Leila])
36. Miss Lo: chut! (.) treize trente que je mettrai après les noms parce qu’il y a beaucoup d’enfants (.) alors la justement
37. Leila: j’aimerais bien comme vous êtes tous la (. ) chut! (.) j’aimerais bien justement qu’on regarde (.) les choses que vous n’avez pas comprises
38. Talia: y que paso
39. Miss Lo: [chambara aujourd’hui†]
40. Talia: [y que paso
41. Miss Lo: ya qui† donc ya euh (.) Cristina:
42. Cristina: [bonjour [excusez-moi de vous déranger
43. Miss Lo: [bonjour
44. Piotr: c’est pour [(. ) Andrea deranger
45. Miss Lo: [bonjour
46. Miss Lo: c’est pour chercher Hakim et Andrea pour le chambara
47. Miss Lo: ah oui c’est vrai (.) c’est vrai (.) vite parce que c’est [qu’il faut partir
48. Leila: [maître! (.) c’est quoi je viens cher- cher- je vous ranger ahh (. ) c’est ça†
49. Leila: []
50. Miss Lo: [pardon†
51. Piotr: je vous de- [je vous déranger
52. Miss Lo: [pardon†
53. Leila: excusez-moi je vous deranger c’est quoi ça†
54. Miss Lo: excusez-moi de vous deranger
55. Leila: c’est quoi†
56. Leila: c’est quoi†
57. Miss Lo: chut!
58. Leila: el pibito que no sabe (south american) <the guy that doesn’t know how to climb> oh!
Miss Lo: ben parce que la moi je suis en train de
faire quelque chose alors comme lui il
tape a la porte (.) du coup je suis
obligée de m'arrêter (.) alors il dit
excusez-moi de vous déranger
Piotr: ah ( )
Talia: ah si ( ) pardoname por interrupirlo
(07:49)
{2}
Miss Lo: de vous interrompre tu vois†
Leila: ah
--08:00--

T2 S1 D9 V36 E2:

--08:04--
1. Leila: melani te vas! ( )
2. Andrea: yo tengo que ir a nadar
3. (.)
4. (Miss Lo is talking to another group in the
5. background)
6. Leila: yo me tengo que ir a historia igual
7. Andrea: me voy contigo ( )
8. (.)
9. Talia: pourquoi tu fais ça (.) c'est mieux que
tu fais ça ((speaking to Piotr))
10. (.)
11. (.)
12. Piotr: [c’est trop facile
13. Leila: [tiene que hablar con vos? (08:19)
14. (.)
15. Talia: hein†
16. (.)
17. Leila: [tiene que hablar con vos Andrea†
18. Talia: [no que se vay con migo en el:: (.)
19. camión
20. Piotr: [de quatre et ( )
21. Leila: ah si†
22. Piotr: c’est quoi ça?
23. Talia: siempre se va Leila
24. Piotr: il faut faire quoi†
25. Leila: ah si yo se yo se
26. Piotr: c’est quoi†
27. (.)
28. Kenji: non!
29. (.)
30. Piotr: c’est quoi ça?
31. (.1)
32. Kenji: non!
33. (.)
34. Talia: je ne sais pas (.) je comprends rien
35. Piotr: c’est pas ça
36. Kenji: non!
37. Piotr: oh la la
--08:40--

T2 S1 D9 V36 E3:

Miss Lo reads Leila’s exercise and corrects it.

--10:35--
237. Miss Lo: ’combien de sandwiches différents fait-
elle’ (.) ’elle fait trente sandwiches’ (.)
239. non (.) haha! (.) ’différents’
240. (.2)
241. Miss Lo: elle en fait pas trente différents
242. (.2)
Miss Lo: elle fait des sandwiches d’un certain style
et des sandwiches d’un autre style.
Leila: ha! (.) soixante-dix-huit!
Kenji: (.) trente euh (.) plus grand.
Leila: je sais pas maîtresse c’est trop
difficile!
Miss Lo: elle fait des sandwiches (.) elle fait des
sandwichs qu’elle appelle (.) ‘petits sacs
de santé’.
Leila: [ça fait (.) dix-
huit!]
Talia: [ça] et ça
Miss Lo: non
Piotr: [non!]
Talia: [non!]
Leila: oui
Piotr: [non]
Talia: regarde (.) ici (.) [combien
elle a trouvé
Talia toute à l’heure
Talia: combien il a-
différents
Miss Lo: et d’habitude Talia elle cherche pas
trop (.) donc si [Talia trouve (.)
c’est que toi tu peux trouver
Piotr: [trois
Leila: ah! (.) vingt-deux!
Talia: [oui
Leila: ici
Talia: non!
Leila: [elle a trouve
Talia: trente j’ai cherché
Miss Lo: non mais-
Talia: non!
Miss Lo: Talia- Leila
Talia: Leila!
Talia: la verdad
Talia: cuanta recetas hizo diferentes†
Leila: ( )
Talia: aqui hay una verdad†
Talia: el sandwich americano
Talia: Talia!
Leila: este (.) aqui hay uno
Leila: si
Talia: acá hay otra
Leila: sí

Talia: son las tres recetas! (.) ahora

Piotr: /trtrtrtr/

Talia: y por qué es tan fácil (. ) treinta!

Veinticuatro veintisiete!

Piotr: /trtrtrtr/

Kenji: cuatro (.) cinco

((all laughing))

Miss Lo: euh Maia viens voir (. ) moi je suis pas

d'accord la (. ) huit plus sept ça fait

combien (. ) ça fait combien huit (. ) allez

vas-y (. ) neuf

Leila: il va gagner un euro avec trois sandwiches

Piotr: /trtrtrtrtrtrtr/ ((imitating Talia))

Leila: [espera como esta

Piotr: trtrtrtrtrtrtrcetas!

Maia: entonces-

Leila: esta mal esta pregunta porque tiene que

Piotr: [/trtrtrtrtrtr/(/trtrtr/ ((imitating Mi))

Miss Lo: [ai par exemple moi je

fais (. ) alors (. ) je fais c'est quoi la

Leila: specialite de euh-

Leila: mais maitresse ici il y a trois recettes

Miss Lo: chut (. ) c'est quoi (. ) oui il y a trois

recettes (. ) voilà

Leila: oui mais ici il dit (. ) sandwiches (. ) pas

recette

Piotr: euh (. ) trente

Leila: trente

Miss Lo: trente (.) mais la dedans yen a qui sont

pareils (.) ya des sandwiches qui sont

americains (. ) style- c'est comme si-

Leila: dix sandwichs americains (. ) dix sandwiches

como ça!

Miss Lo: voilà (. ) c'est comme si moi je dis (. )

demain on va faire les sandwiches polonais

(. ) les sandwiches japonais (. ) les

sandwichs argentins et des sandwiches

Mexicans (. ) je veux dire que- Leila tu

faits (. ) cinq- dix sandwiches argentins (. )

[tu pourrais mettre quoi dedans]

Talia: [en fait c'est le meme

Leila: je sais pas

Talia: boeuf

Miss Lo: du boeuf (. ) sandwich japonais qu'est-ce

qu'on pourrait mettre?

Leila: riz
Leila: poissons, poissons

(Miss Lo talks to a pupil from another group)

Leila: un sandwich japonais, qu'on mettrait quoi
Kenji

Leila: poissons

Kenji: euh, poissons

Miss Lo: voilà, chut! un sandwich polonais
qu'est-ce qu'on pourrait mettre

Piotr: euh, jambon, fromage

Miss Lo: tiens on va faire ça à la fin de l'année

Piotr: [jambon, fromage, et ketchup

Leila: mais maitresse [il y a pas ici boeuf de
arg- de Argentine

Miss Lo: [voilà, et les

sandwichs mexicains

Talia: c'est le pain, le jambon

Miss Lo: ouais

Talia: le fromage

Miss Lo: ouais

Talia: si tu veux la salade

Miss Lo: ouais

Talia: euh, si tu veux (14:25)

et le pain!

Kenji: capsules?

Miss Lo: non mais il faut un truc ou ça-, ou ça
soit mexicain, faut un truc un peu
special parce que sinon jambon fromage

Miss Lo: euh,

(Miss Lo and Kenji keeps on talking)
Leila: tu vas dire ( )
Miss Lo: chut! (.) chut! (.) Leila

Piotr: mon pere donne moi et apres moi toilette
{(laughing)}

Leila: Amanda elle me dit (.) tiens ça c'est mexicain mais c'est pas avec (/) ile/

Talia: que te dijo amanda? (15:37)
Leila: me dijo (.) toma esto no tiene chile (.)
(me disimulo) (.) lo probé y casi lo vomito

(.1)
Talia: que tenia?
(1.)
Leila: chile
(4.)
Talia: porque los argentinos no aguantan el [chile]

Piotr: [c'est ça pour picnic
Leila: que]

Talia: no aguantan el chile los argentinos
Leila: non (.) a mi me gusta [{
Miss Lo: [des oeufs et de l'omelette

Talia: el chile me hace agua la boca ((clicks her tongue))

Miss Lo: c'est quoi ça?
Kenji: c'est rose!
Miss Lo: c'est rose!
Kenji: rose et:: rouge
Miss Lo: rose et rouge

Piotr: japon ça c'est japon?
Kenji: non
(Talia and T, Kenji, and Piotr)

Miss Lo: (Mike go back to the conversation between T, Kenji, and Piotr)
Talia: avec des sushis!
Kenji: rose (.). c'est rose
Leila: (Kenji! (.). ecris ((pointing to Kenji’s digital dictionary))

(.2)
Piotr: ecris
Kenji: ah oui
(.3)
Kenji: euh (.). rose (.). c'est rose
Miss Lo: ouais
Kenji: ici (.). ici (.). et blanc
Talia: ah oui! el salmon
Leila: salmon maîtreass (.). salmon!
Kenji: attends
Piotr: attends ti tan ti tan {{imitating Kenji}}
Miss Lo: attends alors il va nous dire la (.). parce que c'est surprise hein

((Kenji looks for the word in his digital dictionary))
Piotr: Kenji computer!
Leila: computer
Talia: non (.). computer {{correcting pronunciation}}
Miss Lo: alors (.). après voilà (.). après voilà
Kenji: ah (.). jambon!
Researcher: ah bon
Miss Lo: ahahah ((laughing))

((children laughing))
Leila: Kenji!
Piotr: c'est pas comme ça!
Miss Lo: ouais non mais ça c'est des sandwiches

Researcher: comme il y en a partout quoi (.). c'est des
The four children are colouring the drawings they made during their visit to the museum.

--11:12--

1. Kenji: tu aimes dessiner ? (.1) sofi (. ) a
2. (.2)
3. Maia: so-fi-a!
5. (.)
6. Matilda: mm beaucoup de l’eau!
7. (.3)
8. Kenji: un peu::!
9. (.3)
10. Matilda: un peu::!
11. Kenji: c’est comme ça (.1) noir et (. ) gris!
12. Talia: c’est pas gris
13. Kenji: non ça c’est gris! ((laughing))
14. Talia: non ça c’est noir
15. Kenji: ça c’est noir
16. (.2)
17. Kenji: ça c’est gris
18. (. )
19. Matilda: non ça c’est gris (. ) ça c’est noir
20. Talia: ça est noir
21. (.5)
22. Matilda: c’est comme ça↑
23. Talia: yeah
24. Kenji: yes!
25. (.4)
26. Maia: [{(            )}
27. Matilda: [lala ((singing))]
28. Kenji: c’est quoi ça↑ (. ) cadeau↑
29. (.2)
30. Matilda: non! (. ) gâteau
31. Kenji: la ( ) rouge (. ) rouge rouge rouge
32. Matilda: c’est une guitare (. ) tut tut tut
33. ((singing))
34. (.2)
35. Talia: no
36. (. )
37. Matilda: c’est quoi alors↑
38. (.3)
39. Talia: alors (. ) alors
40. (. )
41. Matilda: mais c’est quoi↑
42. (.2)
43. Talia: ( )
44. Kenji: (antoli)
45. (.2)
46. Matilda: c’est comme une guitare ou quoi↑
47. (. )
48. Talia: no::! (.2) c’est une baguette magique (. ) religieux
49. (. )
50. (. )
51. Matilda: ah::! magique!
52. Kenji: ah c’est magique↑
53. Talia: non:: (. ) [c’est comme ça
54. Matilda: [hahaha(Ma laughing)]
55. (. )
56. Talia: ça fait comme ça
57. Kenji: ça c’est mourir (. ) comme ça (. ) euh::
58. (. ) ici
59. (. )
60. Talia: ça c’est je suis
61. (.4)
62. Matilda: magique
63. Kenji: tu colories (. ) n’importe quoi::
64. Talia: n’importe quoi::
65. Kenji: parce que écris pas
66. Matilda: n’importe quoi!
67. (. )
68. Talia: c’est comme ça:: ( )
69. Kenji: ( ) ((imitating Talia’s tone))
70. (.16)
71. Talia: et oui écris les couleurs
72. (.12)
73. Kenji: pam pam pam ((singing))
74. (.7)
75. Matilda: beige
76. (.5)
77. Matilda: oh oui::! peinture! (. ) j’ai oublié
78. (.2)
79. Kenji: t’as même pas colorié
Kenji: hein

Kenji: je n'aime pas colorier

Matilda: je n'aime pas colorier

Kenji: je n'ai\colorie (.). je n'aime (.). je

Talia: marron!

Kenji: marron et rouge

Kenji: rouge::!

Talia: c'est quoi /\u00e0g/

Kenji: marron

Talia: en quelle langue\?

Kenji: espagnol (.). [/\u00e0g/ (.)/\u00e0g//\u00e0g/]

Talia: [non (.).] marron

Kenji: [non (.).] non (.). [rouge (.).]

Maia: [ben oui

Kenji: rouge (.). rouge (.). rouge (.)/\u00e0g/

Talia: ça (.). c'est café

Kenji: café!

Talia: ça (.1) c'est rose (.). ça (.). naranja (.2)

negro (.2) verde

Matilda: haha ((laughing))

Talia: [shu\[hei!]

Kenji: [oui

Talia: verde (.). ça c'est aussi verde

Kenji: [c'est-

Talia: claro (.). gris (.2) [az-

Kenji: [pareil (.).] français

Talia: azul

Maia: oh se me olvidó [escribir esto (15:22)

Talia: [rojo

Talia: crema

Kenji: /\u00e0m/=\u00e0

Talia: =amarillo

Kenji: amarillo

Talia: azul!

Kenji: azul!

Talia: azul claro

Matilda: tatatata ((laughing))

Kenji: café (.). est marron\?

Kenji: Talia (.). marron!

Maia: oui (.). oui

Kenji: café (.). marron\?

Maia: oui

Kenji: Talia café est (.). Talia marron\?

Matilda: tu [bois café

Kenji: [français

Talia: café (.). c'est café ffffff ((aspirating noise)) (.). et aussi café

Maia: café c'est (.). chuk chuk chuk (.). café français est café seulement glou glou glou
Talia: café (. ) Kenji! (. ) café c’est fffff (. ) et café (. ) c’est::
Kenji: marron
Talia: marron
Kenji: ah oui (. ) il n’y a [pas de comme ça (. )
chuk!
Talia: [pas avec l’accent (. )
Talia: chuk!
Kenji: chuk!
Talia: [pas avec l’accent (. )
Maia: dijo il n’y a pas de (. ) chuk!
((laughing))
Kenji: chukiti chikitan! ((singing))
( . )
Maia: chukiti chikitan!
Matilda: chiki chiki wa wa! ((laughing))
( . 6 )
Kenji: wa wa:::
( . 6 )
((So singing))
Talia: j’ai fini!
Matilda: ah bon! ( . ) t’as huit pages!
Talia: now this (. ) hey (. ) that’s not easy (. )
no (.3) it’s [so so-]
Matilda: [if I think ehm::
Talia: it’s so so- (. ) oh! Matilda::
Matilda: quoi↑ (. ) qu’est-ce que j’ai fait↑
Talia: t’as fait ça
Kenji: qu’est-ce que j’ai fais::
Matilda: qu’est-ce que j’ai fais:
Maia: ( ) el café! ( )
((singing approximate lyrics for the song ‘el café))
Matilda: j’ai fini ma robe de la madame
Kenji: madame?
Matilda: ben oui!
Maia: oh arrête! de faire ça::
Matilda: ouh!
Matilda: ah! j’ai fini mon robe de madame
Matilda: ça c’est pas difficile
( . 7 )
Kenji: ça c’est (. ) dessine (. ) très difficile
( . )
Matilda: difficile!
Maia: ça c’est dessine trop difficile
( . 2 )
Matilda: il a dit (. ) difficile
Kenji: pourquoi tu lire↑
Matilda: c’est (. ) difficile!
Maia: avec s- (. ) comme espagnol
Talia: n’existe pas (. ) en [(. ) japonais
Kenji: [non (. ) avec c-
Maia: avec s- comme (. ) espagnoles::
( . )
Kenji: ça c’est (. ) d- i- f- f- u- ci (. ) tu dis
s- (. ) c-!
( . )
Talia: esse (. ) non esse (. ) non s-
Kenji: non s-
( . )
Maia: no s-
Kenji: no s-
Maia: no s-
( . 2 )
Kenji: mouchoir! (. ) mouchoir
Matilda: tu veux un mouchoir (. ) je vais te donner
un mouchoir
Kenji: je veux un moustache! (.) un mouchoir!
Maia: c’est quoi le mouchoir?
Kenji: moustache!
(.
Talia: j’aime moustache
Kenji: moustache!
Matilda: mouchoir!
Kenji: moustache!
Matilda: mouchoir! (.) mouchoir
Kenji: euh:. (.) français (.) beaucoup de
moustaches!
(.
Talia: I have got
Maia: I rave got (mocking Kenji’s accent)
Matilda: mouchoir!
Kenji: moustache!
Matilda: mouchoir! (.) mouchoir
Kenji: I have got!
Maia: I have got!
(.
Kenji: I have got!
Matilda: I have got!
Talia: con café
Maia: con el café
Matilda: con café
(.
Kenji: c’est quoi con el café!
Talia: avec le café
Matilda: chocolat!
Kenji: café!
Talia: café!
Kenji: café (.) café (.) café leche!
(.
Matilda: con leche!
Maia: tu sais (.) tu parles espagnol
Kenji: café (.) café (.) café leche!
Matilda: con leche!
Maia: con (.) con! (.) con leche café (.)
Matilda: me gusta usted
Maia: chocolate con media luna me gusta usted
Matilda: chocolate con media luna me gusta usted
(.
Maia: tu sais (.) tu parles espagnol
Kenji: café (.) café (.) café leche!
Matilda: con leche!
(.
Matilda: me gusta usted
Talia: [chocolate con media luna me gusta usted
Matilda: [chocolate con media luna me gusta usted
Maia: [chocolate con leche!
Maia: [chocolate con leche!
287. Kenji: café
288. Maia: chocola::
289. Matilda: te! (.) el café
290. Maia: [chocola:: (.) te! (.) el café
291. Matilda: chocola::-
292. Kenji: [chocola:: (.) te! (.) el marron!
293. Matilda: chocola::-
294. Talia: ahora que estamos solos
295. Matilda: el café!
296. Talia: ahora que nadie nos ve
297. Kenji: [el café!
298. Matilda: [el café!
299. Talia: arriba (. ) la cafetera la cafetera con el café
300. Matilda: [el café!
301. Maia: [el café!
302. (. )
303. (. )
304. Maia: Talia me prestas un momento tu lápiz!
305. (20:12) <Talia can you lend me your pencil for a moment? >
306. (. )
307. Talia: ahora que estamos solos
308. Matilda: el café!
309. Talia: ahora que nadie nos ve
310. Matilda: el café!
311. Talia: arriba la cafetera la cafetera con el café
312. (. ) [el café!
313. Matilda: el café!
314. (. )
315. (. )
316. Maia: voy a- (.) berrar esto y lo voy a volver a hacer porque no me salió un bonito (20:24)
317. (. )
318. (. )
319. Matilda: ahora que estamos solos (. ) ahora que nadie nos ve (. ) arriba la cafetera la cafetera con el café ((singing with a high pitched voice))
320. Talia: attends! (.) comment on dit euh:: (.) ana (.2) atanashi (.) comment- comment on dit (. ) bonjour en japonais Kenji!
321. Kenji: ko[ni- chi:
322. Talia: konichiwa (. )konichiwa (. )konichiwa (. )konichiwa (. )
323. (.2)
324. (.1)
325. (.1)
326. Matilda: fini!
327. (. )
328. (.2)
329. (.1)
330. Kenji: c'est fini!
331. (. )
332. Matilda: moi j'ai fini
333. Talia: [finish]
334. Matilda: finish ((laughing))
335. Talia: il a dit finish ((laughing))
336. Maia: donde esta el lápiz! (21:02)
337. Kenji: I finish!
338. (. )
339. (. )
340. Talia: [ah! (. ) i finish
341. Maia: [i finish
342. (. )
343. (. )
344. (. )
345. (. )
346. Matilda: [regarde
347. Kenji: [Finish Andrea:: ( ) ( ) me
348. Maia: he:: ( ) Kenji! (. ) Kenji yo traia el lápiz ( ) yo voy a buscarlo
349. (21:19)
350. Talia: Kenji! ((laughing))
351. Kenji: regarde!
352. (. )
353. (. )
354. (. )
355. (. )
356. (. )
357. (.3)
Matilda: elle a méchant
Maia: quoi
Kenji: quoi
Kenji: (.) pourquoi a la
Matilda: elle a
Kenji: pourquoi elle a méchant (.) elle a
méchante!
(.2)
Talia: méchant=
Kenji: =te! (.) parce que (.) elle!
(.6)
Kenji: a la
café ((singing))
Matilda: je peux pas (.) a marche pas!
(.)
Talia: you gotta push (.) look (.) what do you
wanna do↑
Matilda: [hi!
Kenji: [café ((singing))
Matilda: oh
Talia: haha ((laughing))
Matilda: push (.) push push push push
Talia: non Kenji!
Kenji: quoi↑
Talia: noir!
Kenji: après:: [( me )
Talia: [après::
Matilda: apr(és::
Talia: [après me↑ (. ) after me!
Kenji: demain
Talia: non! (. ) [haha ((laughing))
Matilda: [haha ((laughing))
Talia: non
Matilda: ah bon (. ) demain↑
Kenji: après Andrea::
Talia: after me
Kenji: (please) me
Talia: quoi↑
(.)
Maia: kiss me
Matilda: kiss me↑
Talia: quoi!
Maia: please Andrea::
Kenji: c’est quoi kiss me↑
Talia: embrasse moi
Matilda: mous
Kenji: embrasser! ( . ) embrasse Andrea:
(.2)
Talia: kiss Andrea::
(.)
Kenji: prise Andrea::
(.)
Talia: [kiss me
Matilda: [pr-
(.)
Talia: et non je veux pas t’embrasser ( . ) haha
((laughing))
(.3)
Kenji: elle aime euh:: ( . ) ma
Matilda: ma↑ (. ) c’est quoi ma↑ (. ) maxime↑
((children laughing))
Miss Lo: c’est très joli ça c’est quoi Talia↑
Talia: c’est un:: ( . ) palais
Miss Lo: guyanne
(.2)
Miss Lo: c’est super hein
Matilda: haha ((laughing))
Kenji: c’est quoi ça!
Miss Lo: ça rend bien hein ( . ) c’est très beau (. )
ça fait vraiment euh:: ( . ) ah oui c’était
ça (. ) donc euh ça
Researcher: donc ça je vais le garder ( )
{(Rs and T move away from the recorder)}

Matilda: mouchoir ((laughing))

Talia: moustache!

Kenji: non mouchoir!

Talia: non c'est moustache!

Kenji: moustache est (. ) noir

(. )

Talia: ha ha ha ha (. ) moustache c'est ça (. )

Kenji: c'est ça

Kenji: [non ( . ) non!]

Talia: ça c'est moustache

Kenji: non ça c'est mouchoir!

Talia: non ça c'est moustache! ((laughing))

Kenji: mouch- (. ) moustache est (. ) ça!

Talia: non (. ) moustache c'est (. ) ta face (. )

Oh! oh!

Kenji: quoi↑

Miss Lo: chut! (. ) qu'est-ce qui se passe↑

Kenji: euh:: (. ) euh:: (. ) ça c'est mouchoir

Miss Lo: mouchoir oui

Talia: c'est moustache ((laughing))

Kenji: hhh (. ) moustache est noir

Miss Lo: oui ( . ) euh Kenji de quoi tu parles (. )

Montre (. ) explique moi

Matilda: maîtresse! (. ) tu sais quoi (. ) j'ai oublié parce que y en a un ici (. ) un ici

(. ) j'ai colorié encore

Miss Lo: et est-ce qu'on pourrait pas recopier celui-la

Matilda: oui je peux (. ) ben c'est pas difficile

Miss Lo: voilà (. ) ben tu peux

Kenji: c'est pas bouchou!

{(Miss Lo walks away from the recorder)}

Matilda: ici (. ) ici (. ) ici (. )

Talia: no! (. ) you're not! (. ) because you have other↑ (. ) no you don't have other

{(Matilda and Talia laughing)}

Talia: what↑

(. )

Matilda: ah! crayon papier
8. Matilda: c’est les couleurs
9. (.)
10. Kenji: tu écris anglais
11. (.8)
12. {children make noises with their throats}
13. Matilda: crayon:: papier {Ma gets up from her chair and wonders around the classroom to find a pencil}
14. (.5)
15. Matilda: Talia (.). je peux ton crayon papier
16. Talia: il est ici crayon à papier
17. Matilda: il est ici crayon à papier
18. Maia: il est ici crayon à papier
19. Talia: it’s here
20. ?: haha! {laughing}
21. Talia: haha {laughing}
22. (.)
23. Kenji: (            )
24. Matilda: il est ici crayon à papier
25. Kenji: (il a beaucoup)
26. Talia: i love beaucoup!
27. Kenji: i love you
28. {girls screaming}
29. Talia: non!
30. (.)
31. Kenji: c’est pas bien
32. Maia: pas bien
33. Talia: c’est pas bien
34. Kenji: j’aime:
35. Talia: Matilda
36. Matilda: non!
37. Kenji: j’aime même
38. Matilda: i love you
39. {children laughing}
40. Talia: non:
41. Kenji: oui::
42. Matilda: il aime le vieille!
43. Maia: ooh! {laughing}
44. Talia: ah:: tu aimes les vieilles (.). pourquoi tu me dis {} i love you
45. {children laughing}
46. Kenji: i love you
47. {children laughing}
48. Talia: maît-
49. Kenji: maît-! (.). pourquoi tu dis maît-!
50. Talia: i love you (.). haaa {screaming}
51. (.2)
52. Talia: pourquoi tu dis i love you
53. Kenji: i love euh::
54. Talia: pourquoi tu dis i love you
55. Kenji: parce que:: (.). parce {que:: (.). parce
56. que::
57. Matilda: [il a amoureux de
58. (.]
59. Kenji: je sais i love you:
60. Talia: et pourquoi tu dis i love you
61. Kenji: sais pas::
62. Talia: tu t’es amoureuse de Matilda
63. Matilda: non {.} [il est amoureuse d’une vieille!
64. Kenji: [non non non
65. (.]
66. Kenji: non {.}. Piotr (.). et Matilda
67. Talia: oh Piotr loves you!
68. Kenji: non! {.}. Piotr et Matilda
69. (.)
70. Matilda: non::!
71. Maia: ooh!
72. Matilda: non Kenji et Piotr
73. (.)
74. Kenji: non ça c’est::=
Talia: garçon et garçon
Kenji: oui fille et garçon . homme et femme

Matilda: d'accord . Kenji (.) avec euh::

Maia: arrête (.) pas moi hein!
Matilda: avec euh:: ((laughing))
Maia: arrête
Matilda: avec euh:: (.) avec euh::

Maia: oh! je sais! (.) avec catherine rose [parce que catherine les yeux (.) les yeux comme ça aussi
Talia: [catherine!
Kenji: non:: (.) catherine est:: (.) catherine est toujours en cm- (.) ce2!
Talia: c'est pas grave
Kenji: c'est (.) c'est grave!
Matilda: c'est pas grave
Maia: non parce que (.) elle est un chinois et elle c'est pas un chinois ((pointing to al))

Kenji: non c'est- (.) elle est philippines
Maia: oui mais (.) elle a les yeux comme ça (.)

Maia: arrête
Matilda: avec euh:: (.1) avec euh::

Maia: oh! je sais! (.) avec catherine rose's eye shape)

Matilda: tu dis quoi he!

((children shouting))
Matilda: aila hi! aila ho! ((singing))
Kenji: c'est pas normal toi

((children laughing))

Kenji: c'est pas normal (.) c'est bizarre toi

((children laughing))

Talia: Maia↑
Kenji: oui (.) très bizarre (.) parce que toujours hui:: ho::!

Talia: quién es rara? (28:00)
Maia: ( )

Miss Lo: voilà (.) hein (.) bien fini

Matilda: moi j'ai fini (.2) maîtresse! moi j'ai fini!

Kenji: hein hein hein (.) si c'est pas bien

((children singing))

Miss Lo: he euh:: (.) tout ça là (.) et le bord là (.) ce serait joli que le bord il soit::

( )

Kenji: [negro (.) negro
Talia: comme ça↑

Miss Lo: voilà (.) hein (.) bien fini

Matilda: maîtresse moi j'ai fini!

Miss Lo: ouais comment ça s'appelle ça Matilda? (.)

Tu as marqué le nom là! (.) notre quoi↑

Kenji: ça c'est il y a un cha (.) chang (.) tu sais chang↑ ((speaking to So whil T is still talking to Ma)}

Maia: c'est quoi chang↑
Kenji: euh:: (l' )
Maia: non je connais pas
Kenji: Talia (.) comment on dit chang

espagnol↑
Talia: cha!
Kenji: chang!
Talia: c'est quoi chang?
Kenji: chang!
Talia: c'est quoi chang?
Kenji: faire euh:: (.) riz!
(Miss Lo and Ma are still talking in the background)
Kenji: faire les légumes! (.) faire les légumes
(.2) chang! (.) faire les légumes (.2) un
Kenji: faire les légumes!
(.3)
Kenji: légumes verts!
(.2)
Kenji: maîtresse!
Miss Lo: oui::
Kenji: ça c'est il y a un chang
Miss Lo: il y a un ::
Kenji: chan! (.2) chan! (.) et (.) euh::
(.)
oiseau (.2) mm (.) ça c'est:: (.) euh::
(.2)
Miss Lo: ah oui dans les champs! (.) c'est un
épouvantail oui (.2) c'est dans les champs
(.2) c'est pour faire peur aux oiseaux
Kenji: [oui
Miss Lo: [c'est ça Kenji
(.)
Miss Lo: c'est ça que tu expliques!
(.2)
Kenji: parce que vient le oiseau (.) euh::
(.)
il mange légume (.2) ça c'est:: personne
pareille
(.2)
Miss Lo: oui il mange les d'accord ((laughing)) (.)
il mange les semences (.) c'est ça (.)
hein! (.) il mange les semences et quand
les oiseaux viennent manger les semences
(.3) on met des épouvantails pour leur
faire peur (.) c'est ça
Kenji: oui

--30:25--
Miss Lo is showing two books about different cultures around the world. See photo 1 above.

---14:00---
1. Miss Lo: donc c’est un petit livre (.) tout petit
2. (.) et pourtant dans ce tout petit livre
3. (.) il y a plein de choses
4. Talia: il est au Mexique
5. Miss Lo: sur les gens dans le monde (.) regardez là
6. (children talking at the same time)
7. Miss Lo: là il y a toutes les façons de dire
8. bonjour
9. Talia: [c’est japonais]
10. (.)
11. Matilda: ah bon?
12. Cristina: buenos dias
13. Miss Lo: [chut! (.) attendez restez- (.) Karen
14. reste à ta place
15. Kenji: [ah oui! en japonais!
16. Talia: ça c’est japonais?
17. Cristina: oui il y a japonais
18. Kenji: ça c’est- c’est pas bonjour
19. Miss Lo: en russe (.) good morning
20. Talia: [c’est quoi]
Miss Lo: il y a du chinois et il y a du japonais là je crois regarde.
Kenji: ça c'est le matin.
Miss Lo: ouais.
Talia: konichua!
Kenji: ça c'est ( ).
Talia: ça c'est quelle langue?
Miss Lo: ça c'est matin d'accord.
Matilda: il y a pas lituanie.
Miss Lo: chut! ( ) Karen.
Miss Lo: matin aussi.
Miss Lo: bonjour c'est le matin en France.
Miss Lo: matin aussi.
Miss Lo: ben matin oui c'est le matin et l'après-midi.
Talia: buenos dias [c'est matin.
Kenji: [ça ça ( ) c'est matin.
Miss Lo: matin ( ) que le matin ( ) pas l'après-midi.
Kenji: [konichiwa est toujours ( ).
Talia: [c'est qui mexicain ( ) ah ça c'est mexicain.
Miss Lo: ah d'accord::
Talia: ça c'est mexicain maîtresse.
Miss Lo: konichua c'est tout le jour ( ) toute la journée ( ) d'accord ( ) c'est comme je vous salue ( ) et puis ça ( ) c'est que le matin ( ) d'accord ( ) c'est très intéressant ce livre.
Kenji: il y a un chinois là.
Miss Lo: tenez ( ) regardez ( ) je vais l'acheter.
Miss Lo: tenez ( ) je vais l’acheter pour la classe.

---15:26---
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See photo 2 above.

---15:38---

1. Miss Lo: je vous ai apporté un autre livre qui s'appelle ( ) nos fêtes préférées dans le monde entier.
2. Kenji: en japonais!
3. Miss Lo: ouais il y a les fêtes du Japon.
4. {(children laughing)}
5. Miss Lo: et on va voir que [euh:: par exemple.
7. Miss Lo: [Mexique.
8. Talia: rejes.
9. Miss Lo: quand Leila nous avait parlé de la:
10. Talia: rejes.
11. Miss Lo: rejes.
12. Talia: rejes.
13. Miss Lo: ah les rejes.
15. Miss Lo: majos.
17. Miss Lo: majos.
19. Miss Lo: majos.
20. Miss Lo: majos. les rejes ( ) ben on les a
ici (.) les rois mages

Kenji: che

Talia: che boluda (16:32) <cool (mexican idiom)>

((laughing))

(.2)

Miss Lo: regardez (.2) là dans ce livre on voit

plein de fêtes dans le monde (..) halloween

(..) tiens regarde (..) halloween c'était

quand (..) chut!

Karen: c'est (.)

Kenji: /pækæ/

Leila: esta apprendido el [singular (16:52)]

Miss Lo: [voilà chut! (..) était

en automne (..) était une fête-

Talia: moi aussi le troisi [octobre

Miss Lo: [chut! (..) une fête de

l'automne (..) et là (.1) ça c'est des

fêtes indiennes (..) ça nicholas on avait

vu ça avec euh:: (..) [Piotr hein]

Talia: [ça c'est polonaise]

Miss Lo: sainte lucie (..) ah oui parait-il que

sainte lucie on en avait pas parlé de

sainte lucie (..) en suède

((children talking in the background))

Miss Lo: chut! (..) je vais vous le donner après le

livre (..) ça c'est sainte lucie en suède

(..) on en avait pas parlé (..) noël on

avait parlé de noël bien sur

(.2)

Talia: oui

Miss Lo: euh:: (.2) et là voilà (..) les rejes (.)

Talia: [magos]

Miss Lo: [magos!]

(.)

Kenji: [c'est quoi rejes magos]

Miss Lo: [alors]

Talia: les rois (..) magiques

(.3)

Kenji: ça c'est (.)

Miss Lo: la galette (..) [ça c'est la galette

Leila: [espagnol! ça écrit!]

Miss Lo: oui c'est écrit en espagnol

Talia: fiesta de los rejes magos

Miss Lo: et il y a une petite fille qui s'appelle

(..) alors attendez je vais vous dire

Kenji: ça c'est comme espagnol

Leila: ça on donne les [cadeaux

Talia: espagnol! (..) c'est écrit en espagnol (.)

la fiesta de los rejes magos!

((children chatting))

Miss Lo: chut!

Kenji: hola!

Talia: tout ça c'est écrit en espagnol maîtresse!

(.2)

Miss Lo: ah ben elle s'appelle Talia en plus

(..) ça tombe bien

((children laughing))

Miss Lo: mais elle est pas mexicaine hein (..) elle

est espagnol

(.3)

--18:18--
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See photo 3.
Miss Lo: et puis il y a une fête dont on va parler à la rentrée après les vacances (. ) qui s'appelle (. ) alors je sais pas si tu l'as euh (. ) je vais juste voir (. ) la fête (. ) la fête des poupées?

Leila: qu'on mange des œufs (. ) des œufs-

Piotr: crevettes!

( . )

Leila: (des poupées)

Talia: ah (. ) je connais pas

Miss Lo: est-ce que euh (. ) Kenji tu connais la fête des poupées?

Talia: j'ai beaucoup de [poupées dans la maison

Miss Lo: [chut chut chut! (. )

taisez-vous

Kenji: euh:: gâteau†

Miss Lo: le trois mars

( .2)

Kenji: non!

Miss Lo: le trois mars il y a une fête au japon non (. ) qui s'appelle la fête des poupées

Kenji: non:

Miss Lo: ah bon (. ) je vais te montrer et tu vas me dire si c'est-

Leila: il y a aussi une fête où on mange des œufs et des chocolats maîtresse!

( . )

Talia: mm†

Leila: comment s'appelle cette fête† (. ) pasqua†

( . )

Talia: ah la pasqua

Miss Lo: ah paques (. ) euh paques c'est oui (. )

[euh:: hina matsuri <girl’s day>! non†

Talia: [c'est avec les (. ) œufs

Miss Lo: ah oui!!

Kenji: ah:: bon oui (. ) alors hina matsuri

Talia: <girl’s day> tu connais hina matsuri oui†

Kenji: hi!na (. ) matsuri

Miss Lo: comment c'est†

Kenji: hi!na matsuri

Miss Lo: hi!na matsuri (. ) et euh parce que ce sera

pendant les vacances alors si c'est le trois mars

Kenji: non japonais il n'y pas de vacances

Miss Lo: s d'accord (. ) mais pour nous (. ) la on va être en vacances (. ) c'est quand (. ) c'est quand le (. ) hi!na matsuri† (. ) c'est quand cette fête†

( .2)

Kenji: oui fête

Miss Lo: quel jour†

Kenji: sais pas

( {children laughing})

Miss Lo: là ils ont dit que était le trois mars

Kenji: ah oui trois:: mars peut-être premier

Miss Lo: ah premier mars ou trois mars donc nous on sera pas là (. ) on sera en vacances (. ) tout le monde sera en vacances (. ) vous serez pas à l'école (. ) et on en parlera

( . ) Kenji va nous en parler quand on va rentrer de vacances (. ) est-ce que vous allez faire cette fête avec ton papa ta maman tes sœurs†

( . )

Kenji: euh oui

Miss Lo: oui†

Talia: qu'est-ce [qu'il se fait dans cette fête†

Miss Lo: [qu'est-ce que vous allez faire-
ben je sais pas (.) ben vous allez lui poser des questions alors (.) vas-y Talia

Talia: qu’est-ce que tu fais dans cette fête?

Kenji: euh:: (.) je fais pas moi

Miss Lo: au japon qu’est-ce qu’on fait le jour de cette fête?

Kenji: euh:: (.) faire euh::

Leila: dragon↑

Kenji: non::

Miss Lo: laisse-le parle parce que là sinon on va pas y arriver

Kenji: çà::

Miss Lo: un drapeau↑ (.) un cerf-volant↑

Kenji: oui (.) ça sur (.) les poupées

Miss Lo: d’accord

Kenji: et après:: (.) après::

Miss Lo: ah:: on met les poupées sur un bateau↑

Miss Lo: bateau↑

Miss Lo: comme ça

Miss Lo: çà la ((pointing to the book))

Kenji: non:: (.) çà!

Miss Lo: ah d’accord (.) çà

Talia: je peux voir

Kenji: je mange çà

Miss Lo: oui

Kenji: çà non (.) euh çà et (.) çà

Miss Lo: d’accord (.) et qu’est-ce que vous faites avec les poupées qui sont alors↑

Kenji: c’est pas comme çà c’est comme çà

Miss Lo: d’accord

Leila: comme çà↑

Miss Lo: d’accord

Talia: comme çà çà est les poupées↑

Karen: et les filles habillent comme çà↑

Miss Lo: et c’est pour les filles et pour les garçons cette fête↑

Kenji: çà çà est pour fille

Miss Lo: [ouais

Leila: [Kenji!

Miss Lo: chut!

Kenji: çà çà est pour garçon

Miss Lo: d’accord

Leila: Kenjii!

Miss Lo: alors attendez je vais regarder parce que

Leila: les filles s’habillent comme la petite fille là bas (.) le livre (.) t’as vu la fille↑

Leila: non

Miss Lo: [en fait regardez ce qui se passe

Kenji: [non euh::-

Miss Lo: dans la maison (.) chut! (.) dans la maison on met (.) des (.) une estrade (.) c’est comme des petits escaliers (.) et sur cette estrade (.) on met plusieurs poupées (.) voilà (.) euh (.) çà est de poupées de l’empereur et de l’impératrice

Leila: comment s’habillent les filles au japon↑ (.) comme Talia! (.) normalement↑ ou avec tout çà↑ ((pointing at the book))

Talia: nanana

Miss Lo: d’accord alors [en fait regardez ce qui se passe

Kenji: [non euh::-

Miss Lo: dans la maison (.) chut! (.) dans la maison on met (.) des (.) une estrade (.) c’est comme des petits escaliers (.) et sur cette estrade (.) on met plusieurs poupées (.) voilà (.) euh (.) çà est de poupées de l’empereur et de l’impératrice
Talia: c'est les vraies poupées du japon
Talia: les vraies poupées
Miss Lo: oui c'est des vraies poupées
de imparatrice et de l'imperateur
Miss Lo: voilà et on doit donc manger euh:: (.) un
plat qui s'appelle mochi! (. ) c'est ça!
Kenji: moshi!
Miss Lo: ina euh:: (. ) le gâteau la c'est moshi!
(. ) comment ça s'appelle
Kenji: manger
Miss Lo: bon okay (. ) et sakura mochi non on dit
pas ça!
Kenji: ah oui sakura mochi
Miss Lo: ah d'accord (. ) heureusement que je parle
japonais hein Kenji parce que
sinon!(laughing))
Kenji: ça c'est- ça c'est mochi
Miss Lo: d'accord (. ) d'accord (.2) et donc euh::
( . ) on nettoie la plus belle de la maison
et on met cette estrade avec ces poupées
( . ) pour rendre hommage (. ) pour dire que
ce qui est bien au japon c'est être
calme (. ) c'est être sage (. ) voilà
( . ) c'est pour montrer ça (. ) les poupées en
fait elles montrent qu'il faut être
respectueux (. ) faut être clame (. ) digne
( . ) voilà (. ) et là ils disent aussi (. )
je sais pas si Kenji ça se fait dans sa
ville (. ) euh:: (. ) ils disent aussi (. )
que (. ) pour les gens qui ont des enfants
qui sont malades (. ) ou des enfants qui
ont des problèmes (. ) ou des enfants qui
ont quelque chose qui ne va pas-
Kenji: ah oui (. ) il n'y a pas de problème et::
Miss Lo: (. .2) comment on dit (. .) ça
((putting his hands together))
( .3)
Kenji: euh:: (.4) souhaiter!
Miss Lo: mm!
Kenji: euh:: (. .) ça ((putting his hands
together))
( .)
Miss Lo: on prie! (. .) ils vont au temple!
Talia: ah ça de (. ) brbrbr ((putting her hands
together))
Miss Lo: prier! (. .) c'est ça!
Talia: à dieu
( .2)
Kenji: non:: (. ) c'est pas ça (. ) euh::
Talia: Kenji (. ) à dieu
Miss Lo: chut attend Talia
((Kenji looks in his digital dictionary))
Miss Lo: ça!
Miss Lo: ah! On va chercher notre amie euh::
( .2)
Miss Lo: on va l'appeler- (. ) on va lui donner [un
nom parce qu'il fait partie de la classe
Talia: [computer
Miss Lo: comment il s'appelle- comment on dit
dictionnaire en:: (. ) comment on appelle
c ça en japonais! (. ) ça la!
Kenji: ça!
Miss Lo: ouais
Talia: /disk'sonade/
{(imitating japanese accent)
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412. Talia: /disk\'onade/
413. Kenji: non
414. Miss Lo: comment on dit ça en japonais (.) c'est quoi ça ?
415. (.4)
416. Kenji: euh:: ((laughing))
417. Leila: vas-y Kenji!
418. Talia: /iksu/ /teni/ /\slant\slant/ (24:29)
419. Miss Lo: ordinateur en japonais c'est comment ?
420. Kenji: ordinateur (.) est (.) konpyuta
421. Miss Lo: computer (.) bon ben voilà (.) hein
422. Talia: konpyuta
423. Miss Lo: computer (.) comme ça ça nous arrange
424. Kenji: souhaiter !
425. Miss Lo: hein?
426. Kenji: souhaiter !
427. Miss Lo: souhaiter ?
428. Leila: [souhaiter
429. Miss Lo: [souhaiter! ah oui (.) pour souhaiter !
430. (.) trois bien
431. Kenji: oui
432. Miss Lo: il a pas regardé dans son ordinateur
433. alors ? (.2) donc c'est pour souhaiter
434. quoi ? (.) pour souhaiter quoi ?
435. Kenji: euh:: (.) euh:: (.) il n'y a pas de problème
436. Miss Lo: voilà pour souhaiter (.) qu'il n'y a pas de problème ça veut dire que -
437. Talia: ça veut dire quoi souhaiter ?
438. Miss Lo: attendez ( .) j'essaie de vous expliquer là
439. (.2) alors il faut écouter un peu (.2) c'est pour des gens qui ont peur qu'il y ait des problèmes pour leurs enfants ( .) ou bien des enfants qui sont - des parents qui sont inquiets pour la santé de leurs enfants
440. (.2) ils mettent des poupées au temple pour que ça porte de la chance à leurs enfants
441. ( .) voyez ?
442. Kenji: oui
443. Miss Lo: si on voulait par exemple que euh:: ( .)
444. si pour Anika on était on japon ( .) on mettrait une petite poupée pour Anika
445. pour qu'elle voyage bien ( .) pour que son voyage se passe bien ( .) pour que tout soit bien
446. Leila: ah oui ::
447. Talia: [pour qu'elle revient ici
448. Miss Lo: [c'est comme une euh:: ( .) comment on va dire ?
449. Talia: una ofranda
450. Miss Lo: un tradition ( .) c'est une tradition ( .)
451. ça existe ça en Espagne ? ( .) ah oh pardon
452. [au mexique ?
453. Talia: [au mexique ?
454. (.2)
455. Miss Lo: des choses comme ça ? avec des poupées pour souhaiter bonne chance à quelqu'un
456. Talia: je crois que oui (.2) il y a ( .) il y a dans la télè que ( .) euh:: ( .) c'est::
457. (.2) como se dice maria ?
458. Kenji: maria
459. Talia: Matilda ::
460. (.2)
461. Leila: marie ?
462. Kenji: marie ?
463. Talia: c'est le ( .) la mère de dieu ?
464. Miss Lo: oui c'est ça ( .) marie ( .) la mère de de jésus
465. Talia: c'est une personne qui va donner je sais
Miss Lo: ah oui voilà c’est à peu près pareil oui
Talia: il pen\textregistered{}tro:: (.) \textit{como se dice sacrificio}\textsuperscript{†}

Leila: \textit{sacrificio}
Miss Lo: oui (.\textsuperscript{.)} pas un sacrifice (.\textsuperscript{.)} une offrande
Talia: tu vas comme ça (.\textsuperscript{.)} tu marches comme ça
((kneeling on the floor and walking that way))

Miss Lo: ah oui
Talia: si tu veux

Talia: il pén\textregistered{}tro:: (.)
como se dice sacrificio
Leila: \textit{sacrificio}
Miss Lo: oui (.) pas un sacrifice (.) une offrande

Kenji: ça c’est mal
Miss Lo: oui (.\textsuperscript{.)} une euh:: comment on appelle ça?
Kenji: japonais comme ça ((showing the prayer
position in japan))
Talia: j’ai vu dans la télé
Miss Lo: oui oui comme les processions en fait un
peu (.\textsuperscript{.)} mais sacrifice c’est pas tout à
fait ça le terme (.\textsuperscript{.)} euh oui

Kenji: maîtresse!
Miss Lo: euh::
Talia: je sais pas comment on dit
Miss Lo: je sais plus je vais retrouver ça oui
Kenji: au japon comme ça ((shows the prayer
position in japan))
Miss Lo: au japon c’est comment\textsuperscript{†} (.\textsuperscript{.)} comme ça
Kenji: comme ça
Miss Lo: ou ça\textsuperscript{†} (.\textsuperscript{.)} au temple
Kenji: euh:: il y pas de problème et comme ça
Miss Lo: ah oui ((laughing)) pour pas qu’il y ait
de problèmes on fait ça d’accord (.\textsuperscript{.)} au

Talia: j’ai vu dans la télé
Miss Lo: en france aussi vous faites ça\textsuperscript{†}

Kenji: non
Miss Lo: non!
Talia: pourquoi?
Kenji: parce que:: (.3) je achète pas (.\textsuperscript{.)} ça
Miss Lo: ah tu achètes pas les poupées comme ça
Kenji: pour aller au temple d’accord (.\textsuperscript{.)} ça
dépend des familles
Miss Lo: ou ça\textsuperscript{†} (.\textsuperscript{.)} au temple
Kenji: euh:: il y pas de problème et comme ça
Miss Lo: deux poupées ou
Kenji: il y a deux poupées
Talia: chez toi\textsuperscript{†}
Kenji: oui
Miss Lo: ah d’accord (.\textsuperscript{.)} vous faites pas tout ça
Kenji: oui mais deux
Miss Lo: avec deux poupées seulement (.\textsuperscript{.)} pas avec
plein de poupées
Talia: au japon\textsuperscript{†}
Miss Lo: en france aussi vous faites ça\textsuperscript{†}

Kenji: non!
Miss Lo: vous faites pas ça en france\textsuperscript{†}
Kenji: parce qu’il n’y a pas ça (.\textsuperscript{.)} dans la
maison
Talia: et pourquoi tu as pas achète en japon et

Talia: tu l’apportes ici\textsuperscript{†}

((children laughing))
Kenji: moi peut-être dans la poubelle
Talia: hein\textsuperscript{†}
Leila: dans la poubelle\textsuperscript{†}
Kenji: oui
((children laughing))
Talia: pourquoi\textsuperscript{†}
Kenji: parce que:: (.) je vais- je- je vais::
Talia: (.3) france
Miss Lo: mais t’as pas dit l’autre jour que ta
grand-mère elle avait envoyé des choses
par bateau!
Kenji: non
Miss Lo: ta grand-mère l’autre jour (.3) t’as bien
dit que ta grand-mère elle avait envoyé
des choses du japon!
Kenji: non
Talia: son computer
Leila: Kenji!
Miss Lo: ah bon il a pas dit ça l’autre jour!
Leila: oui:: (.) un matin il mange je sais pas
quoi parce que la grand-mère a envoyé par
bateau
Miss Lo: l’autre jour Kenji tu as dis que tu
mangeais des choses du japon parce que ta
grand-mère elle avait envoyé par bateau
Kenji: oui
(.2)
Kenji: parce que ça c’est- (.) ma mère peut-être
a oublié
Miss Lo: ah voilà (.3) parce que sa mère elle a
oublié de demander les poupées c’est ça!
Kenji: oui
Miss Lo: mais à paris je pense qu’on peut acheter
ça
(.2)
Ah: non
Karen: parce que il y a beaucoup de monde de
tokyo
Kenji: c’est très cher
Miss Lo: très cher
Kenji: japonais c’est pas très cher
Miss Lo: ah oui (.3) ici c’est très cher et au japon
(c’est pas trop cher
Talia: il y a beaucoup de choses japonais ou
chinois ici
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Miss Lo: Leila! (.) euh (.) depuis toute a
l’heure (.) est-ce que tu as regarde le
document que j’ai distribue la (.) est-ce
que tu sais de quoi ça parle?
Cristina: c’est anglais?
Leila: oui
((children chatting in the background))
Talia: pourquoi c’est-
Miss Lo: chut!
(.3)
Talia: pourquoi c’est en anglais?
Miss Lo: ah ben je sais pas moi (.) regardez ce qui
est marqué
Kenji: hamburger
(.3)
Talia: living room (.) hamburger with ( )
18. (. clown (. show
19. Karen: manager
20. Talia: manager (. [speaker
21. Kenji: [ça c’est manger!
22. (.]
23. Kenji: ( )
24. Karen: c’est en- (. en anglais (. c’est::
25. Kenji: ça c’est anglais!
26. (.]
27. Leila: c’est quoi ’parlez-vous franglais’?
28. ((laughing))
29. Miss Lo: alors la (. posez-vous la question (.)
30. alors c’est quoi↓
31. Kenji: ’parlez-vous (. fran[g]lais’
32. Talia: ([’parlez-vous fran:
33. (.) glais’ (. ah!
34. Kenji: c’est quoi franglais!
35. Karen: ils demandent si tu parles en anglais
36. Talia: je sais (. franglais c’est (. je parle
37. Kenji: français ( (. anglais
38. Karen: [français et anglais
39. Talia: fran: espa ((laughing)) (. espafrançais
40. Kenji: espagnol et français et-
41. Talia: je suis franc:emexicaine (. franmexicaine!
42. Cristina: franmexicaine
43. Kenji: je suis fran:. (. frannais (. [japouis
44. Talia: c’est
45. trop facile! (. living room (. hamburger
46. (.) poster (.) goal
47. Kenji: ( )
48. (.]
49. Miss Lo: alors (. parlez-vous langue (.)
50. Leila: c’est en anglais maitresse (. je parle
51. pas!
52. Karen: en anglais!
53. Miss Lo: mais alors (. c’est en anglais
54. Talia: [en anglais
55. Miss Lo: mais alors pourquoi moi je vous donne (.)
56. c’est bizarre que je vous donne des mots
57. en anglais alors que je dois vous
58. apprendre le français
59. Kenji: pour travailler: en anglais
60. Talia: pour apprendre anglais
61. Miss Lo: aussi↓
62. Andrea: ( )
63. Miss Lo: [ah Andrea (. alors qu’est-ce que tu
64. pense↓
65. Kenji: [euh (. a cote écrire en français↓
66. Miss Lo: pardon↓
67. (.]
68. Leila: ( )
69. Miss Lo: ah ben oui c’est une bonne idée (. alors
70. comment on va- (. hamburger on va écrire
71. ça comment en français↓
72. (.]
73. Talia: [hamburger
74. Leila: [hamburger
75. (.]
76. Kenji: hamburger (. )
77. (.]
78. Leila: la même chose maitresse!
79. (.]
80. Miss Lo: western (. on va écrire ça comment en
81. français↓
82. (.]
83. Talia: cow girl
84. (.]
85. Kenji: non
Miss Lo: non (.) western
Kenji: ça c'est (.) fille
Miss Lo: goal (.) pour le foot (.) goal (.) commen t
on va écrire ça en français
Cristina: goal!
Leila: goal
C?: goal!
Kenji: euh (.) shooter!
Leila: shooter ((laughing))
Miss Lo: non (.) le goal
Kenji: goal est goal
Leila: g (.) I (.) o (.) l
Talia: poster
Miss Lo: non (.) alors justement (.) pourquoi je vous pose ces questions (.) un clown (.) un clown alors
Kenji: c'est quoi clown
Talia: clown
Miss Lo: donc c'est quoi la question (.) parlez-vous françois ça veut dire quoi a votre avis
Talia: parce que c'est la meme-
Cristina: ça veut dire
Miss Lo: chut! (.) Karen
Karen: ça veut dire français (.) et (.) anglaise
?.
Miss Lo: oui mais alors c'est quoi le français anglais alors 'c'est quoi le français anglais'
Talia: [parce que c'est-
Talia: [parce que c'est trop pareil le français et
Karen: c'est un peu:: la meme chose
Kenji: non tres (.) c'est pas tres
Miss Lo: c'est un peu la meme chose
Cristina: il y a les memes mots que ça ressemble en français
Miss Lo: [ah tres bien! (.) alors (.) est-ce que quand on dit
Kenji: [espagnol et français (.) tres pareil
Miss Lo: en français (.) un clown (.) c'est un mot français (.) le mot
Cristina: oui
?.
Miss Lo: le mot clown c'est un mot français!
?.
Miss Lo: et le mot clown en anglais (.) on dit
Talia: clown
Karen: [clown
Talia: [clown
Miss Lo: clown (.) et pourtant ça s'ecrit pareil
(.). donc vous pensez quoi (.) que c'est deux mots qui sont differents [ou c'est un seul mot pour les deux]
Talia: [c'est meme
Karen: un seul [mot (.) pour les deux
Cristina: [un seul mot pour les deux
Miss Lo: alors (.) un seul mot pour les deux
Kenji: maîtresse goal est gardien
Karen: mais ça non! (.) c'est pas ça
?.
Miss Lo: de quoi?
Karen: [ça c'est salon
Talia: [le living room
Kenji: 'poster'
Miss Lo: ah ben voilà
159. (.1) Kenji: poster meme!
160. Miss Lo: donc il y a des mots (.) mais alors living
161. room (.) est-ce qu'on dit en français
162. living
163. (.1)
164. (?): non
165. Kenji: living room (.1) living (.1) japonais
166. living!
167. Leila: on dit la sala!
168. Talia: c'est quoi living!
169. (.)
170. Kenji: [living euh (.)]
171. Karen: [non on dit (.) le salon
172. Kenji: living euh (.) les gens et
173. Miss Lo: alors (.) [ok
174. Talia: [ah c'est la sala
175. Kenji: [canapé
176. Miss Lo: [un poster alors (.) un poster↑
177. Kenji: salle
178. Leila: c'est la meme chose
179. Cristina: la poste!
180. (.)
181. Miss Lo: ah ça- (.) c'est pas la poste la (.) un
182. poster (.) c'est quoi un poster↑
183. Talia: ah! la poste (laughing)
184. Kenji: moi- (.) japonais aussi living! (.)
185. posuta: <poster>
186. meme!
187. Leila: ça↑ (pointing to a poster in the
188. classroom)
189. Miss Lo: [voilà ça c'est un poster
190. Cristina: [c'est un chanteur c'est un chanteur
191. (.)
192. Miss Lo: donc est-ce qu'on dit un- (.) comment on
193. dit en anglais un poster↑
194. (.)
195. Kenji: [poster
196. Talia: [poster
197. Kenji: poster ((imitating Talia’s accent))
198. Miss Lo: un poster (.) et comment on dit en
199. français↑
200. (.)
201. Miss Lo: poster (.) donc en fait le franglais c'est
202. quoi↑
203. Kenji: poster
204. Miss Lo: vous avez presque trouve la (.) le
205. franglais c'est quoi↑
206. Karen: c'est français (et anglais
207. Leila: [oui que (.)
208. Miss Lo: oui mais c'est quoi↑
209. Leila: que (.) la chose c'est écrit en anglais
210. mais c'est la meme chose qu'en français
211. Miss Lo: d'accord (.) et pourquoi (.) et pourquoi
212. ça serait pas (.) Karen (.) a ton avis
213. les mots la (.) qui c'est qui les a
214. trouve d'abord (.) c'est les anglais ou
215. les français↑
216. ?: les anglais
217. (.)
218. Cristina: les français!
219. (.)
220. Miss Lo: pourquoi↑
221. Karen: parce que les anglais etaient en (.) tous
222. les americains etaient en Europe (.) après
223. ils ont venu a etats unis (.) après et (.)
224. des gens vient de France encore
225. Miss Lo: ah oui donc ça c'est d'accord (.) c'est
226. que les americains ils viennent (.) c'est
227. des europeens a la base (.) mais bon ça
229. c’est pas (.) ça va pas dans le sens de
230. [ma question
231. Kenji: [maitresse!
232. Miss Lo: est-ce que tu penses que clown (.) avec
233. (.) c- l- o- w- n- (.)
234. Leila: oui
235. Kenji: maitresse!
236. Miss Lo: vous pensez que c’est plutôt un mot
237. anglais ou un mot français?
238. ?: anglais!
239. Miss Lo: un mot anglais (.) et alors si on dit
240. clown en France ça veut dire quoi (.)
241. simplement (.) ça veut dire quoi?
242. Cristina: clown (.) ça veut dire-
243. Talia: clown
244. Miss Lo: si on dit clown en France et que c’est un
245. mot anglais et ben ça veut dire quoi?
246. Kenji: pierrot
247. (.)
248. Cristina: euh (.) pareil
249. Miss Lo: ben ça veut dire qu’en français (.) on
250. utilise des mots (.) qu’on a pris?
251. Cristina: anglais
252. Miss Lo: a l’anglais!
253. (.)
254. Miss Lo: quand je dis par exemple-
255. Leila: en espagnol (.) shopping (.) c’est en
256. anglais
257. Miss Lo: shopping (.) c’est en anglais
258. Talia: aussi on peut dire (.) las compras
259. Kenji: japonais beaucoup (.) anglais
260. Miss Lo: et si vous dites shopping en es- en espa-
261. en espagnol (.) en: argentine (.) est-ce
262. que si vous dites shopping en argentine ya
263. que les gens qui parlent anglais qui
264. comprennent
265. Leila: non! (.) tout le monde
266. Miss Lo: tout le monde comprend
267. Leila: mais c’est normal (.) on dit shopping
268. (.)
269. Kenji: [maitresse!
270. Miss Lo: [ben là c’est pareil (.) c’est exactement
271. pareil Leila (.) on dit (.) hamburger
272. (.) personne- si vous dite a quelqu’un en
273. France oh on va manger un hamburger (.) ya
274. personne qui va vous dire (.) c’est quoi
275. ça moi je parle pas anglais je comprends
276. rien (.) parce que hamburger c’est
277. hamburger (.) [on sait tous que hamburger
278. c’est ça
279. Kenji: en japonais (.) living!
280. Talia: en espagnol c’est [hamburguesa
281. Kenji: [hamburger
282. Miss Lo: si quelqu’un dit (.) euh (.)
283. Kenji: ça c’est etats unis
284. Miss Lo: on va voir un spectacle de clown (.) si
285. on dit en France on va voir un spectacle
286. de clown (.) les français ils vont pas
287. vous dire (.) un spectacle de quo? (.) u
288. spectacle de clown (.) c’est quoi ça? (.)
289. non (.) clown (.) tout le monde connait
290. clown (.) donc ce sont des mots
291. Kenji: clown non en japonais
292. Piotr: moi je connais pas
293. Miss Lo: chut! (.) [donc ce sont des mots qu’on a
294. pris a l’anglais
295. Talia: [clown c’est clown (.) payaso
296. Miss Lo: et qu’on a mis dans le français (.)
297. d’ailleurs (.) comment on peut être sur de
298. ça (.) si on prend un dictionnaire (.) un
299. dictionnaire français
Kenji: maitresse! (.) japonais-

Miss Lo: c’est un dictionnaire français (.) normalement un dictionnaire français est-ce que je peux trouver des mots japonais tout ça?

?: [non]

?: [oui]

?:

?: oui

Kenji: non

Miss Lo: normalement (.) ah tu peux trouver

Miss Lo: alors (.) attendez on va voir (.) est-ce que je trouve clown la-dedans?

Cristina: oui maitresse (.) je sais ou c’est clown

Miss Lo: ça veut dire qu’on a pris des mots (.) et n les a mis dans le français et que maintenant (.) tous les gens qui parlent français utilisent ce mot comme si c’etait un mot français (.) il y a d’autres mots- il y a des mots qui viennent de l’arabe par exemple qu’on utilise en français qu’est-ce qu’on utilise? (.) comme mot qui vient de l’arabe?

Miss Lo: qu’est-ce qu’on utilise au Senegal comme mot qui vient du français (.) toubib (.) est-ce que vous dites toubib

Miss Lo: est-ce que vous dites toubib!

Miss Lo: ah non vous le dites pas (.) euh:: (.) est-ce que vous dites- (qu’est-ce que vous dites tiens en peul qui sont des mots euh (.) attends ça marche pas

Talia: [taxi! (.) taxi!]

Miss Lo: taxi (.) taxi

Talia: en espagnol (.) taxi

Kenji: en japonais taxi

Miss Lo: [taxi! (.) taxi!]

Miss Lo: taxi (.) taxi

Talia: [voilà!]

Miss Lo: [pizza]

Miss Lo: pizza voilà (.) pizza ça vient de quoi a votre avis?

Talia: euh (.) italien

Miss Lo: je pense ouais

Kenji: living

Cristina: anglais maitresse

Talia: pizza c’est italien

Miss Lo: taxi par exemple (.) taxi ((looking in her dictionary))

Miss Lo: [japonais (.) tres bien pizza (08:39)]

Kenji: [non] japonais (.) tres bien pizza (08:39) c’est un mot français que vous utilisez (.) alors la- il y a ds mots français qu’on utilise dans d’autres pays et la c’est ds mots (.) étranger qu’on utilise en français (.) parexemple on arabe il y a quoi (.) attends je vais me retrouver (.) le:: (.) ah! Le bled!
Miss Lo: le bled (.) c'est un bled (.) un bled ça veut dire c'est un village (.) un petit village (.) quand en france on se promene (.) il y a de endroits c'est des tous petits villages on [dit mais (.) on dit mais c'est un bled ici!]

Miss Lo: ça veut dire (.) c'est un village (.) et bled c'est un mot arabe

Miss Lo: ça veut dire (.) c'est un village (.) et bled c'est un mot arabe

Talia: [maitresse!

Miss Lo: ça veut dire (.) c'est un village (.) et bled c'est un mot arabe

Talia: et comment on dit metro

Kenji: [metro

?: [metro

Talia: en japonais

Kenji: densha (09:13)

Talia: oh (...)tesha

Miss Lo: tesh (.) si je cherche tesa dans le dictionnaire je vais pas le trouver

Kenji: densha

Talia: euh:: comment on dit pizza

Kenji: densha

Talia: piza (.) [imitating peul])

Miss Lo: voilâ (.) bled! (.) la c'est marque bled campagne en afrique du nord' (.) 'petit village isolé' (.) voilâ (.) quand on parle (.) ça c'est quand on parle c'est pas quand on écrit (.) quand on parle on dit oh là là c'est un bled ici (.) et ben ça [c'est un mot qui vient de l'arabe

Miss Lo: donc ça c'est des [mots qu'on utilise-

Talia: en:: Senegal

Kenji: /pɔje/

Miss Lo: voilâ (.) bled! (.) la c'est marque bled campagne en afrique du nord' (.) 'petit village isolé' (.) voilâ (.) quand on parle (.) ça c'est quand on parle c'est pas quand on écrit (.) quand on parle on dit oh là là c'est un bled ici (.) et ben ça [c'est un mot qui vient de l'arabe

Miss Lo: donc ça c'est des [mots qu'on utilise-

Karen: pizza

Miss Lo: donc ça c'est des [mots qu'on utilise-

Miss Lo: donc ça c'est des [mots qu'on utilise-

Talia: [buonjorno

Miss Lo: donc ça c'est des [mots qu'on utilise-

Miss Lo: donc ça c'est des [mots qu'on utilise-

Talia: [buonjorno

Kenji: ()

Talia: buonjorno

Miss Lo: don qu'est-ce qui change --10:09--

---10:14---

Miss Lo: vous écoutez (.) et après Karen va les voir si- si on- si on prononce pareil (.) en français on dit (.) un living room (.)
5. un living room c’est- ça veut dire un
6. salon mais aussi on dit aussi un living
7. room (.) [en anglais on dit comment]
8. Leila: [en espagnol aussi
9. Miss Lo: chut! (.) oui d’accord mais la on est sur
10. le français
11. Talia: living room
12. Kenji: en japonais aussi on dit living room
13. Karen: living room
14. Miss Lo: chut! (.) ah alors écoutez
15. (.)
16. Talia: sala
17. Miss Lo: oh oh! (.) moi je dis living room
18. (.)
19. Karen: [hamburger
20. Miss Lo: hein donc c’est pas tout a fait la même
21. prononciation (.) moi je dis hamburger
22. (.)
23. Karen: [hamburger
24. Talia: [hamburger
25. (.)
26. Kenji: hamburger
27. Miss Lo: moi je dis western
28. (.)
29. Karen: western
30. Talia: western'
31. Miss Lo: ah moi je dis western et elle elle dit
32. western (.) eu- (.) et moi je dis ai-
33. Kenji: [elle dit ouh ouh
34. Miss Lo: [poster
35. (.)
36. Karen: poster
37. Talia: 'poster'
38. Miss Lo: elle elle dit posteer (.) et moi je dis
39. posteer (.) et si je devais- et si je moi
40. je disais posteer comm. je l’écrirai en
41. français je l’écrirai pas e- r- (.)
42. j’écrirai'
43. (.)
44. Cristina: e- r-
45. Talia: e- r-
46. Miss Lo: non! (.) en français e- r- ça fait pas (.)
47. ça fait pas eur hein (.) posteer
48. ?: eu'
49. Miss Lo: oui (.) e- u- r- (.) j’écrirais e- u- r-
50. (.) d’accord? (.) donc la c’est écrit (.)
51. c’est écrit comme on écrit en anglais (.)
52. c’est écrit comme en anglais pas comme en
53. français (. ) living room (. ) room je
54. devrais l’écrire comme en français? (.)
55. room
56. Talia: room!
57. Miss Lo: j’écrirais comment room?
58. Leila: r- o- u- m-
59. Miss Lo: voilà (.) r- o- u- m- (.) parce que deux o
60. ça n’est pas en français ça (.) sauf les
61. mots qui viennent de l’anglais (.) alors
62. euh:: un goal
63. (.)
64. Karen: a goal
65. (.)
66. Miss Lo: un clown
67. Karen: [clown
68. Talia: [clown
69. Miss Lo: ah ouais (.) clown moi je dis clown et
70. elle elle dit clown (.) c’est pas pareil
71. Miss Lo: un show
72. Karen: show
73. Talia: show
74. Miss Lo: ouais (.) presque pareil (.) un manager
Karen: a manager

Miss Lo: ah alors moi je dis ma!nager et toi tu dis

Karen: oui

Miss Lo: ben moi je dis ma (. ) speaker

Karen: speaker

Talia: speaker

Miss Lo: ah voilà c'est presque pareil

Kenji: speaker

Miss Lo: donc en fait le franglais c'est quoi (. )

Karen: qui c’est qui peut me dire maintenant c’est

Kenji: [( )

Miss Lo: ce sont des mots↑

Leila: anglais (. ) qu'on utilise en France

Miss Lo: en français (. ) avec une prononciation↑

Karen: anglaise

Talia: différente

Leila: française

Miss Lo: française (. ) voilà (. ) alors maintenant-

Miss Lo: maîtresse show! aussi c’est en espagnol

Miss Lo: ouais ben c'est- c’est du (. ) c’est du

Miss Lo: (. ) spanoglais alors

Leila: oui

Miss Lo: du spanishglais (. ) je sais pas comment on

Kenji: pourrait dire?

Kenji: en japonais non c’est pas show

Talia: francespanishglais

Miss Lo: hein

Talia: francespanishglais

Leila: poster aussi! (. ) c’est écrit comme ça

Talia: poster

Miss Lo: en espagnol aussi vous dites ça

Kenji: non (. ) japonais (. ) poster (12:29)

Miss Lo: donc si vous- parlez-vous spani-

Leila: c’est peut être a- euh (. ) quelqu’un dit

Leila: living aussi

Talia: en espagnol living room (. ) o:: (. ) sala

Miss Lo: (. ) hamburgesa (. ) western c'est quoi↑

Miss Lo: western (. ) [les films avec des cow boy

Leila: [vacero

Leila: vacero (. ) poster (. ) goal (. ) pallaso

Leila: vacero (. ) poster (. ) goal (. ) pallaso

12:54)

Miss Lo: vous utilisez ça en espagnol aussi↑

Leila: oui!

Miss Lo: ah::

Talia: euh:: show

Miss Lo: ouais

Talia: c'est quoi manager

Miss Lo: un manager c'est le directeur (. ) celui

Leila: bueno (. ) director

Talia: v

Miss Lo: donc vous utilisez pas manager

Leila: [periodista

Kenji: [tomato

Leila: [periodista

Hakim: en algerie [aussi on dit directeur

Talia: [periodista

Miss Lo: ah ben voilà (. ) en algerie on utilise des

Miss Lo: mots du français (. ) d'accord

Kenji: euh tomate!

Miss Lo: hein↑
Kenji: tomate
Miss Lo: tomate !
Leila: moi j’ai vu dans un-
Hakim: maitresse en algerie on dit tomate aussi
Miss Lo: chut!
Kenji: ça c’est tomate (.) legume
Miss Lo: oui
Kenji: c’est–
Miss Lo: attendez attendez parce que la je suis pas
tout chez Kenji
Kenji: ça c’est (.) japonais aussi
Miss Lo: ah en japonais on dit tomate !
Kenji: oui
Leila: maitresse j’ai vu a la television en
Hakim: maitresse en algerie on dit–
Miss Lo: ouais
Leila: et un programme que: (.) la personne dit
ça suffit!
Kenji: salade aussi
Leila: en français elle dit (.) ça suffit!
Miss Lo: comme ça
Leila: oui
Karen: maitresse aussi comment on dit–
Leila: mais normalement on dit pas (.) en
espagnol
Miss Lo: d’accord
Kenji: maitresse salade aussi (.) salade!
(a lot of children talking at the same time)
Talia: en français c’est des tomates
Miss Lo: ouais
Talia: en espagnol c’est (.) los tomates (.)
c’est écrit– [(.) le meme
Kenji: [salade!
Miss Lo: d’accord
Kenji: maitresse salade!
Miss Lo: salade on dit en japonais aussi!
Kenji: oui
Miss Lo: ah d’accord
Talia: en espagnol (.) ensalade de letuga
Miss Lo: chut! (.) ben ça ce sont des emprunts du
français la par contre (.) c’est pas des
emprunts de l’anglais attention hein!
Kenji: salada
Leila: ( )
Hakim: ( ) en algerie
Miss Lo: euh ( ) salade en japonais c’est un
emprunt du français
Talia: lettuga ensalada
Kenji: café
Miss Lo: mais tomatoes en espagnol c’est pas un
emprunt
Kenji: maitresse! (.) café!
Leila: café! oui café!
Talia: café!
Miss Lo: café voilà (.) c’est un emprunt aussi
Talia: café! c’est un emprunt aussi
Kenji: anglais aussi (.) japonais aussi anglais
aussi
Leila: en español tambien se escribe con acento
Miss Lo: alors la euh! Y a que Karen qui a
[commence a travailler
Talia: [y en francés?
Miss Lo: donc la on vous dit (.) ’il parle à la
radio’ ça s’appelle– il s’appelle– c’est
216. comment\,\(\,\) un nom en anglais hein\,\(\,\) (.)
217. il parle à la radio\,\(\,\) on va le faire
218. ensemble alors
219. Talia: la radio parle
220. Karen: en anglais!
221. Miss Lo: ah ben oui parce que là c’est des mots-
222. Kenji: [ça c’est plus gens
223. Miss Lo: le\,\(\,\)
224. Matilda: radio
225. Karen: ( )
226. Miss Lo: non (.\,) non (.\,) le mot anglais qu’on
227. utilise en français pour dire le métier de
228. quelqu’un qui parle à la radio
229. Hakim: chanteur\,\(\,\)
230. Miss Lo: non [ça c’est français
231. Talia: [\textit{speaker}!
232. (.\,)
233. Talia: le \textit{speaker}!:
234. Miss Lo: oui\,\(\,\) (\,) très bien
235. ?: \textit{speaker}!:
236. Miss Lo: alors on va écrire
237. Leila: comment on écrit \textit{speaker}!:
238. Talia: \textit{shi esta}
239. (.\,)
240. Kenji: comment écrire \textit{speaker}!:
241. Talia: c’est ici Kenji! (.\,) \textit{speaker}
242. Kenji: \textit{speaker}
243. Talia: haha ([laughing])
244. Miss Lo: et la femme c’est comment (.\,) la femme qui
245. parle à la télé là pour dire la météo (.\,)
246. ça s’appelle comment\,\(\,\)
247. Kenji: euh
248. Leila: \textit{espeaker}
249. Karen: oh!
250. Miss Lo: en français c’est le \textit{speaker} la \textit{speakerine}
251. Kenji: \textit{speakerine}
252. Miss Lo: \textit{speakerine}! (.\,) \textit{speakerine} ça existe en
253. anglais\,\(\,\)
254. Karen: non
255. Miss Lo: non voilà (.\,) on a inventé un féminin
256. Kenji: comment écrire \textit{speakerine}?
257. Karen: ah maîtresse! on doit écrire en anglais\,\(\,\)
258. Miss Lo: oui!
259. Karen: ah!
260. Miss Lo: euh (.\,) ‘le film d’aventure dans l’ouest
261. américain
262. Leila: \textit{western}
263. Miss Lo: [\textit{western
264. Leila: [\textit{western

--15:09--

\textbf{T2 S1 D10 V40}

\textbf{T2 S1 D10 V40 E1:}

--02:20--

1. Matilda: t’as un stylo noir\,\(\,\)
2. (.\,)
3. Talia: \textit{yeah}
4. (.\,)
5. ([Matilda comes to Talia])
6. Talia: no I don’t wanna
7. (.\,)
8. Andrea: noir\,\(\,\)
9. Matilda: oui (.\,) stylo noir
10. (.\,)}
11. Matilda: merci
--02:39--
The second group is doing a written exercise whilst Miss Lo is helping the youngest group to read a story on an Easter egg.

---03:01---
1. Miss Lo: alors comment elle est-ce qu’elle
2. s’appelle (. ) c’est écrit ‘elle’ parce
3. qu’elle s’appelle comment (. )
4. Matilda: poulette crevette (. )
5. Miss Lo: poulette crevette (. ) et pourquoi elle
6. s’appelle crevette (. ) puis crevette parce
7. que c’est une petite poule (. ) et crevette
8. pourquoi (. ) parce qu’elle est de quelle
9. couleur (. )
10. Matilda: rose
11. Miss Lo: rose (. ) et la- qu’est-ce qui est rose (. )
12. (. ) les crevettes vous savez ce qui c’est
13. que les crevettes (. )
14. Maia: non
15. (. )
16. Miss Lo: je vais vous montrer
17. Andrea: el camaron! <shrimp>
18. (. )
19. Miss Lo: camaron
20. (. )
21. Maia: ah!
22. Andrea: conoce (. )
23. Maia: camaron (. )
24. Andrea: si
25. (. )
26. Miss Lo: d’accord (. ) camaron (. ) voilà (. )
27. crevette (showing her a picture book with an image of a shrimp)
28. (. )
29. Miss Lo: donc (. ) c’est pour ça qu’on l’a appelée
30. (. ) euh:: crevette (. ) c’est parce
31. qu’elle est rose comme la crevette
32. Matilda: euh::
33. Miss Lo: ben comment on dit en anglais crevette
34. euh:: (. ) shremps (. ) non (. ) shremps (. )
35. Matilda: shremp (. ) ah! (laughing)
36. Miss Lo: d’accord (. ) Hein (. ) c’est pour ça qu’on
37. l’appelle crevette (. ) parce qu’elle est
38. rose comme une (. )
39. Matilda: [crevette
40. Maia: [crevette= (. )
41. Miss Lo: =crevette (. ) d’accord
42. (Miss Lo moves to another group)
43. (. )
44. Maia: comment on dit camaron (. )
45. Talia: camaron (.) como el camaron es rosa (. )
46. por eso le dicen asi a la (. ) la gallina
47. <since a shrimp is pink (. ) that’s why
48. they call it like that (. ) the hen>
49. (04:13)
50. Miss Lo: chut! (. ) vous vous occupez de votre
51. texte (. ) et moi je suis avec eux la (. )
52. d’accord (. ) je suis avec elles
53. Karen: maîtresse!
54. Miss Lo: alors

---04:30---
Same situation. T is talking with So only here.

--05:10--

1. Miss Lo: elle dit ‘or alors voilà qu’un matin (.)
2. elle saute sur un mur et crie (.) crotte
crotte crevette’ (. ) ‘crotte crotte
crevette (. ) et crotte c’est quoi le mot
crotte†
3. Miss Lo: elle elle devrait dire cotte codette
cotte codette (. ) et elle dit
4. pas ça (. ) elle dit (. ) crotte crotte
crevette (. ) crotte c’est le caca
5. C?: oh!:
6. Karen: pourquoi?
7. Miss Lo: non mais (. ) elle- c’est parce que- (. )
8. Maia (. ) c’est parce que elle dit (. )
9. cotte cotte (. ) elle arrive pas à dire
cotte cotte (. ) parce qu’avant elle ne
10. parlait pas (. ) elle arrive pas elle dit
11. (. ) cr- cr- crotte crotte (. ) tu vois? (. )
caca caca (. ) donc du coup (. ) oh!: du
coup ses parents ils disent (. ) oh! mais
12. qu’est-ce qu’elle dit? (. ) c’est comme un
gros mot c’est comme un mot qu’on ne dit
13. pas (. ) voyez?
14. Miss Lo: alors du coup ils sont (. ) ses parents
15. ils sont†
16. (.3)
17. Matilda: euh::
18. Miss Lo: ils sont honte!
19. Maia: honte†
20. Miss Lo: honte (. ) comment on dit honte en espagnol
21. Andrea
22. Talia: [comme ça]
23. Andrea: [vergüenza
24. (.)
25. Miss Lo: honte (. ) non=
26. Andrea: = vergüenza!
27. Talia: oye (. ) (tipo) que están avergonzados
28. (06:04)
29. Maia: ah ah
30. Miss Lo: tu vois? (. ) parce qu’elle a dit quelque
31. chose qu’il ne faut pas dire (. ) mais en
32. même temps (.3) en même temps après (. )
33. ça les fait†
34. Andrea: honte
35. Miss Lo: est-ce qu’ils sont fâchés (. ) est-ce
36. qu’elle est punie†
37. Maia: non
38. Miss Lo: non (. ) ça les fait rigoler (. ) parce
39. après ils comprennent (. ) qu’elle fait
40. pas exprès (. ) c’est la première fois
41. qu’elle parle (. ) elle arrive pas a dire
42. coco (. ) et crotte en français c’est un
43. mot qui veut dire le caca (.2) c’est pour
44. ça (. ) et après (. ) ils sont contents
45. parce que ils disent que elle sait parler
46. (. ) et elle va apprendre tout doucement a
47. bien! parler (. ) c’est comme vous des
48. fois quand vous dites des mots (. ) que
49. vous arrivez pas a bien prononcer (. ) ben
50. la c’est pareil (. ) elle arrive pas a bien
51. prononcer

--06:58--
T2 S1 D11 V44 E3:

--15:15--
1. Miss Lo: 'on y depose un peu de lard' (. c'est
2. quoi le lard?
3. (.3)
4. Miss Lo: le lard
5. Cristina: lard!
6. Miss Lo: mm
7. Samba: oui
8. Miss Lo: ça veut dire quelque chose dans ta langue
9. (. lard?
10. (.3)
11. Miss Lo: oui (. ça veut dire quoi?
12. Amkoule: maîtresse comme ça
13. (.3)
14. Miss Lo: lard (. ça veut dire quelque chose (. en peul?
15. Samba: oui
16. Miss Lo: ça veut dire quoi?
17. (.5)
18. Samba: nous on dit lard (. on met du lait
19. (.3)
20. Miss Lo: oui dis-moi!
21. Samba: on met du riz
22. Miss Lo: ouais
23. Samba: avec du lait
24. Miss Lo: ouais (. et ça s’appelle lard?
25. Samba: oui
26. Miss Lo: c’est le plat
27. Samba: oui
28. Miss Lo: est-ce qu’on en mange pendant le ramadan?
29. Samba: oui
30. Miss Lo: oui c’est ça je vois (. on met du mil
31. aussi des fois avec du lait non?
32. Samba: oui
33. Miss Lo: d’accord (. ça s’appelle lard (. d’accord (. ben là non ((laughing)) la
34. c’est carrément autre chose (. la c’est
35. du porc! en fait (. c’est du porc en::=
36. Andrea: =ah d’accord
37. Miss Lo: en comment [dire
38. Maia: que?
39. Cristina: en porc
40. Andrea: porco
41. Miss Lo: c’est du porc en:: (. c’est ce qu’on met
42. [quand il reste du lard
43. Karen: [qu’est-ce qu’on mange pour le déjeuner?
44. Miss Lo: c’est comme le bacon un peu (. voyez?
45. Andrea: [c’est quoi bacon
46. Karen: [bacon (. j’adore!
47. Miss Lo: tu vois (. donc c’est de la viande (. on
48. lui met un petit peu de viande se- (. parce que c’est très gras le lard (. et
49. Miss Lo: elles mangent ça (. alors

--16:19--

T2 S1 D11 V45
Children are working in groups. It is time to go to the playground but there is a storm.

--12:25--
1. Talia: maîtresse je peux (.) je peux sortir avec mon parapluie?
2. Miss Lo: oh là là ((looking at the window)) (.) alors là c'est la tempête (.) là ça s'appelle une tempête!
3. Karen: [c'est quoi]
4. Miss Lo: une tempête c'est que il y a beaucoup de vent (.) il y a les arbres [qui bougent beaucoup]
5. Talia: [(au mexique)]
6. Miss Lo: c'est:: (.) tormenta
7. Karen: (.) qui s'envolent
8. Miss Lo: voilà (.) là on a de la chance avec la météo (.) on peut avoir plein de mots [qu'on a jamais (.) la grêle (.) la tempête]
9. Hakim: [maîtresse en algérie (.) un garçon]
10. Miss Lo: [maîtresse en algérie un garçon]
11. Cristina: [.] maîtresse! (.) je sais pas c'est quoi-
12. Miss Lo: (.) non (.) chut!
13. Miss Lo: tu demandes (.) à Talia (.) elle va t'expliquer (.) tu lui fais pas (.) tu lui expliques

--12:51--

T2 S1 D11 V45 E2:
Children are working in their respective groups.

--13:48--
1. Miss Lo: chut! (.) ((knocks on the table to call for attention)) moi j'ai besoin d'un peu de silence pour travailler avec Maia et Matilda donc- 2. Cristina: maîtresse! (.) je sais pas c'est quoi-
3. Miss Lo: [.] non (.) chut!
4. Hakim: [(.)]
5. Cristina: [.] maîtresse! (.) je sais pas c'est quoi-
6. Miss Lo: [non (.) chut!]
7. Miss Lo: [.]
8. Miss Lo: tu demandes (.) à Talia (.) elle va t'expliquer (.) tu lui fais pas (.) tu lui expliques

--14:01--

T2 S1 D11 V45 E3:
Talia helps Cristina to understand the story about the Easter egg. The microphone is near them.

--14:16--
1. Talia: se esconde
2. Cristina: si (.) 'elle (.) se cache derriere la porte'
3. Talia: porque?
4. (.2)
5. Talia: para que la- para que los niños no la encuentran (.) no esta no es (.) escrive
6. (.3) par que (.) les enfants ne trouvent pas elle
7. (.14)
11. ((children in other groups are talking with
12. the teacher))
13. Cristina: parce que
14. Talia: non
15. (.3)
16. Cristina: como se hace (.2) parce que
17. Talia: qui c’est elle?
18. (.1)
19. Cristina: oui
20. Talia: que fait-elle?
21. (.1)
22. Cristina: mm
23. Talia: que hace?
24. Cristina: se esconde
25. (.3)
26. Talia: elle se (.3) elle (.2) elle se
27. Cristina: cache derrière la porte
28. Talia: de
29. Cristina: de (.3) michoir
30. Talia: de michoir (.2) pourquoi
31. (.2)
32. Cristina: parce que les enfants la trouvent=
33. Talia: =parce que les enfants la trouvent pas!
34. (.3)
35. Cristina: les enfants ne ((writing))

[...] Same context. T talks with other pupils in the background.

--23:51--
1. Cristina: je sais pas qu’est-ce qu’il faut faire sur
2. celui-là! (.2) grammaire
3. (.2)
4. Talia: brrrr
5. (.6)
6. Talia: en este
7. Cristina: sí
8. (.3)
9. Talia: escribe el primer parágrafo (.2) en la
10. forma afirmativa (.2) escribe estos
11. párrafos en el afirmativo! (.2) ‘ce n’est
12. pas une maison comme une autre’ (.2)
13. entonces será en afirmativo (.2) c’est une
14. maison comme une autre (.2) c’est une poule
15. comme les autres (.2) c’est un jour tout a
16. fait comme les autres jours (.2) y después
17. en esto (.2) re- (.2) re-escribe en
18. masculino las frases sulinadas (.2) del
19. párrafo dos (.2) entonces (.2) esta ya esta
20. (.2) y con el masculino (.2) ‘c’est une
21. poule’ (.2) ‘c’est un coq’ (.2)
22. ‘il se nomme (.2) coco’ {laughing} (.2)
23. il est-
24. Cristina: brun
25. Talia: brun
26. Cristina: [en chocolat
27. Talia: [en chocolate (.2) au lait!
28. (.11)
29. Cristina: ( ) (25:16)

--25:23--
Children from the three different groups are gathered at the end of the day to paint their Easter eggs.

**T2 S1 D11 V46 E1:**

---07:40---

1. Miss Lo: c’est joli euh:: (.). Kenji (.). un œuf
2. Kenji: d’or Kenji dis-donc c’est super beau
3. Miss Lo: ouais or! (.). c’est chouette!
4. Kenji: gold
5. Miss Lo: gold ouais ((laughing))
6. Matilda: c’est en anglais gold
7. Miss Lo: moi je vais m’occuper des boîtes (.). voir qu’est-ce que je vais pouvoir mettre dedans (.). À qui sont les œufs là-bas (.). ah oui ça c’est mélanie et::
8. Samba: Hakim
9. (.5)
10. Talia: je fais rose
11. (.1)
12. Maia: rojo con::
13. Matilda: qui a du vert† (.). personne†
14. (.2)
15. Talia: non il n’y a pas (.)
16. (.1)
17. Miss Lo: euh:: (.). Cristina le vert tu fais du vert (.). tu mets du bleu et du jaune et ça fait du vert
18. (.2)
19. Cristina: hein† combien
20. Miss Lo: tu mets du bleu et du jaune (.). tu mélanges du bleu [et du jaune (.). ça fait du vert
21. Cristina: [bleu (.). bleu et du jaune
22. Miss Lo: ça va faire du vert
23. Cristina: je vais essayer hein
24. Miss Lo: ouais ben (.). tu mets du jaune et après tu mets un tout petit peu de bleu (.). [tu mélanges (.). tu mets encore un petit peu de bleu (]
25. Maia: [noir
26. Matilda: si tu veux le noir (.). tiens
27. Children making noises and singing!
28. (.11)
29. Matilda: regarde (.). noir et violet (.). regarde la couleur maintenant de l’eau

---
43. (.3)
44. Maia: oh! violet forte
45. Talia: non ça c’est un noir
46. Matilda: je veux du rose aussi (. ) madame
47. (Miss Lo talks in the background)

--09:36--

T2 S1 D11 V46 E2:

--10:40--
1. Amkoulel: le noir
2. (.3)
3. Maia: noir↑
4. Amkoulel: je veux le doré
5. (.3)
6. Talia: why don’t you get pink↑
7. Matilda: there
8. Talia: but that’s mine!
9. (.2)
10. Matilda: yeah! (. ) i think i know::
11. (.7)
12. Talia: haha ((laughing))

--11:22--

T2 S1 D11 V46 E3:

--14:29--
1. Amkoulel: le doré Kenji!
2. (.1)
3. Matilda: haha ((laughing))
4. Amkoulel: je veux le doré
5. Maia: noir s’il te plait Matilda
6. Matilda: haha ((laughing)) (. ) je peux pas j’ai
7. fait qu’un œuf=
8. Kenji: =samba (. ) rouge!
9. (.3)
10. Samba: regarde Amkoulel
11. (.5)
12. Miss Lo: non samba il y a trop d’eau là!
13. Kenji: non mais ici
14. Miss Lo: tu veux faire quoi là
15. Samba: doré
16. Miss Lo: ben doré tu tu-
17. Kenji: après!
18. Cristina: l’éponge s’il te plait!
19. Kenji: éponge↑
20. Miss Lo: ben non tu prends un autre pinceau dans ce
21. cas là
22. (.4) ((children making high pitched noises))
23. Miss Lo: voilà par exemple il y a un pinceau là qui
24. n’est pas utilisé (. ) voilà (. ) tu
25. l’essuie (. ) et tu l’utilises pour le doré
26. (.2)
27. Matilda: éponge!
28. (.2)
29. Matilda: je fais faire une couleur! (. ) une
30. couleur
31. (.2)
32. Talia: tu fais:: (. ) violet
33. [.]
34. Miss Lo: on dit en malgache (. ) Karen elle est
35. moura moura (. ) moura moura [ça veut dire
36. euh::
37. Matilda: [qui veut une
38. couleur comme ça! (. ) comme ça comme ça
39. Maia: qui veut:: (. ) [violet
40. Miss Lo: [tranquille hein (. ) parce
41. que là il est deux heures cinq (. ) donc il
faudrait commencer un petit peu
Matilda: [qui veut ça et ça
Maia: qui veut violet! qui veut violet!
Matilda: j’ai fais ça couleur et ça
Kenji: après moi
Maia: Talia (.). quieras morado!
Talia: morado
Maia: aqui tengo
Kenji: finit
Cristina: regarde maîtresse
{(Miss Lo is talking with Ye in the back of the classroom)}
Kenji: vite (.). vite (.). vite
Maia: ese corazón en rojo (16:40)
(.6)
Maia: este tonto si que no {(combiniendo)
(16:50)
Amkoulel: [noir! (.). passez moi le noir!
Talia: ( .) creo que este y este
(.5)
Amkoulel: he! (.). noir!
(.10)
Matilda: quelle couleur tu veux sur ton œuf!
(.4)
Matilda: quelle couleur! (.). ça! ça! ou ça!
Maia: rose
(.21)
Matilda: noir noir noir noir noir ((singing))
Amkoulel: maîtresse! (.). j’ai envie de faire ça
maîtresse
{(Miss Lo speaking to Rs in the background)}
Matilda: noir! (.). noir! (.). samba noir! (.).
passe!
Samba: attend
Matilda: oh (.). euh d’accord
(.29) {(children singing and blowing on their eggs to fry the paint)}
Matilda: tu veux une boîte! (.). pour ton œuf!
Maia: non j’ai: ça
(.7)
Maia: un papillon ici
(.23)
Maia: j’ai fini! (.). noir et rouge et j’ai fini!
(.10)
Matilda: t’as pas fini!
Maia: oui j’ai fini
Matilda: tu fais pas beaucoup de décoration
(.10)
Matilda: non touche pas!
(.3)
Maia: et ici:
Matilda: oui je vais faire
Maia: et ici
Matilda: oh!
Maia: je fais rien!
{[...] (the janitor walks in the classroom)}
--16:17--

T2 S1 D11 V46 E4:

--23:58--
1. Amkoulel: où est le mouchoir!
2. (.)
3. Amkoulel: ou est le [mouchoir]
4. Matilda: [where did you get]
5. Miss Lo: oh dis-donc! (.). or et argent Kenji (.)
6. c’est super (.). ah Amkoulel aussi c’est rouge et noir
7. --16:17--
---24:15---

**T2 S1 D11 V46 E5:**

---29:29---

1. Samba: noir! et noir noir noir!
2. ()
3. Talia: pourquoi tu prends pas un [ ]
4. Samba: [noir!]
5. Talia: il y a beaucoup de prend et-
6. Samba: "( )"° (29:35)
7. Amkoulel: "( )"
8. Samba: ( )
9. Amkoulel: "( )" c’est wolof
10. Talia: qu’est-ce que ça veut dire
11. Samba: "( )" (.)"( )"° (.)°( )°
12. Talia: qu’est-ce que ça veut dire]
13. Samba: ( ) (.) viens-là
14. (.2)
15. Samba: viens-là
16. (.)
17. Talia: viens
18. Samba: viens-là
19. Talia: qu’est-ce que ça veut dire]
20. Samba: viens-là!
21. Talia: qu’est-ce que ça veut dire viens-là
22. Matilda: viens [(.] là!
23. Samba: [viens (.) là (.)] c’est français ça!
24. Talia: non
25. Samba: [si
26. Matilda: [fran- (.) viens! (.] là! (.1) viens!
27. (.) et là!
28. Cristina: viens-là!
29. Amkoulel: tu comprends pas qu’est-ce que
30. ( )
31. Matilda: oh::! ((screaming))
32. (.14)
33. Matilda: et noir noir noir!
34. Maia: il est là le noir

---31:20---

**T2 S1 D11 V46 E6:**

---36:15---

1. Matilda: juste un petit peu!
2. Talia: no (.) it’s mine
3. Matilda: but you’re finished!
4. (.1)
5. Talia: but ( )
6. (.)
7. Maia: ( ) Talia ya terminaste le puedes:
8. dar (38:40)
9. (.2)
10. Matilda: s’il te plaît!
11. ( )
12. Talia: no::
13. (.40)
14. Maia: Talia ne veut pas donner-
15. Talia: ( ) (37:32)
16. Maia: si
17. (.20)
18. Matilda: c’est pas moi qui a la colle
19. Talia: yeah it’s you!
20. Matilda: c’est– c’est–
21. Talia: you (.) c’est toi (.) and you do
22. everything
23. Matilda: but I didn’t do that
24. Talia: yeah
25. Matilda: and you-
26. Talia: yeah you do
27. Matilda: no it was Piotr
28. Talia: no he don’t use that glue
29. (.15)
30. Talia: but why you cut in (.) in pink
31. Matilda: 
32. Talia: why you do like me?
33. Matilda: cause
34. (.16)
35. Miss Lo: voilà le premier œuf sénégalais de paques
36. (. ) super!

--39:20--