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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the functions of codeswitching (CS), the use of more than one linguistic variety in the same conversation, in the language teaching/learning environment of French as a foreign language at The Ohio State University.

The data for this investigation were collected by means of observations. This mainly consisted of videotaping lessons from three intermediate level French courses. Transcripts of the lessons were produced and examined according to the CA (conversation analysis) method of sequential analysis.

It was found that despite their effort to avoid it, teachers and students sometimes used English in their French classes. Some of the purposes of the recourse to English included translating, enhancing reflection and bridging communication gaps. CS was also found to be either communicational when it occurred in an informal type of interaction, or pedagogical when it was explicitly used to explain facts about French, the target language.

Thus, the study supports the claim that the first
language (L1) is difficult for teachers to avoid, and perhaps more difficult for students to ignore in second/foreign language instruction. Consequently, teaching methods that incorporate L1 in L2 teaching/learning environments are highly recommended. To this end, the study suggests that, in addition to the L1 model, an L2 learner, whose linguistic multicomptence has made a successful L2 user, may constitute a model for both L2 teachers and learners.

Finally, the purposes of CS in a foreign/second language learning are likely to be numerous and diverse. This is why the study recommends further investigations in the area for a better understanding of the phenomenon.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Codeswitching (hereafter CS), the use of more than one linguistic variety in the same conversation or occasion, has in recent years become a familiar research topic in linguistics (Poplack 1980, Bentahila 1983, Joshi 1985 and Muysken 1995), discourse analysis (Auer 1988, 1995), and sociolinguistics (Hassselmo 1970, Heath 1989, Gumperz 1976, and Myers-Scotton 1993, 1995). CS has also been examined in foreign language teaching (Townsend and Zamora 1975, Lagaretta 1977, Andendorff 1996, and Hancock 1997). In this particular area, as Martin-Jones (1995) explains, it has reflected influences not only from an education-oriented perspective, but also from the above mentioned disciplines.

Yet, despite the abundance of research on the topic, CS still remains a sensitive and critical issue for practitioners of foreign language teaching. The sensitive question is whether using another language, often students’ native language, when teaching a foreign language is pedagogically relevant, appropriate and effective, or not.

The answer to this question is not an easy one for at
least two possible reasons. The first reason could be attributed to teachers’ education and training. A brief review of the history of foreign language teaching may help us understand the status of CS in L2 classrooms over the years.

Historically, four methods, (1) the Grammar-Translation Method, (2) the Direct Method, (3) the Audiolingual Method, and (4) the Communicative Teaching Method may have shaped teachers’s attitudes toward CS. The main goal of the Grammar-Translation Method, Richards and Rogers (1993) report, was to study a foreign language in order to read its literature. To achieve this goal, the use of the first language as the reference system in the acquisition of the second language was strongly emphasized. Thus, the student’s native language was the language of instruction. It was used to explain the grammatical rules, and translate sentences from the target language. To the proponents of this method, using the native language to teach a foreign language was therefore the norm. The method dominated foreign language teaching in the Western hemisphere for about a century (1840s-1940s), until it was undermined and then abandoned in the mid nineteen century by a series of reforms.

The Direct Method, as a result of the Reform Movement of the late 1880s and the early 1990s, included views that strongly opposed the principles of the Grammar-Translation Method. One of the main tenets of the Direct Method
consisted in viewing the spoken language as primary to the written language. Consequently, an oral-based methodology needed to be developed. Conversation, as Howatt (1984) explains was crucial in the Direct Method. As the name indicates, the method suggests that the student be directly put in contact with the target language without any other language between the two. The method thus promoted the target language as the unique language of instruction, and excluded the use of the native language in foreign language classrooms.

Based on the same principles as the Direct Method, the Audiolingual Method developed between the 1940s and 1950s is mostly well-known for its strong appeal to behavioral psychology. According to this method, the target language is the only language to be used in a foreign language classroom. Learning is achieved by means of drilling, a practice whereby students are mainly required to react to the teacher’s prompts (or stimuli) without much thinking.

Finally, the present day trend called Communicative Language Teaching Method is a selection of insights from the methods just described. Developed in the early 1980s, its main goal is to teach a foreign language in order to communicate with the speakers of that language. Communication being primarily oral, a good portion of the syllabus is allocated to oral language. Although the use of the target language remains the norm, there is no objection
to the recourse of another language for help. The question however remains on when and how to do so.

This brief historical perspective reveals three major trends in the us of CS in second/foreign language learning over the years. The first is a strong establishment of CS. The second consists of a total rejection of CS; whereas the third trend may be called a compromise solution between the two. This third trend seems the most problematic as it provides no guidance on how to use another language alongside the target language in a second/foreign language classroom.

The notion of CS is also missing in many textbooks and syllabuses used in foreign language teaching programs. It is likely that the concept is viewed more as a research topic for ethnographical studies than a component of foreign language teaching methodology. For instance, in an effort to introduce teachers and student teachers to observation as a first step toward classroom-based research, Allwright and Bailey (1991) have presented some of the many features of L2 (second/foreign language) instructional talk. Their essay includes classic concepts such as comprehensive input, teacher talk, motivation and turn taking. Unfortunately, CS, one of the most pervasive phenomena in the foreign language classroom has been ignored. Similarly, Silberstein’s (1993) account of the 25 years of TESOL includes no mention of CS.

Furthermore, in what is considered the most
comprehensive present-day essay on SLA theories, Ellis (1995), quoting Faerch and Kasper (1984), simply refers to CS as a learner strategy, this means a technique, namely translation, often used by foreign language learners to solve comprehension problems in the target language. Finally, Stern’s (1990) Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching includes only two mentions of CS, while Scarcella, Andersen and Krashen (1990), and Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) ignore the phenomenon altogether.

In addition to the lack of specific pedagogical guidelines about the use of CS, teachers’ uncertainty about CS may also be the influence of some language theories, namely Chomsky’s (1971) notion of UG (Universal Grammar) and LAD (Language Acquisition Device). According to UG, every speaker knows a set of rules that are applicable to all the languages, but which may vary from one language to another. LAD is the humans’ innate ability to acquire their first language. The situation is further complicated with the claim that the co-existence of two linguistic systems would interfere with one another, and that the result would be the emergence of an “interlanguage” (Selinker 1972, Corder 1983), an intermediate linguistic system before a native-like competence in a second language is achieved. As a result of the above mentalist claims, CS may have been considered disruptive and intrusive in L2 learning.

On the social plan however, CS is a manifestation of
the many practical ways in which bilinguals make sense of their talk. Whatever the level of its bilingualism, low intermediate or advanced, an L2 classroom is a bilingual community in its own right. Therefore, CS as a bilingual phenomenon should not be excluded.

The lack of guidance on how to deal with CS whenever it occurs in a foreign language classroom coupled with the difficulty of inserting it in the broad paradigm of UG may lead teachers, even the most experienced ones, to be skeptical about CS.

It is therefore the purpose of this study to examine how the use of the target language actually works in a (second/foreign language) classroom, and to find out how CS, as a natural language use, may contribute to effective foreign language teaching and learning.

**Motivation and Research Questions**

The topic of the present investigation is CS in French as a foreign language at The Ohio State University. The French program is one of most attended foreign language programs of OSU, both at the undergraduate and graduate level. For this reason, a good number of participants producing a lot of talk for the study is expected. At the undergraduate level, the number of registrations for the program may originate in university policy which imposes a
foreign language in all majors as a requirement for
graduation. Students with some knowledge of French from high
school find it easier to pursue the course at the college
level.

At the graduate level, the attraction to the program
stems not only from the quality of its teaching, but also
from its ability to provide financial aid to nearly all its
students. All those factors have contributed to making the
French program worthy of an investigation.

The level chosen for this investigation is
intermediate. The reason is that students at a lower level
may choose to speak English while the teacher would speak
French. At an advanced level both the students and the
teacher may opt for an exclusive use of French. In either
case, chances for CS production are scare. However, an
intermediate level, where students are proficient in French
but not enough confident about their knowledge, is expected
to be the best area for the production of CS.

In order to reach its primary goal, the study seeks to
answer the following questions:

1) What is the teachers’ attitude toward CS? In
   other words, how do teachers react to CS when it
   occurs in French classes at OSU?

2) What kinds of function does CS fulfil in French
   classes at OSU?

3) In what type of sequencing (e.g., reviewing,
presenting, explaining or concluding) of a French class is CS likely to occur?

(4) What relevance may understanding CS have in planning and delivering French language instruction at the college level?

(5) What implications could this study have for formal teaching French at the college level?

Significance of the Study

This investigation may be regarded as part of “awareness-raising practices” (Ellis 1993) intended to develop the student teachers’ conscious understanding of the principles underlying second language teaching and/or the practical techniques that teachers can use in different kinds of lessons.

The first step toward awareness raising is classroom observation which helps detect interactional features such as questioning techniques, wait-time and time-on-task. The second step consists of conducting research on what has been observed in order to further describe foreign language teaching and contribute additional knowledge to the field.

The study may thus inspire both teachers and student teachers in undertaking research projects based upon classroom observations. The study will also show how methodic and systematic observation of a feature of language
use, even the least significant, may constitute an important research topic. Also, the question whether CS as a natural use of language can be included in foreign language teaching methodology has thus far remained unanswered. As a result, language teachers seem to opt for one of the following strategies toward CS, to ignore, avoid or take it for granted without any further notice. This study may shed more light on the issue, and help develop a theory of CS based on classroom research.

With regard to the present development of research on CS, it may be argued that investigators have thus far dealt with two types of bilingual communities, (1) balanced-bilingual also called classic communities (Bokamba 1988, Heath 1989 and Myers-Scotton 1993a) such as established bilingual societies in which speakers are fluent in more than one language, and (2) unbalanced-bilingual communities (Dabène 1981, Martin-Jones 1995 and Hancock 1997) such as migrant societies and second language classrooms where speakers display high proficiency in only one of the languages available, mostly their native language.

Given this competence differential, it is legitimate to argue that patterns of CS in both types of communities are different. Foreign language classrooms in particular constitute a special type of bilingual community in that the ultimate goal of language use in instructional setting is not communication per se, but learning the language. A
better understanding of CS as a communicative strategy may be the result of insights from research on both balanced and unbalanced bilingual speakers.

**Basic Assumptions**

This study is based on the following three assumptions. The first is that communicative competence, as defined by Hymes (1972), includes not only linguistic competence, the knowledge of grammatical rules in Chomsky’s (1965) terms, but also the ability to use the language appropriately according to the context. One way of expressing this ability is through linguistic variation. Speakers, indeed, vary their speech according to the situation, the subject matter or their intent and motivation. Some evidence of linguistic variation includes foreigner talk, teacher talk, mother talk, and interlanguage. CS as the ability to switch from one language to another is also part of bilinguals’ communicative competence.

The second assumption is that linguistic variation is the norm, rather than the exception, in all kinds of human communication. CS is a natural type of language use in a bilingual setting. A foreign language classroom being a bilingual community, although a micro and unbalanced one, the kind of talk that occurs in such an environment is expected to include instances of CS.
Finally, the third assumption is that language teachers are also required to be researchers. Hoetker and Ahlbrand (1972), Shapiro-Skrobe (1982), Long (1983) and Gebhard et al. (1993) have pointed out the scarcity of research by language teachers when they argued that in many cases teachers, even well-trained ones, usually continue to follow the same patterns in teaching. This could originate in the lack of opportunity for complementary activities that gear to a revision of their practice. Almost in the same vein, Stern (1990) argues that there is shortage of research and no real research tradition in modern language teaching. As a consequence, Nunan (1992: 62) wrote: "teachers need to conceptualize their practice in theoretical terms". The results of such a conceptualization will be a change for more effective teaching, and a body of teaching theories based on teaching practice.

**Definition of Terms**

Before investigating classroom CS, it is necessary to define the concept first, and some of the key terms related to it. **Codeswitching** (also spelled **code-switching**) may be defined as a "change by a speaker (or writer) from one language or language variety to another" (Richards et al. 1993: 58). However, a broader notion of CS includes not only code alternation by the same speaker within a single
utterance, but also the use of a different language or language variety by another speaker at turn-taking (See Scotton 1993a). The focus of CS in the present study includes two languages in their spoken form, French and English, rather than varieties or styles of either of the two languages. Some researchers such as Muysken (1989), Kachru (1983) and Bokamba (1988) make a distinction between code-mixing (CM) and code-switching (CS). The former relates to switches performed within sentences (e.g., intra-sentential switches), while the latter refers to switches that occur between sentences (e.g., inter-sentential switches). In this investigation, however, the distinction is irrelevant because the focus of the study is on CS per se, that is, the occurrence of more than two languages in the interactions, rather than on the grammatical structure of the utterances.

A distinction is often made between codeswitching and borrowing. According to Appel and Muysken (1986), a term is called a borrowing when its sound and meaning are considered to have been integrated in the lexicon of another language. The integration may occur with or without substitution (i.e., phonological and/or morphological adaptation). In the former case, the word is known as loanword, whereas in the latter case it is called loan blend. A fundamental problem, however, remains about how to distinguish borrowing from nonce borrowing, a word not integrated in the receptor.
language, but used in a speaker’s discourse.

**Delimitations**

CS refers not only to language switches, but also to dialectal and stylistic variations. The present study, however, deals only with language switches in a foreign language classroom. Also, this study is not concerned with the written language, even though CS may be examined from the written language point of view as well as the oral. Finally, the study deals with CS performed in French classroom at the intermediate college level.

**Summary**

This introductory chapter has first provided some justification for the choice of the research topic, CS in foreign language teaching/learning environment. The difference in the treatment of CS from both researchers and teachers is the major motivation for the choice. Researchers, it was argued, have developed interest in the phenomenon, whereas teachers appear to display scepticism and embarrassment when confronted with it in their daily practice.

Next, four research questions were provided, before the significance of the study was analyzed. The importance of
the study consists of contributing insights on CS as a world phenomenon from an unbalanced bilingual community, and understanding the roles and functions of CS in this particular community named L2 classroom.

Finally, the chapter has presented three assumptions underlying this study. The most important includes the idea that language teachers are also expected to be researchers, following Nunan's (1993) claim that teaching has become so professionalized that research is now an indispensable skill for teachers.

**Organization of the Study**

This study includes five chapters. The first chapter, the introduction, deals with the statement of the problem, the research questions and the basic assumptions underlying the study. The significance of the study was discussed. The definitions of the important terms were provided prior to the delimitations of the scope of the study. However, the main task of the first chapter has mainly consisted of presenting the motivations for conducting this research project.

The second chapter deals with a review of literature of CS, and discusses three major aspects of the studies of CS including conversational CS, classroom CS and the interactional approach to CS investigations. The third
chapter which concerns the methodology provides a brief description of the research site, the Ohio State University in general, and the OSU French Program in particular, before explaining data collection procedure and data analysis.

The fourth chapter includes data analysis and presents the findings, whereas the fifth chapter examines the implications of the findings, and suggests some recommendations. Appendices are provided after the list of cited references.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

The establishment of CS as a valuable research topic for scholarly investigations dates back to the early 1970s. Before that period, the prevailing view was that CS was not worthy of research, because it was believed to represent inadequate linguistic competence of bilingual speakers. Haugen (1956) who is credited with having coined the term CS took nonetheless little interest in this type of language use. He first dismisses CS remarking that it is only "in abnormal cases" that speakers use two languages, and that the incorporation of the elements of one language into another language "merely means an alteration of the second language, not a mixture of the two" (Haugen 1950: 211).

Weinreich (1953) in turn analyzes lexical switches as cases of language transfer, not as instances of intrasentential CS. He writes: "The ideal bilingual switches from one language to another according to appropriate changes in the speech situation (interlocutors, topics, etc), but not in an unchanged speech situation, and
certainly not within a single sentence” (Weinreich 1953: 73).

Haugen's and Weinreich's attitude toward CS is to be interpreted as reflecting the structuralist trend in linguistics that prevailed at that time. Influenced by researchers such as de Saussure (1949), structuralist linguists hold the view that language consists of a system of interrelated lexical, grammatical and phonological elements, and that the interrelations among those elements are either syntagmatic (e.g., how they are sequenced in an utterance), or paradigmatic (e.g., how they contrast with one another to make categories). Such a belief in the integrity of grammatical system precluded the existence of CS as part of linguistic competence.

Research in bilingualism before the 1970s was also influenced by Ferguson's (1959) and Fishman's (1965) studies. Ferguson investigated language diglossia, a situation in which two varieties of a same language coexist within a community. One called High variety is usually a more standard variety, whereas the other, a non-prestigious variety, is called Low variety. The former is used in government, education, religious services and the media. The latter is used in daily life interactions in the family and among friends. Examples of diglossia, Ferguson indicates, may be found in languages such as Swiss German, Modern Greek
and Haitian Creole.

Fishman is credited with the introduction of the notion of language "domains" in sociolinguistic investigations. The essence of the notion is that there are three factors or domains that lead a bilingual speaker to make the language choice. These are (1) the group to which s/he belongs, (2) the situation in which s/he finds her/himself, and (3) the topic involved. Language choice here is not limited to varieties of the same language, but also includes different languages. For this reason, Fishman's work may be seen as an extension of Ferguson's study.

The concepts of diglossia and domain have, nonetheless, faced much criticism. Their most noticeable weaknesses consist of the emphasis on factors beyond the speaker's control. Rather than explaining language choice, diglossia excludes the individual's option. For the same reason, the concept of domain has been abandoned in favor of an approach based on the analysis of social interactions.

The present development of studies of CS originates in Gumperz's (1967, 1972, 1982a, 1982b) work. Researchers, however, agree that it is Blom and Gumperz's (1972) article published in a collection of essays on sociolinguistics by Gumperz and Hymes that constitutes a landmark for research in CS. The article reports on an investigation of CS involving two dialects of Norwegian in Hemnesberget, a
fishermen’s village in northern Norway. One of the major findings of the study is the distinction that the authors make between situational and metaphorical CS. Situational CS is triggered by a change in participants or/and topics, and it is “patterned and predictable on the basis of certain features of the local system” (Blom and Gumperz 1972: 409).

Metaphorical CS, on the other hand, is a change in topical emphasis or/and comment. This means that CS is one of the many devices known as contextualization cues. These include verbal (e.g., prosody and choice of lexical items) and nonverbal (e.g., eye contact and body posture) signals used by participants to express different kinds of meaning in an interaction.

Though the distinction between situational and metaphorical CS has been criticized for being unclear (see Auer 1984 and Myers-Scotton 1993), it has nonetheless put forward the idea that there are two kinds of organizations involved in the production of CS. These are external and internal organizations. The former include elements beyond the speaker’s control such as the setting and the situation; whereas the latter relate to the speaker’s motivation and intention.

Another important result of Blom and Gumperz’s (1972) study is the recognition of CS as a skilled language use. Indeed, nowhere in their analysis do the researchers
study is the recognition of CS as a skilled language use. Indeed, nowhere in their analysis do the researchers consider CS as aberrant or unique to some exotic cultures. Instead, they present CS as a linguistic phenomenon of significant importance, and hence worth of scholarly investigation.

CS has to the present days been studied from different perspectives including social, psychological, educational and SLA-based orientations. Despite this diversity of perspectives, the two contexts in which CS has mostly been investigated thus far are naturally occurring conversations and foreign language classrooms.

**Conversational Codeswitching**

CS was first observed and investigated in natural conversation before it became a topic for classroom-related research. Utterances from naturally occurring conversations of bilingual speakers constitute the primary data for the studies of conversational CS. Three major trends have developed in this particular area, the linguistic (or grammatical), the sociolinguistic, and the interactional (or discourse analysis) trends. The following is a brief discussion of the three paradigms.
The linguistic/grammatical trend

The linguistic/grammatical perspective to CS includes work by researchers interested in the extent to which grammatical theory and CS are related. Linguists’ main task has been to detect the syntactic constraints on the production of switched codes. Those constraints have sometimes been examined in a linear fashion, that is, the sentence is viewed as a meaningful string of words drawn from different categories (e.g., noun, verb and preposition). A study of Mexican-Americans’ and Puerto Ricans’ speech conducted from this perspective by Gumperz and Hernandez-Chavez (1972: 95) showed that Spanish-English switches were possible between a head noun and a relative clause as in

(1) ... friends from Mexico QUE TIENEN CHAMÁQUITOS
who have little children

and between a subject and a predicate in sentences involving a copula as in

(2) An’ my uncle Sam ES EL MAS AGABACHADO
is the most Americanized
(Gumperz & Hernandez-Chavez 1972: 92)

Using the same approach, Timm (1975) suggests that no switch is permissible between an auxiliary and a main verb, or between a main verb and an infinitive as shown in the
following examples quoted from Appel and Muysken 1989: 122):

3) (a) *Ha (he has) seen 1
    (b) *They want AVENIR (to come)

The problem with Timm’s study is that subsequent work has provided many counter-examples to her findings. The following examples from Poplack (1978: 11) show that the above switches are in fact possible.

(4) (a) So you take the ham... as they’re ABLANDANDO, 
softening,

YA QUE ESTA UN POQUITO HIRVIENDO, TU LE ECHAS EL 
as they are boiling a little, you throw in the

QUESO DEL JAMON
throw in the ham bone

(b) There’s an old Spanish saying that it goes, you have to DAR DE L’ALA PA’ COMER DE LA PECHUGA
give from the wing to get from the breast

An oft-quoted study is Poplack’s (1980) investigation of English-Spanish CS in a Puerto Rican community in East Harlem, New York. Two of her most popular findings are known as the equivalence constraint and the free-morpheme constraint. In the equivalence constraint, Poplack (1980: 586) argues: “Code-switches will tend to occur at points in discourse where juxtaposition of L1 and L2.. elements does not violate a syntactical rule of either language, i.e., at point around which the surface structures of the two languages map onto each other”. This means CS is possible

1. (*) indicates that the sentence is ungrammatical.
only if the phrase structure rules of the two languages are identical. The following example from Poplack (1980: 585) illustrates the equivalent constraint between English and Spanish. The vertical lines show places where switches are possible, whereas crossed lines indicate points at which switches are not allowed.

\[ (5) \text{I told him that so that he would bring it fast} \]
\[ (Yo) \text{le dije eso pa’ que (el) la trajiera rapido} \]

The free-morpheme constraint, on the other hand states that "code may be switched after any constituent provided that the constituent is not a bound morpheme" (Poplack 1980: 585) as in

\[ (6) *\text{eat - IENDO (eating)} \]

Like Timm’s (1975) findings, Poplack’s (1980) equivalence and free-morpheme constraints have also found many counter-examples from different languages. Using data from Adagme-English speech by a group of Ghanaians, Narrey (1982: 185) provides evidence that switches may occur even at points where there is no equivalence between the two languages.

\[ (7) \text{A ne mi help-e} \]
\[ \text{They are help-ing me} \]

Counter-examples of the free-morpheme constraint have

---

2. Adagme is spoken in south-eastern Ghana.
also been provided by Bentahila and Davies (1986) who report that French verb stems can be inflected with Moroccan Arabic affixes. Panharipande (1990) shows that English nouns can take Marathi possessive suffixes. Other counter-examples are the result of research on agglutinative languages, namely Bantu languages. Bokamba (1988) and Kamwangamalu (1989) have shown the inconsistency of the free-morpheme constraint in Lingala-French and Ciluba-French CS. The following is Myers-Scotton (1993b: 30) counter-example from a Swahili-English corpus.

(8) Hapa FLAME hiyo inaenda juu haiwezi ku- -ku- -BURN INFIN 2s OBJ

"The flame is going upwards, it can’t burn you"

In an effort to solve the many problems raised by the linear approach, some researchers have engaged in non-linear types of investigation. One such approach is the GB-based approach used by Woolford (1983), DiSciullo, Muysken and Sigh (1986), and Pandit (1990). Initiated by Chomsky (1981, 1986), GB (Government and Binding) theory proclaims that language grammars refer to principles that are common to all

3. Marathi is spoken in central India.

4. Lingala is widespread in the Democratic Republic of Congo, whereas Ciluba is spoken in south-western Congo.

5. Swahili is spoken in east-central Africa and eastern Congo.
the languages.

In short, GB is mostly concerned with the hierarchy of the phrases that constitute sentence structure. Its basic assumption is that the internal structure of a phrase is determined by its head (e.g., the main word of a phrase). Thus, for instance, an N (noun) determines the category of the Complements (i.e., obligatory constituent) and Adjuncts (i.e., optional constituent) that make up an NP (noun phrase), whereas a VP (verb phrase) reflects the features of its verb (e.g., number or tense). GB also determines the limits in which nouns and referring expressions (e.g., pronouns and reflexives) can adequately be interpreted.

Woolford (1983) applied GB theory to CS research and made a claim similar to Poplack’s (1980) notion of equivalent constraint. Based on a study of Spanish-English CS, Woolford found that switches from one language to another were easily performed when the syntactic structures in the two languages overlap. For instance, switches were possible between a Determiner and a Noun. This is because the rule structure for an NP is the same in both languages:

\[ \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{Det} \quad \text{N: the boy} \]

\[ \text{el muchacho} \]

However, no switches were allowed between a Noun and an Adjective because the structure rules in both languages are
different as shown below:

NP -> Adj N: good boy
NP -> N Adj: muchacho bueno

Switches are nonetheless possible between the English phrase “good boy” and its equivalent marked form in Spanish “bueno muchacho”.

Di Sciullo et al. (1986: 5) in turn argued that “any constraint on code-mixing should capture the fact that within a sentence elements bearing a certain type of relation to each other must be drawn from the same lexicon”. This relation, they explain, is one of government. Their claim is summarized in the following formula (Di Sciullo et al. 1986: 5),

(10) if X governs Y, \ldots X^q \ldots Y^q

which means if X has language index q and if it governs Y, Y must have language index q as well. Using examples from other researchers’ studies, Di Sciullo and her associates were able to show that un gover ned elements such as tags and exclamations could easily be switched, but that governed elements such as objects could not.

Finally, using a Hindi-English corpus, Pandit (1990: 33) examined the grammaticality of sentences involving switched items in terms of the “observance of the rules, principles and constraints of Universal Grammar (UG)”. Pandit suggests that a crucial factor in determining
grammaticality in a code switched sentence is government relationship. He goes on to provide numerous examples of government relations in structures such as NPs, simple and embedded sentences. Pandit’s (1990: 39) major claim, however, is that “CS must not violate the syntax of the head of the maximal projection within which it takes place”.

Despite its strong theoretical appeal and popularity, the GB-based approach to the study of CS presents some drawbacks. The most important is the fact that some government relations such as subject-verb, specifier-noun and verb-adverb do not obey the rule. The Adanme-English sentence in (7) above includes a switch between a verb and a object, whereas the following Spanish-French example from Sankoff and Poplack (1981: 27) illustrates a case of CS between a verb and an adverb.

(11) Mettava tanto MAQUILLAGE sulla faccia
    “She put so much MAKE UP on her face”

Another nonlinear approach to the study of CS is Myers-Cotton's (1995b) lexically based approach known as the Matrix Language Framework (MLF) model. The main argument of this model may be summarized in the following three principles. The first is that of the two languages involved in CS, one is more dominant than the other. The dominant language is the matrix language (ML), whereas the other is the embedded language (EL). The second principle states that
the distinction between system versus content morphemes is crucial in processing switches. System morphemes are categories such as function words and affixes whose role "involves quantification across variables", Myers-Cotton (1995b: 240) explains. Content morphemes, on the other hand, include categories such as nouns and verbs and any lexical item likely to either assign or receive a theta role6. Finally, the third principle insists that it is the ML which determines the morphosyntax of a mixed constituent, that is, a unit composed of the elements from both the matrix language and the embedded language (ML + EL). Most importantly, the model argues that all the syntactically relevant system morphemes of a mixed constituent come from the ML.

Unlike the other approaches discussed above, the MFL model has accounted for many cases of irregularity found in the formulation of universal constraints on CS. Nonetheless, some researchers have argued that the identification of the ML is not always easy, especially "in language contact situations where convergence and interchangeability of codes are very high" (Ramat 1995: 55). Gardner-Chloros (1995: 70) questions the notion that the system of the ML hardly

6 Theta role (from the theta theory, a sub-category of Universal Grammar) is a semantic role such as Patient or Agent is assigned to a noun phrase in a sentence.
changes, and suggests that "a more flexible framework" be found to account for switches of grammatical patterns available in mixed constituents. The studies of the grammar of CS have mainly consisted of trying to relate two observations. The first is that switch patterns are a function of contact situations. That is, different switch patterns are found in different language contact situations. The second observation is that switch patterns depend on the typological characteristics of the languages involved. Romance languages, for instance, produce code switches that are different from those performed in Bantu languages, and that the combination between the two language groups is likely to result in new patterns of language alternation. Of the two observations, Muysken (1995) finds that the first is methodologically more desirable because it makes a unified account of CS possible.

Pandharipande (1990) in turn notes that a grammar-based approach has to the present days failed to provide a cross linguistic explanation of CS. The reasons, she states, are that (1) in most studies no distinction is made between universal and language-specific character of constraints, and that (2) the variable patterns in CS have often been ignored. She suggests an approach in which both the contextual (i.e., functional) and grammatical dimensions of CS are taken into consideration.
The sociolinguistic trend

The purpose of the sociolinguistic trend consists of finding out which speech communities show language alternation in which situations and for what purposes (Auern 1984). Influenced by Ferguson's (1959) and Fishman's (1965) concepts of diglossia and language domains, early researchers of CS such as Gumperz (1967, 1972) and Abdulaziz (1972) aimed at providing a principled account of language alternation at the social level. In the recent years the scope of sociolinguistic investigation has been extended to include not only the speech of long-established bilingual communities, but also the language use of migrant societies.

Work on bilingual communities includes Gardner-Chloros's, (1991) study of language selection and switching in Strasbourg, Alsace, eastern France. Alsatian, one of the numerous varieties of German, is spoken in the area alongside French. The researcher's main purpose was to gather quantitative data on the use and the extent of French-Alsatian CS in Strasbourg and the neighboring areas. Using stores, an insurance office, a bakery and a plumber's shop as domains of the two languages, Gardner-Chloros's hypothesized that in places of higher social standing French, not Alsatian, would more frequently be used. In
places of lower prestige, however, more Alsatian would be expected. In addition, the age of the individuals involved in the interactions would constitute a variable for language choice.

The results of the investigation supported most of the hypotheses. Concerning stores, it was found that more Alsatian was spoken in lower standing stores than in high standing ones. The latter showed more switching as well as more use of French. As for age, French displayed a higher percentage of use in the three age groups involved (e.g., below 31, below 46 and over 45). The rate of switching in the three groups was also high. Similarly, the predominant use of French in high standard work place such as an insurance office was obvious, compared with low prestige work place such as a bakery and a plumber's shop where Alsatian was mostly used. Gardner-Chloros (1991) concludes that language choice and switching in that particular community was influenced by factors such as the speaker's linguistic competence, his/her perception of the interlocutor, and by some other "deeper" reasons including individual characteristics, language change, ethnic compromise, and social behavior. Myers-Scotton's (1993a) study of Eastern African communities is another example of the sociolinguistic paradigm in CS research. The major goal of the study consisted in answering the question: "What do
bilingual speakers gain by conducting a conversation in two languages (i.e., through codeswitching) rather than simply using one language throughout" Myers-Scotton 1993a: 3). The data were collected in the capital cities of Nairobi in Kenya and Harare in Zimbabwe, and in the rural areas of the two countries. The corpus included audio-recordings of naturally occurring conversations in places such as participants' homes, bus stops, car parks and bars. The languages involved were Swahili, Kikuyu, Luyia (or a variety of it), Kalendjin and English in the case of Kenya, whereas English and Shona were the major languages used in the conversations recorded in Zimbabwe. The results of this study constitute the basic motivations for Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model (MM) of CS. According to the MM, part of bilingual speakers’ linguistic competence is the awareness that language choice in a bilingual setting is either unmarked or marked. The unmarked choice is the language usually expected in a conversation between two or more participants. The marked choice, on the other hand, refers to the language that signals a departure from the norm.

The two major components of the MM are the speaker and the social context. The speaker, as a rational actor, makes his/her decision on whether to use language X rather than Y only after s/he has assessed potential costs and rewards that such a choice would entail. Decision-making is possible
because the speaker's mind includes a device called "markedness matrix" that enables her/him to assess codes choices as marked and unmarked. The social context, which determines the norms of social behavior among the members of a community, is also responsible for establishing rights-and-obligations sets between participants in a conversation. This means that it is through daily life experience that community members acquire the awareness of what language to use, with whom, in what circumstance and why.

The sociolinguistic perspective of CS, as mentioned early, has also been investigated in migrant societies. This area includes studies by researchers such as Dabène (1981, 1990), Dabène and Billiez (1986), Moore (1986), Schatz (1989) and Del Coso-Calame et al. (1985). The following is a short presentation of a study conducted by Dabène and Moore (1995) on the Iberian and Algerian communities in Grenoble, France.

The study involves two populations, a Spanish or Portuguese community on the one hand, and an Algerian community on the other hand. The two populations were further divided into two age groups related to two different generations including children and their parents. The research question consisted of (a) finding out the types of CS used by the participants and the contextual constraints that conditioned that use, and (b) uncovering the types of
bilingual behavior and the situational conditions that seemed to encourage them. The data were collected by recording naturally occurring conversations among the participants.

The results concerning the types of CS and their constraints showed that the four subgroups of participants had recourse to three main kinds of CS: (1) inter-utterance CS (e.g., a switch performed between two utterances of the same speaker and mostly perceived as a change of code rather than a case of CS), (2) intersentential or intrasentential CS (e.g., a switch whose function involves a change in discourse orientation such as from statement to request), (3) segmental CS (e.g., a switch that modifies the whole segment of an utterance), or unitary CS (e.g., a switch that only modifies a lexical item of an utterance). As for the constraints on the performance of those switches, the researchers found that the participants in this study continuously renegotiated the conditions that allow CS, contrary to what is usually expected in typical diglossic situations in which the functions of CS are pre-determined by the social context. The study showed that CS was not triggered by the social context alone, but also by the individual communicative competence of the participants. The interaction between situational factors and bilingual linguistic and pragmatic knowledge seemed to be crucial.
With regard to the types of bilingual behavior and their conditions of emergence, two major claims were made. The first is the notion of complementary bilingualism whereby the older generation (e.g., the parents) tended to use elements from both languages to compensate for the insufficient mastery of either of the two codes. The second claim is the idea of functional bilingualism found in the younger generation (e.g., the children). The participants in this category used elements from both languages as a discourse strategy to signal stylistic or pragmatic differences. The emergence of both complementary and functional bilingualism were determined by two types of setting, the family context and peer group interactions.

In answering the question of what speech communities show language alternation in which situation and for what purposes, the ultimate goal of sociolinguistic research has been to provide a cross-linguistic explanation of CS. This explanation has sometimes been expressed in the form of a taxonomy of reasons for CS, and supported by findings from pragmatics (see Sperber and Wilson 1986) and communication studies (see Giles 1979). The basic claim made in those studies is that linguistic variation is the norm in most human interactions, and that speakers vary speech because they are rational actors who first evaluate the cost and reward of every single move before acting. Thus, according
to Appel and Muysken (1987), CS is used to serve the following 6 functions:

1. referential function, that is, switches are used to fill out communication gaps in one of the two languages involved in an interaction;
2. directive function. This means speakers may switch to associate or disassociate themselves with the interlocutor;
3. expressive function: CS is a mode of speech by itself, especially among balanced bilingual speakers;
4. phatic or metaphorical function whereby a switch signals a change of topic or participants configuration;
5. metalinguistic function: the use of language to express attitude or knowledge of language.
6. poetic function is the use of CS for artistic purposes such as in fiction, poetry and drama.

The taxonomic approach to CS was particularly successful in the 1970s and early in the 1980s when the use of scientific methods in sociolinguistic investigations was the norm. Sociolinguists, Labov (1966) in particular, have long believed that theories of language use could most appropriately be generated through testing hypotheses and quantitative research techniques. Since the 1980s, however, the resurgence of descriptive and qualitative approaches has strongly challenged the primacy of natural sciences methods.
in investigating social sciences. As a result, the taxonomic approach to CS has become obsolete. Also, as a general impression, the approach has failed to provide an exhaustive account of the reasons why bilingual speakers alternate between languages; nor did it attempt to explain how this alternation takes place.

Just like work in First Language Acquisition (FLA) helped develop Second Language Acquisition (SLA) as a discipline, research on conversational CS constitutes the background to the investigation of classroom CS. Also, just like in the case of FLA versus SLA, one may argue about the extent to which conversational CS and classroom CS resemble or differ from one another. Even though a comparative approach of both settings is not the focus of the present investigation, drawing insights from one situation to explain the other may prove helpful in the process.

The interactional trend

The purpose of the interactional perspective is to determine the meaning/function of individual instances of language alternation by examining how they relate to previous utterances in the discourse. The trend originates in research in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis
Initiated by Garfinkel (1967: 11) ethnomethodology is "the investigation of the rational properties of indexical expressions and other practical actions as contingent ongoing accomplishments of organized artful practices of everyday life". Garfinkel's main idea is that people construct a stable social world through daily life activities. Social order, therefore, is not a pre-established attribute of a community, but the result of a joint effort of community members throughout their daily life interactions.

The initial and most fundamental step in the analysis of social action is observation. As Atkinson and Heritage (1992: 18) indicate, in order to develop a "natural observable science" of interaction, researchers need a high level of "openness to empirical phenomena." This means observation must focus on naturally occurring social events, and proceed without preconceived ideas on what is there to be found, or on the importance of the event at stake. Thus, a systematic and detailed study of social phenomena, even the smallest ones, may help understand the way in which humans do things.

Conversation analysis (CA) is a form of ethnomethodological research technique that has developed in the last twenty years. Founded by Sack (1964) in
collaboration with Schegloff and Jefferson (see Sack, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974), CA is the investigation of the competences underlying ordinary social activities. Its basic assumptions, according to Heritage (1992: 241) are the following: (1) interaction is structurally organized, (2) contributions to interaction are contextually oriented and (3) these two properties inhere in the details of interaction so that no order of detail can be dismissed, a priori, as disorderly, accidental or irrelevant. Sequentiality is therefore a crucial feature of CA. That is, determining how utterances achieve individual actions, given their position and involvement in the sequences of actions constitutes the ultimate goal of conversation analysts.

The CA perspective in CS studies was introduced by Auer in the early 1980s as a reaction to the taxonomic approach. His first attempts (see Auer 1981) is an article in which he characterizes "bilingualism as a members' concepts". It is, however, his subsequent publications that provide a well documented concept of his approach. One of those publications is his report on the Muttersprache italienischer Gastarbeiterkinder (M.I.G.) project, also known as the Constance Project. This is a monograph (see Auer 1984) based on about 1800 instances of language alternation recorded from 20 Italian migrant children in Constance, West Germany. As Auer (1984: 9) himself writes: "
The aim of this little book is not to analyze the linguistic situation of Italian migrant children in Germany, ... [but] to outline a model of bilingual conversation which should be applicable to other bilingual communities as well".

Auer's model of bilingual conversation includes the following main features. The first is what he calls "the sequential implicativeness of language choice" (Auer 1984: 5). This means any language choice a participant makes in order to organize his/her turn has an impact on the subsequent language choices by the same or other participants.

The second characteristic relates to two pairs of distinctions, (1) discourse-related versus participant-related language alternation, and (2) transfer versus CS. The first distinction is straightforward and means that language alternation may co-occur with a change in the discourse, or in the participants constellation. The second distinction is more complex.

Transfer, according to Auer, is a referential language choice, that is, a switched element (e.g., a word, phrase, sentence or a larger unit) that simply signals a participant's linguistic competence or lack of competence, or a structure that shares the same meaning with a previous structure in the conversation. CS on the other hand refers to particular points in the conversation where various kinds
of function are introduced such as topic or participant change. In other words, there is evidence for CS if language alternation coincides with change of footing.

This definition of transfer versus CS is further complicated with the notion that both kinds of language alternation can be discourse-related or participant-related. Auer seems to acknowledge the difficulty when he insists that transfer be related to language structures in general, but typically to words, and that the focus of CS be not simply the point at which a language switch occurs, but mainly the kind of meaning change such an alternation brings about.

Auer's approach to investigate local meanings is thus based on a two-way procedural grid including the above pairs of distinction. The researcher needs first to distinguish transfer from CS, before s/he can determine how each category is related to the discourse or the participants. A sequential analysis of members' utterances is crucial in providing evidence for each of the four categories known as (1) discourse-related transfer, (2) participant-related transfer, (3) discourse-related CS, and (4) participant-related CS.

Another important distinction Auer (1984) makes is one between transfer from the second language acquisition (SLA) point of view, and transfer from the members' perspective.
The former, he argues, takes the monolingual systems of the two languages in contact as the point of reference, whereas the latter takes bilingualism as the norm. Also, the "proof procedures" in the two cases are different. SLA transfer usually does not behave as a contextualization cue so that "we cannot demonstrate that the production of an other-language item has a function", Auer (1984: 27) writes. Members' transfer on the other hand is concerned with showing evidence for, rather than speculating on the participant's reasons for language alternation.

Finally, in a recent article that summarizes and revises some of his previous claims, Auer (1995) further explains the effectiveness of a sequential approach in investigating CS. He first dismisses the transfer-CS dichotomy and coins the terms "code-alternation" to refer to the two types of language alternation. He then goes on to argues that CS is basically one of the various contextualization cues available to all interactants. This means "all those activities by participants which make relevant, maintain, revise, cancel some aspects of context which, in turn, is responsible for the interpretation of an utterance in its particular locus of occurrence" (Auer 1995: 123). However, CS as a contextualization cue is strongly related to the sequential patterns of language choice.

CS, according to Auer (1995) is an index of language
negotiation. Although situational factors may remain stable, what is being said in a conversation is often subject to constant re-definition between the participants. A careful analysis of code-alternation sequences helps the researcher find structural features which, in turn, determine the dynamic nature of a conversational event.

CS in Classroom Discourse

Classrooms discourse has been a prolific research area for studies in the last two decades (see McHoul 1978, Mehan 1979, Payne and Hustler 1980, Brophy 1982, Macpherson 1983, Macbeth 1987, 1991). Some of those studies have underlined fundamental differences between classroom discourse and natural conversation. One of such differences, according to McHoul (1978), consists of the formal aspect of the classroom.

Classrooms are, in McHoul’s (1987: 14) terms, “formal situations”, which means “those [situations] in which the persons taking part have allocated positions”. These positions usually include a platform of some sort for the chairperson, and members’ positions at a lower level facing the chairperson. The spatial organization of a formal setting also influences the organization of talk. For
instance, Payne and Hustler (1980) found that in most cases teachers address individual students as members of a cohort. The classroom includes, indeed, a cohort of several participants, possibly 20 to 30 and sometimes more. Individual students are members of the cohort, and each student’s turn is usually perceived as a cohort’s turn. Such a perception implicitly creates a sense of mutual responsibility among the students. The strategy, Payne and Hustler concludes, is crucial for enhancing participation from the students, and maintaining order in the classroom. In addition, the whole organization being under the teacher’s authority and supervision, instances of overlap, that is, talk by more than one person at the same time is reduced to the minimum.

McHoul (1981: 198) in turn describes the three major areas of difference between natural conversation and classroom talk as follows:

1. The potential for gap and pause is maximized
2. The potential for overlap is minimized in that:
   2a) the possibility of the teacher (or a student) ‘opening up’ the talk to self-selecting first starter is not accounted for
   2b) the possibility of a student using a ‘current speaker select next’ technique to select another is not accounted for
(3) The permutability [openness] of turn-taking is minimized.

Despite those differences, classroom interactions have shown some common patterns with natural conversations. Both include a wide range of speech acts such as requests, responses and repetitions. Their most important common feature, however, remains the possibility for the negotiation of meaning\(^7\).

Early classroom CS investigations focused on how language policies were being implemented into the daily classroom life. This was particularly the case of the American school system during the 1970s when the controversy about bilingual education was a major concern. To some educators, bilingualism was a handicap to the development of minority children’s L1, Spanish in particular. Research was therefore needed in order to determine the extent to which L1 and L2 were used in the classroom (see Martin-Jones 1995). Two studies, Townsend and Zamora (1975) and Lagaretta (1977) represent this early attempt of classroom CS research.

Townsend and Zamora (1975) compared verbal and non verbal interaction patterns of bilingual teachers and

---

\(^7\) The issue of meaning negotiation is developed further in the study.
assistant teachers of a child care center in Texas. In all, 56 teachers and assistant teachers were involved in the study. 53 among them were Mexican-American. The children were 3 to 4 years old, most of them Mexican-American and monolingual speakers of Spanish. The purpose of the study was to find out (1) whether verbal and nonverbal behaviors of bilingual teachers differed from those of assistant teachers, and (2) whether bilingual teachers and assistant teachers exhibited different verbal and nonverbal interaction patterns when they taught the same subject but in two languages.

The results showed significant differences between teachers' and assistant teachers' behaviors. Concerning verbal behavior, it was found that teachers tended to be more indirect than assistant teachers, using more praise, acceptance and encouragement. Assistant teachers scored higher on "teacher talk" category, with more lecturing, telling and idle conversations. Differences were also found in nonverbal behavior. The most significant was that assistant teachers displayed more instances of negative behaviors. These included negative nodding of head and negative eye contact.

About using one language or the other for the same subject matter, differences between the two groups were found only in verbal behavior. Lessons taught in Spanish
included more teachers' and assistant teachers' questioning, more students' responding and more rejections of students' responses. Lessons taught in English, however, showed a greater percentage of directives, praises and reinforcing behaviors. An important implication of the study was that nonverbal interaction patterns seem to be more universal, and can easily be used to bridge the language gap within a communication event.

Lagaretta (1977) examined language use in five bilingual Spanish classrooms. The participants were kindergarten students and teachers from a Californian city with a diversity of ethnic communities. Four of the classrooms used the Concurrent Translation method initiated by Tucker et al. (1970). This means material was presented alternatively in Spanish and English. One classroom used a modification of the Alternate Days approach that consisted in using English one day until recess, then Spanish until dismissal. Another day Spanish was used until recess, then English until dismissal. About 65% of the students was composed of native Spanish speakers. Four of the teachers were Spanish speakers. One teacher was a native of American English, but with high proficiency in Spanish. The observation procedure utilized was an adaptation of Flanders’s (1970) Multiple Coding System, combined with categories from Ober et al.’s (1971) Reciprocal Category
System.

The results showed that in Concurrent Translation model, (1) English was used by teachers over 70% of the whole class time, (2) Spanish-speaking students responded with very similar language choices, (3) teacher talk included 80 to 85% of classroom talk, and (4) English was the language used for directing, warning and correcting. The model therefore did not achieve the balanced use of language, 50% Spanish and 50% English, expected of both the teachers and the learners. The Alternate Days approach, on the other hand, produced an equal distribution of Spanish and English by teachers and learners overall, but with more Spanish used for warming and directing. Again, correcting errors was performed in English.

Since the 1980s, however, the focus of classroom CS studies has shifted from frequency count of the elements of the embedded language to a broader view of interaction as a discourse. Using descriptive kinds of approach, researchers have mostly been interested in finding out how teachers and learners achieve acts in bilingual classrooms when they switch from one language to another, and what language values are being transmitted through such an alternation.

Two techniques have been used in order to assess the functions of classroom CS. One is sequential (fully discussed in the next section), which examines the function
of CS by relating utterances to previous ones from either the same speaker or other speakers. The other technique is non-sequential.

A most recent study of classroom CS using the sequential technique is Hancock’s (1997) analysis of language “layering”. Hancock investigated the language produced by 18 Spanish-speaking teenagers during group activities of English lessons in Madrid. He found that CS performed in those circumstances included two levels that he respectively named literal and nonliteral frame. The literal frame was produced off-record and equated with genuine negotiations among the participants. The nonliteral frame, however, was produced on-record and meant to be heard by both a referee (e.g., the teacher) and the whole class audience. Hancock also found that the unmarked language for on-record discourse was English whose function mainly consisted of turn-taking. On the other hand, when Spanish was used for on-record discourse, it signaled insections (e.g., words or short phrases) and jokes.

A pedagogical implication of the study, Hancock concludes, is that language learning is influenced by the set of attitudes evolving between the referees and the learners as individuals, and among the learners themselves. For instance, by referring to a marked (on-record) use of
L1, a learner may want to express divergence from the referee. Sometimes, convergence to the referee throughout a marked (off-record) use of the target language may constitute an opportunity for a learner to be considered as a traitor by his/her in-group classmates.

A non-sequential kind of study is Milk's (1981) analysis of the speech of a Mexican-American teacher during a civics class in California. It was found that English prevailed in most classroom acts, especially in directives and metastatements (e.g., the category of acts whose function is to help the students understand the structure of the lesson). The only act that was performed equally in Spanish and English was elicitation. To Milk, the implication of the predominance of English in directives is that English is the language of power and authority.

Ndairyipfuwamiye (1993) examined several Grade 5 lessons in Burundi, and found that the teachers and the students constantly refrained from switching codes in language lessons, namely in Kirundi and French lessons. The reason, Ndaryipfuwamiye says, was that the teachers were trying to implement the textbooks step by step. The few cases of Kirundi switches that were recorded during some of the French classes dealt with questioning and checking comprehension. On the other hand, an abundant use of CS was found during content courses such as math, natural science
and history. The language of instruction for those courses being French, the teachers frequently used Kirundi to introduce new material (e.g., the presentation stage) and reinforce the acquisition of new knowledge (e.g., the practice stage). Ndayipfukamiye concludes that despite strict curriculum regulation and teacher’s effort to avoid it, CS does exist in Burundi’s classrooms. For this reason, it “should be explicitly accounted for in decisions about teaching methods and language policies” (Ndayipfukamiye 1993: 91).

Andendorff (1996) conducted a similar study in South Africa, using a corpus of high school teachers’ and students’ speech during English, biology and geography classes. Unlike Ndayipfukamiye (1993), Andendorff recorded many instances of CS in the English class in which Zulu was mostly used in the presentation phase of the lesson. CS at this crucial stage served to facilitate comprehension and convey meta-messages, that is, information beyond course content. This, most probably, was because the subject of the lesson, literary explanation of a poem, was a particularly difficult one. Attention-getters in Zulu were frequent in the biology class. As for the geography class, Andendorff notes that CS was mainly used by the teacher to fulfill social objectives such as classroom management, building solidarity, and entertaining. Like Ndayipfukamiye (1993),
Andendorff also emphasizes the role of CS as a contextualization cue, a communicative resource that helps teachers and students achieve a number of social and educational objectives in the classroom such as accommodating to the interlocutor’s speech or drawing attention.

A most insightful observation from the two studies, however, isNdipfukamiye’s (1993) notion that despite their lower educational status in Africa, local languages cannot be avoided in the classroom. Rather than minimizing their role, one should instead examine their contribution to education in general, and to foreign language learning in particular.

**Summary**

This review of literature has consisted of a survey of the studies on CS from its beginning to the present day. CS was presented from two different research areas, natural conversation and classroom conversation. Conversational CS included the sociolinguistic trend, the linguistic or grammatical perspective and the interactional approach which constitute the three majors developments in the studies of CS.
Although interest in language contact phenomena dates back to Weinreich's (1953) and Haugen's (1956) era, no actual studies of CS was undertaken before the publication of Blom and Gumperz's (1972) article on CS in Norway. Before that time, research on language alternation was mainly conducted according to the allocation model of who said what, where and when initiated by Ferguson (1959) and Fishman (1965), and developed later on by Hymes (1972).

From the sociolinguistic point of view, the focus of research of CS studies of CS has been to account for the motivations for CS, a task the taxonomic approach could achieve only partially. That is why the interactional approach based on the notion of sequentiality was proposed. Linguists on the other hand have mostly tried to find out whether CS entails constraints at the syntactic level. Here again research has proven inconclusive thus far. Finally, an overview of research of CS in L2 environment was provided. The main argument was that even though it may be categorized as a formal setting, a classroom setting involves language use features that are similar to those found in a natural conversation, but most importantly, talk in both types of settings includes a gradual process whereby meaning is
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

Research methods may be divided into two main categories known as the quantitative and qualitative paradigms. The former, usually associated with natural science investigations, has also been called the positivist trend. The latter, more appropriate in social science research, is also known as the constructivist trend.

Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) and Johnson (1992) describe the major differences between the two paradigms by pointing out that the quantitative paradigm advocates the use of quantitative methods (e.g., statistic analyses), seeks to establish cause-effect relationships among phenomena, and ultimately leads to generalizability. The qualitative paradigm, on the other hand, resorts to qualitative methods (e.g., descriptive analyses) by relying on naturalistic and uncontrolled observations. In addition, the qualitative paradigm is subjective (i.e., includes researcher's opinion and bias) and process-oriented; whereas the quantitative paradigm is objective (i.e., remote from
the researcher’s perspective) and result-oriented.

The choice of either of the approaches mainly depends on both the nature of the data and the purpose of the investigation. However, the ultimate issue is not research methods as such, Rist (1971: 43) explains, but "the adherence to one paradigm as opposed to another [which] predisposes one to view the world and the events within it in profoundly different ways".

A qualitative approach implemented by means of discourse analysis has been chosen for the present investigation. The motivation for such as choice is to be found in a philosophical perspective named constructivism (or constructionism) which underlies the whole concept of CA.

Represented in the work of researchers such as Weber (1949), Berger and Luckman (1966), Schulz (1967), Garfinkel (1967) and Heritage (1987), constructivism is “philosophical perspective interested in the ways in which human beings individually and collectively interpret or construct the social and psychological world in specific linguistic, social and historical contexts.” (Schandt 1997: 19). A narrower strand of the movement with a focus on social process and interaction is known as social constructivism. Its proponents hold that social actio is not a given reality that should not be taken for granted. Rather, it a product
of endeavors by community members. Social action is thus viewed as a series of events leading toward an ultimate goal.

In CA the constructivist view is mostly expressed through the notions of meaning negotiation and sequentiality. Meaning negotiation is a process whereby individuals engaged in a conversation attend to each other and so make the interaction meaningful, whereas sequentiality means the interpretation of speakers’ utterances with reference to the previous utterances in the discourse.

Bloome and Egan-Roberston (1993) describes the microa analysis of classroom life as including two basic activities, (1) transcribing (video/audio) recorded material and (2) describing individual messages. This study, however, takes a 3-step procedure comprising (1) the selection and description of the site, (2) data elicitation procedure, (3) and the transcription of the data.

Selection and Description of the Site

The Ohio State University

This project was initially meant to investigate English-French CS in high schools in Kinshasa, DR Congo.
Unfortunately, the idea was abandoned due to social and political unrest in the country¹. The Ohio State University (OSU) and the French Program were instead chosen for this reason, and for their easy accessibility.

According to Cope (1920), the Ohio State University was founded on a grant made by an Act of Congress approved by President Lincoln on July 2, 1862. The Morrill Act, also known as the Land-Grant Act, proclaimed that an amount of public land equal to 30,000 acres be given to each state. The state of Ohio received 630,000 acres of land. The local government decided that the land be used to build an institution of higher training in agriculture, mechanics and military education. The school was then known as The Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College.

It was decided later on to broaden the institution into a wider learning center with programs including language programs as well, namely English, ancient and modern languages. As a result of the expansion, on May 2, 1878, The Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College was renamed as The Ohio State University.

Today, with a main campus in Columbus, the capital city of the state of Ohio, and four regional campuses in Marion,

¹ A long-lasting struggle for democracy in the Democratic Republic of Congo, former Zaire, culminated in a civil war that ended with the overthrow of a thirty-one year old dictatorship on May 17, 1997.
Newark, Lima and Mansfield, Ohio State is one of the biggest institutions of higher education in the United-States. The students whose population is nearly 55,000 yearly are registered in approximately 10,500 different courses.

Foreign Language Programs at The Ohio State University

Ohio State has a long tradition in foreign language teaching. French and German, Cope (1920) writes, are known to have been introduced early in the curriculum of foreign language programs. There are more than 30 language programs at Ohio State nowadays. These includes, ESL Programs (American Language Program, ESL Composition and Spoken English), European languages such as English, French, Italian, Spanish and German, Asian languages such as Japanese, Arabic, Chinese and Yiddish, and African languages such as Swahili, Yoruba and Hausa.

In addition to such a wide variety of language programs, the university also provides language-related courses in two major departments, the Linguistic Department and the Educational Studies Department which includes a program in Foreign Language Education. Many students registered in the above mentioned departments work as

Graduate Research Associates (GRAs) or Graduate Teaching Associates (GTAs) at the university. The university also includes a Foreign Language Center that coordinates all the foreign language programs available in the different departments.

The Ohio State University French Program

The French program, the main site of the present investigation, is one of the two programs that compose the Ohio State University Department of French and Italian. A pilot study was conducted on this topic in the Spring quarter of 1996. This, in addition to taking 15 credit hours of French linguistics courses in the department, allowed us to know more about the site.

The goal of the French program is to help the students communicate in the French language by learning not only the grammar, but also the culture, history and literature of the 35 French-speaking countries that make up the Francophone world. Courses are offered at both the undergraduate and the graduate level, with a major and a minor at each level. An undergraduate major consists of at least 50 hours of 400-
level French courses, whereas the requirement for a minor includes a minimum of 20 hours of such courses. A number of students, however, take the course as a language requirement for graduation in their areas of specialization.

At the graduate level, both the thesis and non-thesis plans are offered for the Master's degree. The course work required for the thesis option (45 hours) and the non-thesis (50 hours) option is distributed so as to allow the students some degree of concentration in an area of special interest, while still maintaining familiarity with the language and literature being studied. Under both plans, the students must pass a comprehensive examination.

Doctoral students are required to complete at least 45 hours of course work beyond the Master's degree. They are also required to choose a major and two minor areas respectively from a list of 12 and 14 categories designed by the graduate school board. Passing the comprehensive examination is mandatory for Ph.D. students.

The Participants

The participants of this study were of two types, the students and the instructors. The students were from three undergraduate courses of the intermediate level of the French program. The courses included French 103.01, French
104.01 and French 104.03. The objective of French 103.01 as described in the course syllabus is to develop and enhance knowledge of the French language and the French-speaking world by expending proficiency in speaking, listening, reading and writing. French 104.01 on the other hand is designed to consolidate already acquired knowledge through lengthier written and oral production. Although grammar is extensively reviewed, the goal of the course is to write and speak fluently on a variety of topics, to be able to express opinions easily, and to analyze the content of a French text. Finally, French 104.03 is an introduction to French culture. The course uses selected readings to help students understand the contemporary history and the geography of France, France’s political system and its relation to the post-colonial Francophone world.

The instructors were three Ph.D. students in French and who were working as GTAs in the program. Two of the instructors were female. Of the two female instructors, one was a native speaker of French, whereas the other had a native-like proficiency in the language. The third instructor was a native-speaker of American English. No real names of the participants, instructors or students, will be used in this study.

In all 14 hours of videotaped material were produced. One of the problems with naturally occurring data is that
they may not include enough instances, or none at all, of
the phenomenon under investigation. This is why a large
corpus is preferred in order to secure more chances of
capturing the targeted interactional feature. Fourteen hours
of speech is believed to include a number of CS occurrences
worthy of research.

**Data Elicitation Procedure**

Unlike the pilot study that faced some technical
problems such as interruption of sound or inappropriate
zooming, the present study was conducted without major
incidents. However, it should be admitted that recording all
the utterances was an impossible task to achieve. Some parts
of the interaction were inaudible, especially when the
students and the instructor were speaking off the record,
that is, when they were addressing individuals or small
groups rather than talking for the whole class to hear.
Also, there was a legitimate concern that the visitor's
presence and all the recording equipment (e.g., camera,
microphone and tripod) could have influenced participants’
behavior and performance. Although the effect of such
intrusive factors in this kind of study is unavoidable, it
can nonetheless be minimized by the effect of the time
factor. It was indeed noticed that both the students and the
teachers looked tense and uncomfortable during the first week of the recording, but they seemed to be more relaxed later on as the process went on in the quarter.

**Transcription of the Data**

Transcribing the data was the longest and one of the most difficult parts of the investigation. This is because a good understanding and interpretation of what is said requires that the transcription be accurate. As mentioned above, some utterances were more audible than others, and therefore easier to transcribe.

The transcripts are unedited and divided into sections whose boundaries are determined by a change of activity (e.g., from lecturing to group activity), or a transition in the lesson plan (e.g., from review to view/presentation). A glossary of transcript symbols adapted from Jefferson (1984) has been used (see Appendix C).

**Actions and Time Line**

The following is an action plan for insuring a timely development of the research project:

- **Proposal completed** October 1997
- **Field work completed** February 1998
Transcribing tapes
Analysis of data
Writing up data
Completion

March-December 1998
December 1998
January 1999
April 2000

Summary

The methodology part of this study has dealt with a presentation of three of its four components, the selection and description of the site, data elicitation, and the transcription of data. The inadequacy of the working conditions in Kinshasa High Schools, RD Congo, the initial site was presented as the main reason for choosing The Ohio State University for this investigation. Therefore, a brief description of Ohio State, the French program and the participants was also provided.

The data elicitation procedure was described as mainly consisting of videotaping, whereas the transcription of the data was presented as one the most difficult task of the project. Utterances were transcribed as they were said, that is, unedited. The main problem consisted of the ability to transcribe all the utterances, especially those issued off record. Data analysis, the object of the next chapter, mostly consisted of answering the questions of who (speaker) says what (content) and for what purpose (function). The
analysis was based on sequentiality, a key concept in CA.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter discusses the results by restating and answering the initial questions of the study. As explained in chapter 3, CA (conversation analysis) was used to examine the data, despite the many differences that exist between classroom talk and natural conversation. The motivation for the choice of this kind of investigation, it was argued, was to be found in the constructivist perspective underlying CA, and in the interactive nature of both daily life conversations and classroom interactions.

The constructivist perspective, it shall be recalled, capitalizes on the negotiation of meaning between two or more individuals. CA theorists insist that such a negotiation must be based on materials collected from naturally occurring interactions. This means the language under investigation needs to be spontaneous, unplanned and triggered by the situation at stake. However, the classroom context as a formal situation involves part of non-spontaneous speech revealed not only by the teacher’s lesson plan and the students’ preparedness for the class, but also by the course syllabus. Thus, the notion of naturally
occurring data obtained in a classroom environment has certain inherent limitations.

This, however, is not always the case. Classroom talk may prove to be as natural as ordinary conversation as long as classroom talk does not consist of a mere recitation of what has been memorized. Also, even though it may have been planned or memorized, how speech is delivered to the participants in a conversation or a classroom environment may be subject to negotiation. This is particularly true in formal settings such as a courtroom or a classroom where participants usually already know what to say or not to say. Mutual understanding as the ultimate goal is thus the result of a gradual and sometimes elaborate process. The following excerpt illustrates the dubious characteristic of classroom talk where both planned and unplanned speech occur at the same time.

**Excerpt 1: Planned versus Unplanned Speech (TP1/ScD)**

After a vocabulary review about the weather, another type of vocabulary practice has just begun. This consists of a drill exercise whereby the teacher says a word or phrase in English, and the students are requested to provide the English translation. The excerpt was chosen because of its clarity on how both spontaneous (unplanned) and non-spontaneous (planned) speech may intertwine with one another in a foreign language classroom discourse. Again, as a
reminder, the transcript is unedited. T stands for “teacher” and S for “students”, while spaced opened and closed parentheses (()) indicate inaudible portions of speech. The English translation of the transcript is provided in bold.

88. T: Je vous donne le français, vous me donnez une I give you the French (version), you give me traduction en anglais. Ça vient de vot’ liste. a translation in English. It comes from your list.

89. Ce n’est pas la peine, ce n’est pas la peine. It is not the pain, it is not the pain.

90. Alors ça va être très difficile si vous (()). So it’s going to be very difficult if you (()).

91. Ce n’est pas la peine, ce n’est pas la peine, Don’t bother, don’t bother

92. S: Don’t bother.

93 T: Don’t bother, oui. It comes from the book. So yes.

94. That I don’t need to make the sentences (()).

95. Déranger quelqu’un, déranger, To bother someone, to bother,

96. S: Don’t bother.

Students in the above translation drilling exercise are required to react immediately and correctly to the teacher’s prompts. In lines 88 and 89, the teacher explains the procedure for the exercise: She would say a word or phrase in French, and the students would have to find its English equivalent. Also in line 89, the teacher indicates that the words and phrases have been selected from a list that the students presumably know about. This may be an attempt to
help the students remember the words more easily by locating the source. Then the first expression to be translated, "ce n'est pas la peine" ("it is not worth it"; literally "it is not the pain") is introduced in lines 90 and repeated in line 92. In each line, the expression is said twice by the teacher, most probably for a better understanding on the students' part. In line 91, the teacher warns the students about the difficulty of the exercise. This may be an attempt to urge the students to think more about the targeted expression. Line 93 finally provides the desired response. The second expression, "déranger quelqu'un" (to disturb someone) is presented in line 96, whereas its English translation is shown in line 97\(^1\).

As in every lesson, the teacher in the above excerpt has worked from an overall script, the lesson plan. Indeed, the teacher had previously selected and prepared the expressions for the drill practice exercise. This is shown in line 89 when she declared: "This comes from your list." The teacher's statement also indicates that students are supposed to have read the passage of the textbook related to the exercise. Thus, the teacher and the students must have

---

\(^1\) The teacher has accepted broad, rather than narrow and literal, translations of the expressions.
prepared the exercise.

On the other hand, not all the utterances in the above excerpt have been planned. For instance, teacher’s utterances in which she tries to help the students find the right answers (see lines 89, 91, 94 and 95) may be said to be somewhat spontaneous. Also, the teacher wants the drill to move faster. That is why she keeps reminding the students about the list from which the expressions had been selected. After a first reminder said in French (see line 89), the teacher provides a second one in English (lines 94 and 95). Switching to English proves to be more effective as the tempo of the drilling for the second expression (lines 96 and 97) seems to quicken. CS, in this particular instance, may have played a significant role by enhancing students’ capability to remember.

It is the interplay between the unplanned and planned kinds of speech which was of interest in this study. How the teacher makes the students uncover what s/he has planned may be the result of either a short or a long negotiation. In the above excerpt, for instance, some elaboration including the teacher’s repetitions and comments was needed for the first (see lines 90, 91 and 92). Only the repetition of the key term, déranger (to bother), was needed for the second expression (see line 96).

This chapter is divided into five sections including
the answers to the five research questions of the study presented in chapter one. Those questions are repeated below for the reader’s convenience:

(1) What is the teachers’ attitude toward CS? In other words, how do teachers react to CS when it occurs in French classes at OSU?

(2) What functions does CS fulfil in French classes at OSU?

(3) In what type of sequencing (e.g., reviewing, presenting, explaining or concluding) of a French class is CS likely to occur?

(4) What relevance may an understanding and the use of CS have in planning and delivering French language instruction at OSU?

(5) What implications could this study have for formal teaching French at the college level?

What is the teachers’ attitude towards CS?

Attitude, like motivation and any other psychological factors that influences foreign language teaching and learning, is difficult to observe. Nonetheless, a number of studies of both social and individual attitudes towards languages in general and some aspects of foreign language teaching and learning in particular have been conducted in
the last three decades. For instance, Gardner and Lambert (1972) found that the attitude that an individual has towards the target language seems to have significant effect on the motivation for learning that language. Thus, a positive attitude such as the desire to identify oneself with the speakers of the target language may be at the origin of a successful language learning; whereas a negative attitude such as a tendency to disassociate oneself from the target language community may constitute a handicap to learning. Another example is an investigation of learners’ attitudes toward the teachers by Stevick (1980). The study showed that some students prefer teachers who allow them to use their own learning strategies, and resent those who impose strict learning guidelines on them.

Attitudes, according to Ellis (1995), are usually measured directly or indirectly. Direct measurement consists of the use of self-report questionnaires as in Gardner and Lambert (1972) and Stevick (1980) studies just mentioned. Indirect measurement has been found in Matched Guise studies by Lambert, Hodgson, Gradner and Fillenbaum (1960). Researchers in those investigations used the Semantic Differential Technique whereby the same speaker, who was bilingual, read a passage in two languages. The learners were then asked to evaluate the speakers (as they had assumed that there were two different speakers). In judging
the speakers, the learners expressed their attitudes towards
the two languages.

The present study, however, used neither of the two
measurements in answering the question of the teachers’
attitudes towards codeswitching (CS). The answer to this
question was solely based on what was found during the 14
hours of the transcribed classroom observations.

As a general impression, instances of CS during the 14
hours of observation were relatively scarce. This was
evidenced by the long stretches of talk in French that occur
before the switches in English, and by the teachers’
explicit remarks that English was not allowed in class.
Excerpt 2 shows that French, the target language, was the
main language of interaction in the observed classes.

**Excerpt 2: Long sequences of speech without CS
(TP1/ScABC)**

It is the beginning of the quarter. The teacher first
deals with management problems, before engaging the class in
a review of vocabulary. The teacher, in this excerpt, seems
to have committed herself to speak only French. As a result,
the teacher-dominated talk in this particular excerpt
displays only a few instances of CS. This is the main reason
for selecting the excerpt. The hyphen sign (-) such as in
lines 3, 12 and 17 indicates an interruption or a quick bridge in the flow of speech by the speaker, whereas colon punctuation (:) means a lengthening of sound as in lines 21. The length may be emphasized by an additional colon as in lines 70 and 78. The symbol "hmhm" is an actual transcript of a sound produced by the teacher. It most likely means hesitation on the speaker's behalf.

Section A

1. T: Alors. Aujourd'hui, mercredi quatorze, j'ai reçu So. Today, Wednesday fourteen, I've received

2. une liste d'étudiants, qui doivent venir me voir, a list of students who must come to see me,

3. dans mon bureau quatre-cent douze. D'accord? in my office four hundred twelve. OK?

4. Vous avez signé, alors vous vous souvenez de ça? You have signed up, so you remember it?

5. (0.2).

6. C'est pour discuter, de vous, anglais, français, It's to discuss, of you, English, French,

7. savoir d'où vous venez, etc. (( ( ) )). to know where you come from, etc.

8. tas de problèmes. Comment tu t'appelles? lots of problems. What's your name?

9. S: Angie, (0.1). Angie,

10. T: Angie?


12. T: Tu n'es pas sur mon- You are not on my-

13. S: Non. Eum. (( )) No. Um

14. T: Oui, tu veux-1, tu veux être dans cette classe? Yes, you want-1, you want to be in this class?
15.  S: Oui. Eum. ((   ))  
     Yes. Um  

16.  T: D’accord? Tu auras un papier-  
     OK? You’ll get a form-  

     Um- Yes.No.  

18.  T: Non? ‘K. Eum. Si tu veux vraiment assister à la  
     No? ‘K. Um. If you really want to be in this  

19.  classe, alors il faudra que tu t’inscrives.  
     class, then you must register first.  

20.  D’accord? Eum (( il faut )) que tu t’inscrives  
     OK? Um (( it is a must )) that you register  

21.  donc il faut que tu e: ok ((   ))à cette heure.  
     so you must ((   )) at this hour hour.  

22.  D’accord?  
     OK?  

Section B  

23.  T: Bon. Comme bientôt la classe va commencer,  
     puisque  
     Ok. As the class is going to start soon, since  

24.  ce n’est pas encore l’heure, mais très bientôt  
     it is not time yet, but very soon  

25.  it (0.1). ça va l’être. Alors en attendant-hmhm.  
     it is going to be. So meanwhile-hmhm  

26.  Et puis rappelez-vous, ((noises)).  
     And also remember,  

27.  Tu veux écrire ton nom s’il te plait? sur eu:m tu  
     Would you like to write your name please? On u:m  

28.  veux écrire ton nom sur cette liste? Ça sera très  
     would you like to write your name on this list?  

29.  gentil, à la suite, avec ton numéro de téléphone  
     That’ll be very kind of you, at the bottom, with  
     your phone number.  

30.  ((   )).  

31.  Bon. Aussi~alors un petit rappel, eu:m vous vous  
     OK. Then~also a little reminder, u:m you
souvenez de cette demoiselle qui est venue nous remember about that young woman who came to tell
dire que il y a, vous pouvez aller, dans la us that, you can go, in the Cunz class
de Cunz (( ) ), et là vous pouvez parler and there, you can speak
français. vous pouvez discuter des points French, you can discuss about grammar issues, etc.
de grammaire, etc. C’est GRATUIT. Free. C’est It’s charge free. It’s
GRATUIT. D’accord? Alors le lundi de vingt heure FREE. OK? So Monday from 8:40 pm
quarante, de dix-huit heure quarante cinq a dix- from 6:45 pm to
heure trente, donc il y a de l’espace, et le (jeu 10:30 pm, so there is some space, and the
)). Vous avez tous ce papier je vous rappelle You remember this form I remind you
c’est très pratique. (0.1). Je trouve. Bon. (0.1). It’s very convenient I find. OK.
Questions? On va commencer on va sonner dans Questions? We’ll begin the bell’s going to ring
voilà, on commence. On commence par faire l’appel. here we go. Let’s begin. Let’s take the roll first.
(T takes the roll then bell rings).
Section C
T: Et ça commence. Un ptit peu d’avance mais il y a And here we go. A little bit ahead of time but
beaucoup de choses a faire comme quoi. (( )). there are lots of things to do
48. C’est très important. (0.3). Alors. Bon. E::m quel
It’s very important. So. OK. Erm what
49. temps fait-il aujourd’hui s’il vous plaît?
is the weather like today please?
50. Réfléchissez, quel temps fait-il?
Think, what is the weather like?
51. S1: Il fait froid.
It’s cold.
It’s cold yes? Yes.
53. S3: E:m il fait bcn.
Erm it’s good.
It’s beautiful. Yes? Who likes this weather? Who
temps? Betsy?
likes this weather? Betsy?
55. Betsy: Pourquoi Gerry?
Why Gerry?
56. Gerry: E:: j’aime l’hiver.
Err I like winter.
57. T: Tu aimes l’hivers? Ah-bcn, oui mai:s tu aimes
You like winter? How come, yes but you like
l’hiver humide? avec de la pluie? ou tu aimes
a wet winter? with rain? or you like it
58. ça.
this (way).
This (way).
60. T: Bon. John, pourquoi tu aimes ce temps.
OK. John, why do you like this weather.
61. John: J’aime la neige, (( )).
I like the snow
62. T: Tu aimes la neige, (( ) ) wow-huhuhh.
You like the snow,
Tu mm-ok. Tu aimes l’hiver aussi, Betsy? Pourquoi
You mm-ok. You like the snow as well, Betsy? Why
tu aimes ce temps.
you like this weather.

Betsy: Parce que j’aime l’hiver.
’Cause I like the snow.

You like the snow. I’d like to LIKE the snow.

Pourquoi tu aimes l’hivers. Pourquoi.
Why do you like winter. Why.

Betsy: Pasque:: je pense que que c’est très joli. Je
’Cause:: I think it’s very beautiful. I
ne sais pas pourquoi, mais j’aime bien
don’t know why, but I like winter.
l’hiver.

T: Tu ne sais pas pourquoi.
You don’t know why.

Il faudra une bonne discussion pour que
It will take a good discussion for me
j’arrive à aimer l’hivers. Je n’aime pas
to like winter. I don’t like winter.
l’hiver. De grosses chaussures, de gros
Big shoes, big coats,
menteaux, qui aime l’hivers dans cette
who likes winter in this
classes? Qui aime l’hiver? Alors une, deux,
Who likes winter? So, one, two,
trois oh::, ce n’est pas mal-hein? Je vous
three oh::, this is not bad. I will need your
advice.
demanderai des conseils. Comment faire pour
How do I do to
like winter.
l’aime pas l’hiver.
I don’t like winter.

Long sequences of talk, such as the one just quoted
above, where instances of CS were just a few or not available at all, were not rare in all the three classes observed. The abstract is a 7-minute portion of French 104.01. The three sections, A, B and C constitute each a different phase of the lesson. Sections A and B may be considered small talk as they are produced before the actual (official) beginning of the lesson, the main talk, and mostly deal with class administration problems. The sections constitute the non-official part of the lesson. The following is a short analysis of the lesson.

Section A opens with a reminder concerning the incoming tutorial with the teacher (lines 1-8). Next, the teacher tries to help a student register for the course (lines 8-22). In Section B the teacher clearly acknowledges that it is not yet time for the class to start (lines 23-26). She then continues with class management by reminding the students of a young woman who has volunteered to offer a workshop on the course (lines 26, 31-41). The reminder is then interrupted in line 26, as the teacher’s attention in lines 27-29 shifts back to the student with a registration problem. The beginning of line 42 constitutes a final check whereby the teacher is trying to make sure that all administration problems have been solved. Then comes another concern about the beginning of the lesson (lines 42-44). The
section ends with the ringing of the bell when the teacher has just completed taking the roll (lines 44-45). Finally, Section C opens with the end of the non-official part of the lesson. It marks the actual (official) beginning of the lesson.

The commitment to an exclusive use of French by the teacher and the students was obvious in the above excerpt. This can be noticed in the very beginning of the lesson, that is, even during the non-official class time (see line 1 of Section A). Contrary to what happened in the pilot study when the teacher and the students interacted in French only during the official class time, the instructor of this class and her students speak the target language even during non-official class time. It is, however, important to mention that other teachers observed spoke English during non-official class time.

Excerpt 2 also shows that the use of French, the target language, in this class was intense. Even when communication seemed difficult as during the dialogue between the teacher and the student with a registration problem, the teacher and the students seemed committed to keeping the interactions unfold in French. CS, as it will be shown later, can be used to bridge a communication gap, but in this particular case, the norm seemed to be the use French in all circumstances. The question nonetheless remains on the extent to which such an endeavor was possible in classes studied in this
research. More evidence of the avoidance of CS is found in the following extract.

**Excerpt 3: More evidence on the avoidance of English (TP1/ScF)**

The excerpt is from a peer review session. Working in pairs, the students are requested to evaluate their colleagues first draft of the composition. The conversation between the partners is meant to be carried out in French. The excerpt is a good illustration of the class commitment to maintain French as the only language of instruction.

208. **DEUX personnes lisent UN brouillon. C’est Two persons read One draft. Is it clear?**

209. **clair? Et puis alors vous regardez et vous And then you look and correct**

210. **corrigez les fautes (( )) the errors.**

212. **Oh, je ne sais pas. Ça me paraît pas bien. Oh, I don’t know. That cannot work.**

213. **Qu’est ce que tu en penses. Si vous ne savez pas, What do you think of it. If you don’t know,**

214. **vous me demandez. Je vais juste être là pour you ask me. I’ll be here to answer**

215. **répondre à TOUTES les questions. D’accord? ALL the questions. OK?**

216. **Bon. Sept minutes pour un brouillon, puis OK. Seven minutes on a draft, then**

217. **vous changez. Encore. DEUX personnes sur UN you exchange. TWO persons on ONE**

218. **brouillon, it’s not exchanging a little bit, draft,**
et-la même chose. D'accord? Alors. Deux par and-the same thing. OK? So. Two by two
220. Deux, vite vite, pousssez vos chaises, Two, quick quick, pouch your chairs,
221. (Noises and pulling of chairs).
222. Bon. Tout le monde est prêt? Ne parlez pas OK. Is everyone ready. Don’t speak
223. anglais. Et puis j’ai entendu ici, j’ai English. And then I heard here, I heard
224. entendu I am. Qui a dit I am? I am. Who said I am?
225. S: OK.
226. T: Non-non. Français. Français. It is not the- No-No. French. French. Ce n’est pas le-

As mentioned earlier, Excerpt 3 was from a peer review practice in which the students evaluate their classmates’ composition first draft. The teacher’s explanation of how this should be done is provided in lines 208 through 222. In addition, line 222 includes an explicit remark about the avoidance of English when the teacher clearly commanded: “Ne parlez pas Anglais” (Don’t speak English). She also tried to find out who spoke English (see lines 223 and 224), and rebukes him in line 226. She then repeats the instructions in English as shown in lines 226-228, most likely for a better understanding2.

The teacher’s avoidance strategy with regard to CS is

2 The issue of a better comprehension is closely examined in the next section that discusses the various functions of CS.
both understandable and paradoxical from a pedagogical point of view. A teacher’s attitude toward CS, as argued in chapter 1, may originate in his/her educational background and training. The teachers of the observed classes were all trained following the nowadays trend of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) which makes no provision for the role of the first language in teaching a second language. This can explain their reluctance to speak English in their French classes.

That L1 is a handicap to effective second language learning is widespread belief among L2 teachers. In her book Teaching Language in Context\(^3\), Hadley (1993) provides 9 principles she believes govern the teaching of second languages. The principles she calls hypotheses and corollaries suggest a total immersion of the second language learner in the target language and the target-language culture. The goal of those principles is to get rid of the influence of L1 so as to maximize performance in L2. “Opportunities must be provided for students to practice using [the target] language in a range of contexts likely to be encountered in the target culture”, Hardly (1993: 77) insists. The implication of such a claim and many others underlying the target-language-only principle is that the

---
\(^3\)The textbook is used to train instructors of French at OSU.
role of an auxiliary language in teaching a second language has been neglected. It is therefore understandable that a teacher trained according to the mainstream trend of CLT pays less attention to the contribution of L1 to L2 teaching and learning.

On the other hand, the treatment of L1 in teaching L2 constitutes also a paradox. Even within the CLT trend, there is some indication that one can not teach an L2 without taking L1 into account. This is particularly shown in the textbooks. As an example, the book Invitation by Jarvis et al. (1993) used in the French program at OSU highly recommends that instructions for the exercises be provided in English. Passages to be translated, along with a French-English lexicon are also provided. The teacher's edition of the book includes even more material written in English such as a lengthy introduction containing methodological guidelines for the course, and marginal notes suggesting the procedure for each lesson. Despite this overwhelming presence of L1 in L2 course books, L1 is still being avoided in L2 classrooms.

Teachers' attitude toward CS in the classes observed can thus be described primarily as one of avoidance. The use of the target language seemed to be the norm. This, as it was argued earlier, is most likely the result of the
teachers' training and education. However, confronted with communication problems during the lessons on the one hand, and the idea of making their teaching more accessible to the learners on the other hand, teachers sometimes used English, rather than French, in communicating with their students.

What kinds of function does CS fulfil?

CS may be treated like a teaching technique such as a drill or role-play. In this respect, its aim is to facilitate students' comprehension and maximize the teacher's efficiency. This, however, can be achieved in many different ways. In the lessons observed, CS was used to (1) translate, (2) practice discovery and rote learning, (3) explain/expend a teaching point, (4) bridge communication gap and (5) enhance students' reflection. The 5 functions are thoroughly discussed in the section that follows.

Translation as a form of CS

The most noticeable form of CS recorded in the three classes observed was translation. Mainly used in vocabulary lessons, translations were found to be either delayed or
immediate with regard to their sequencing and timing. Delayed translations were preceded by elements such as students’ request of clarification or teacher’s elaboration of the question. Excerpt 1 above, repeated below as Excerpt 4 for the reader’s convenience, includes instances of delayed translation.

**Excerpt 4: Delayed translation**
(TP1/ScD)

88. T: Je vous donne le français, vous me donnez une
    I give you the French (version), you give me

89. traduction en anglais. Ça vient de vot’ liste.
    a translation in English. It comes from your
    list.

90. Ce n’est pas la peine, ce n’est pas la peine.
    It is not the pain, it is not the pain.

91. Alors ça va être très difficile si vous (( ))
    So it’s going to be very difficult if you (( )).

92. Ce n’est pas la peine, ce n’est pas la peine,
    Don’t bother, don’t bother

93 S: Don’t bother.

94 T: Don’t bother, oui. It comes from the book. So
    yes.

95 that I don’t need to make the sentences (( ))

96. Déranger quelqu’un, déranger,
To bother someone, to bother,

97 S: Don’t bother.

The teacher provided the expression to translate in line 90, whereas the student’s translation occurred in line 93. This happened because the student’s response was delayed by the teacher’s warning (lines 91) and repetition (line
Delayed translations made classroom talk sound more conversational. Students did not seem to work under time pressure, and the teacher’s help was significant. For instance, when the teacher referred the students to the list from which the words for the vocabulary practice were taken (lines 94-95), the recollection process was made easier by means of association, which, according to Ausbel et al. (1978), makes learning meaningful.

Immediate translations, on the other hand, occurred when a word, a phrase or an entire sentence was translated from French to English without any other utterance between the two as. Excerpt 5 includes instances of immediate translations.

Excerpt 5: Immediate translation
(TP2/ScB)

After a 10-minute written quiz on vocabulary, the teacher uses the questions for an oral practice. The excerpt is an example of mechanical drill in which the students’ reaction time to the teacher’s prompt is crucial.

12. T: OK, ( ) en français, comment dit-on democracy? in French, how do we say democracy
13. S: (0.4). Democracy with a T and I E.
14. T: Excellent. Démocratie est-ce masculin ou féminin. Democracy is it masculine or feminine.
   Feminine.

   It’s feminine. Number two peace
   Peace

17. S: La paix.
   Peace.

18. T: La paix. (0.3). p-a-i-ex. Numéro trois le chômage.
   Peace. Number three
   unemployment.

19. Qu’est-ce que c’est que le chômage en anglais.
   What’s chômage in English.


   Very good. Number four. The
   homeless.

22. abri.


   Number five.

   Overpopulation.

   Overpopulation. Number seven. Future.


   Number eight.

30. S: ((  )) les devoirs.
   Duties.

31. T: Les devoirs. Très bien. Et est-ce que devoir est
   Duties. Very good. And is duty

32. masculin ou féminin.
   masculine or feminine

33. S: Masculin.
   Masculine.
34. T: C'est masculin. La plupart des- I'll say this in It's masculine. Most of-
35. English. Most nouns in French that are derived from
36. verbs like devoir which comes from the verb devoir
37. are masculine. There are exceptions (()) but most
38. of them are masculine. Numéro neuf. A female
citizen. **Number nine.**
A citizen.

The students' translations in the above extract are immediate because there is no further explanation or comment between the teacher's prompts and the students' answers. An in-depth analysis of this type of translation will soon reveal its pedagogical importance.

Like Excerpt 4, Excerpt 5 may be seen as a deliberate attempt by the teacher to combine both French, the target language, and English, students L1, during the instruction. Unlike Excerpt 4, however, Excerpt 5 capitalizes on the speed as the main factor of a mechanical drill exercise. In this particular case, the exercise consists of a series of teacher's selected words to be translated into English, except for the first word, democracy, whose French translation was requested. Another dimension, gender recognition, has been added to two of the 7 words, "democracy" and "duty." The teacher provided the prompt in French and the students responded in English. Then the
teacher proceeded in French. The process went on with the teacher using French and the students English until the 7 selected vocabulary items were all covered. The pattern of language alternations and actions undertaken by both the teacher and the students during the translation drill of the above 7 lexical items can be summarized as:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
abc & abc & abc & abc & abc & abc & abc
\end{array}
\]

where the numbers refer to the words\(^4\) and \(a, b\) and \(c\) mean the language used and the action being performed. Thus, for each word, the sequencing of action and language use consists of (a) questioning in French by the teacher, (b) students responding in English and (c) teacher accepting students' responses in French. Table 1.4 below further clarifies the language/action sequencing pattern of the exercise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a: French</td>
<td>Teacher questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b: English</td>
<td>Student responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c: French</td>
<td>Teacher accepting student's respond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.4. Language/Action sequencing in a drill exercise

---

It would be of interest to note first that the sequencing reflects the stimulus-response-reinforcement pattern, reminiscent of the audiolingual method criticized earlier for promoting rote learning\(^5\). Second, the French-English alternation is nothing more but a partial implementation of the grammar-translation method. As mentioned earlier, the method has been rejected because the recourse to L1 has been considered a handicap to L2 learning.

Despite the controversy surrounding these two methods, teachers, even those trained according to the new trend of communicative teaching approach such as those involved in this study, still believe in their usefulness. Teachers may indeed have realized that reception (or rote) learning and discovery learning\(^6\) are complementary, rather than dichotomous. As Ausbel et al. (1978) point out, a long-

\(^5\) Rote learning is “the acquisition of arbitrary, verbatim associations where either the learning material itself cannot be nonarbitrary and substantively related to cognitive structures (that is, does not possess logical meaning), or where the learner exhibits a nonmeaningful learning set” (Ausbel et al. 1978: 629).

\(^6\) Discovery learning takes place when “what is to be learned is not given (or presented), but must be discovered by the learner before he [or she] can assimilate it in his [or her] cognitive structure” (Ausbel et al. 1978: 626).
standing and widespread belief among educators has been that rote learning is forcibly ineffective, and that discovery learning is inherently and necessarily productive. The belief, they argue, is unwarranted. They suggest a more defensible proposition that both types of learning may (or may not) be meaningful and productive depending on the conditions under which learning takes place.

The discovery process in the acquisition of vocabulary is not always possible, as sometimes there is no obvious relationship between an object or concept and its expression. This is why rote learning in such a case is appropriate. Thus, both delayed and immediate translations seem to play two different but important roles in L2 learning in general, and in the acquisition of vocabulary in particular.

Immediate translations were not only found in vocabulary lessons, but also in other lessons, most particularly when the lesson included a quiz or a test of some sort. Translation was then used to clarify either the instructions or the quiz questions. This is illustrated in the following abstract from FRENCH 104.03.

**Excerpt 6: Immediate translation beyond mechanical drill**

*TP3/ScA*

The class begins with a 10-minute quiz. The following talk happens before the quiz. In addition to the teacher’s
numerous questions related to understanding the instructions of the quiz, there is an explicit request of the translation of the quiz questions into English.

1. T: Est-ce que vous avez des questions sur la lecture. Des Do you have questions about the reading. Questions,

2. questions, des choses, difficiles a comprendre, (0.1). things, difficult to understand. Do you have


4. entre deux questions, d’accord, (0.4), vous avez le choix entre between two questions, OK, you have the choice between two

5. deux questions, (0.10). Alors. Vous repondez a une seule questions So. You answer only one

6. question. Alors une seule question. Alors qui était Louis XIV question. So only one question. So who was Louis XIV

7. et quelle est son importance dans l’histoire de la France? Ou and what is his importance in the history of France? Or

8. quelles sont les causes de la Révolution Française. Vous avez le what are the causes of the French Revolution. You have the

9. choix, vous repondez a une seule question. Qui peut traduire les choice, you answer only one question. Who can translate the
10. questions en Anglais. Qui peut traduire les questions en Anglais. questions in English. Who can translate the questions in English.

11. Numero un, qui était Louis XIV et quelle est son importance dans Number one, who was Louis XIV and what is his importance in

12. l’histoire de la France. Oui? the history of France. Yes?

13. S: Who is Louis XIV and what is his importance in the history of France.

14. 15. T: OK, c’est bon, vous avez compris numero un? Numero deux. OK, that’s good, you have understood number one? Number two.


17. S: What are the causes of the French Revolution.

18. T: OK? Vous avez compris numero deux? Les causes? OK. You have understood number two? The causes? OK. Answer only

19. une seule question. Je vous donne dix minutes (avec ça). one question. I give you ten minutes (with that).

As revealed by the teacher’s numerous questions lines 1-3 and 9-10), her main concern in Excerpt 6 was comprehension. She wanted to make sure that the students had a full understanding of both the content of and the directions for the quiz before administering it. The concern was more explicitly expressed throughout three different
actions, requesting, repeating and translating.

The teacher began by asking the students whether they have read the passage related to the quiz. This can be seen in the first three lines of the excerpt. Next, in a series of repetitive directives, the teacher instructed the students about the format of the quiz (see lines 3-6). The questions for the quiz were presented in lines 6-9. Finally and probably as a last attempt to assure full understanding, the teacher asked for the English translation of the quiz questions (see lines 9-17). Even after translation, the teacher did not seem to be sure whether the students had understood the questions and the instructions. Hence, comprehension check and directions resumed in lines 18-19.

Unlike what was observed in the vocabulary lessons where CS was the main teaching technique, CS in this lesson was used as a strategy, that is, a procedure that serves to reach a specific goal. In this particular case, CS has been used as the last resort whereby accurate understanding of quiz questions by the students could be warranted.

CS in the form of translation is not unusual in both naturally occurring conversation and L2 classroom talk. In conversation, Auer (1995) argues that in some activities, bilinguals tend to switch from one language into the other. He mentions actions such as reporting speech, changing participation constellation and translating for the purpose
of emphasizing on demands or requests, or for the purpose of clarification. In L2 classroom, reporting on his study on Chinese learning ESL, Guthrie (1984) identified a variety of communicative functions, including translation, in a series of the recorded classroom talks. In addition to those findings, Jarvis et al. (1992) in the textbook Invitation (Instructor’s Edition) suggested that translation be used for the purpose of accuracy and clarification. Thus, the teachers in the observed classes did not innovate. They were using translation, a well-known conversational resource available to all bilinguals, as a teaching strategy.

CS for explanation

CS in the classes observed was also used to explain lexical items or grammatical issues. The explanation sometimes took the form of a side-comment, that is, a brief expansion on the item at stake. Excerpt 6 provides an illustration of the use of CS for explanation.

Excerpt 7: Use of CS in a side-comment
TP2/ScB

This is a portion of Excerpt 5 examined earlier to discuss the concept of immediate translation. It is being
use here as to illustrate the use of CS for explanation in
the form of a side-comment.

31. T: Les devoirs. Très bien. Et est-ce que devoir 
est
Duties. Very good. And is duty

32. masculin ou féminin.
masculine or feminine

33. S: Masculin.
Masculine.

34. T: C’est masculin. La plupart des- I’ll say this
in
It’s masculine. Most of-

35. English. Most nouns in French that are derived
from

36. verbs like devoir which comes from the verb
devoir

37. are masculine. There are exceptions ((())) but
most of

38. them are masculine. Numéro neuf. A female
citizen.

Number nine.

A citizen.

40. T: Une citoyenne. Et le numéro dix, coupable.
A citizen. And number ten, coupable.

41. S: Guilty.

42. T: Coupable is an adjective which means guilty but
also

used as a noun meaning guilty person.

The abstract includes two instances of CS dealing with
explanation. The first is found in lines 34-38, and the
second in lines 42-43. The first explanation is about the gender of the noun “devoir” (duty). The teacher points out that the noun derives from the verb “devoir” (must), and that for this reason, it must be masculine. The scope of the explanation exceeds the word “devoir” to include all the nouns derived from verbs.

Also, the teacher’s explanation is delayed by an opening statement, “I’ll say it in English” (lines 34-5). The statement can be interpreted as a teacher’s reminder that he is not supposed to speak English, but would do so in this particular circumstance, most probably to guarantee a better understanding. The second explanation occurs in lines 42-3. Like the first, it consists of a switch to English. But unlike the first, this second explanation is immediate and shorter. Regardless of their structure, delayed versus immediate and long versus short, the above two switches illustrate the use of CS as a means of providing more information over a teaching point.

CS to bridge communication gap

CS was also used to solve communication breakdown. This means the speaker switches code because he/she finds it difficult to get his/her message across in the target language, and thus resorts to L1. In such as situation, as
will be seen in the extract below, it is the speaker’s communicative competence which is at stake.

**Excerpt 8: Use of CS to bridge communication gap**

**TP1/ScE**

The situation was a peer review session. A student who did not have her composition draft, tried to explain why to the teacher. The dialogue was a two-way interaction whereby the interlocutors display a good example of meaning negotiation from one another.

173. T: E:: composition. Vous devez avoir vos brouillons, E::r composition. You must have your drafts,  

174. sortez vos brouillons. (0.2). E:: tu ne l’as pas? take your drafts out. E::r you don’t have it?  

175. S: Erm.  

176. T: (to another S) Oh pardon-pardon. D’abord. Oh excuse me-excuse me. First.  

177. S: (to S in line 174). Elle, nous avons alle au She we have gone to  

178. Cunz Hall erm cet- matin et nouz printer? Cunz Hall erm this morning and we to print?  

179. T: Imprimer, To print,  

180. S: Oui. Erm la brouillon, Yes. Erm the draft’  

181. T: Oui, Yes,
182. S: Mais erm il n’a erm n’a pas (o.1) erm
   But erm it didn’t erm didn’t erm

183. T: N’a pas marché, n’a pas imprimé.
    Didn’t work, didn’t print.

184. S: No erm

185. T: Non?

186. S: They didn’t open the computer lab.


188. S: They were supposed to open at nine. We were

189. T:         OK.
           D’accord.

190. S: Until nine twenty.

      Good. OK.

201. S: It sounds like ((   )).

      Good. OK-OK.

The above section is a dialogue between a student and
the teacher. As the peer review is about to begin, the
teacher notices that one of the students does not have her
composition draft and asks her why (line 173). The student’s
response displays uncertainty and hesitation (line 175). She
nonetheless makes a first attempt to explain why she did not
bring her draft. But this is done in a grammatically poor
French (lines 176 and 177) so that the teacher has to
correct her (line 179). The student makes a second attempt
(line 180-183), but still fails to communicate clearly. Finally, after a short moment of decision-making process (line 184), the student gives up and continues the rest of the dialogue in English (lines 186-201).

From a teacher’s point of view, the student in the above excerpt has no doubt exhibited a very low level of proficiency in spoken French, as revealed by the kind of language she produced. From a conversation analyst’s perspective, however, the student represents an example of real life language user. In order to keep communication going on, the student has made it bilingual by switching onto English while the teacher remains in French. It is therefore more accurate to argue that there was no communication breakdown. Rather, it was communication in the target language which failed.

This student could have acted in the same way in a real life situation. Confronted with a communicative problem, she could have opted for the use of a language that she and her interlocutor have in common. Again, as in the case of translation, the student’s apparent surrender seems to be motivated by bilingual pragmatics and common sense.
CS to enhance students’ reflection

This function was found in translation exercises, more precisely in the drilling practice of vocabulary lessons. Excerpt 1 which includes this function of CS is repeated below as Excerpt 9 for the reader’s convenience.

Excerpt 9: Use of CS to enhance reflection (TP1/ScD)

88. T: Je vous donne le français, vous me donnez une  
    I give you the French (version), you give me
89. traduction en anglais. Ça vient de vot’ liste.  
    a translation in English. It comes from your list.
90. Ce n’est pas la peine, ce n’est pas la peine.  
    It is not the pain, it is not the pain.
91. Alors ça va être très difficile si vous (())).  
    So it’s going to be very difficult if you (())).
92. Ce n’est pas la peine, ce n’est pas la peine,  
    Don’t bother, don’t bother
93. S: Don’t bother.
95. that I don’t need to make the sentences ((()))
96. Déranger quelqu’un, déranger,  
    To bother someone, to bother,
97. S: Don’t bother.

As observed earlier, translation in this excerpt was delayed by the teacher’s additional utterances between her prompt and the students’ turn-taking (see line 94-96). The
ultimate goal, it was argued, was to help the students learn through discovery process and by means of association. However, the immediate goal of the teacher’s comments was to enhance students’ reflection. That is, the comments constituted clues likely to help the students find the right answer to the question. As a result, the time usually referred to as a wait-time became an active time in which students’ reflection was boosted by the teacher’s intervention. This activator role should, however, not be attributed to CS alone. In order to increase students’ participation or attract their attention, the teacher used a quick reference (see line 89), a series of comprehension checks and repetitive directives (see Excerpt 6, lines 1-6).

*Types of sequencing in which CS is likely to occur*

It can be concluded from the above observations that there are two situations in which CS is likely to happen. One is inside the class framework, and the other is outside class time. CS during the official class time has just been discussed. It was argued earlier that despite their effort to avoid it, both the teachers and the students appealed to CS for a number of reasons. It was also noticed that CS was
likely to occur before a quiz to clarify both the instructions and the quiz questions. Finally, CS can also occur during the presentation stage in order to explain/expand a teaching point. A moment during the lesson when CS is most likely to happen is during pair or group activities. It was indeed noticed that during those activities students tended to speak English among themselves. Such interactions were difficult to record as they were conducted simultaneously and in a very low voice. As the speakers switch codes but maintain the new code for the rest of the conversation, it seems most appropriate to describe this as a change of language, rather than CS. Switches, in this case, were not limited to a few words or sentences, but included longer stretch of talk.

Likewise, language change was observed outside the class framework. Both students and teachers sometimes interacted in English before and after class. The topics of the interactions often consisted of class management (e.g., information on where to buy the textbook) or a subject matter not related to the course. These out-of-class interactions were similar to real life conversation as the participant sounded informal and relaxed.

As a general impression, CS will most probably occur during the official class time for explanation, clarification and translation purposes. It may also function
as a device to solve a communication problem during the lesson.

Outside the official class time, language change occurs to mark the transition between formal class sessions and real life conversation between the teacher and the students, or among the students themselves.

What relevance may an understanding and the use of CS have in planning and delivering French language instruction at the college level?

This question has already been partially addressed in the section on the significance of the study in chapter one. Its full significance will, however, become more explicit in the next chapter where the findings and the ensuing pedagogical implications and recommendations are presented. This section is limited to providing some reasons why understanding CS may be relevant to L2 teaching in general, and to the teaching of French as a second language at the college level in particular.

The relevance of understanding CS may be found in the present day’s trend about teacher education. Two major tendencies have emerged in the last two decades concerning what should constitute background knowledge for L2 language
teachers. The first is a monolithic view expressed throughout the work of researchers such as Richards and Nunan (1993) and Ellis (1997), and proclaims the autonomy of L2 language pedagogy. This view considers L2 teaching as an activity of which the chief goal is to help the learner achieve native-like proficiency in the target language. All teacher’s effort is geared toward developing new ways of attaining this goal. Hence, the notion that a teacher is also expected to be a researcher has become one of the leading principles of this view. As a result, theories of language teaching are built upon the only basis of what happens within the classroom framework.

The second tendency, on the other hand, is a multi-disciplinary view which considers teacher education as a combination of insights from different fields of human knowledge. Stern (1990), a representative of this view, believes that an ideal language pedagogy must include concepts drawn from theories of language, language and society, language learning and language teaching. This means that linguistics, sociolinguistics, SLA and language teaching methodology should constitute the core of a teacher education program.

As the starting point of the emergence of all new disciplines, the monolithic view has always been encouraged. Thus, the idea that language pedagogy has to be
developed as a discipline of its own has found support from both practitioners and theorists of L2 pedagogy. The considerable amount of studies undertaken in L2 teaching in the last twenty years testifies to the effort. Allright’s (1983) work on classroom-centered research and Bartlett’s (1993) concept of reflective teaching can be seen as some of the implementations of the uni-disciplinary view of L2 teaching. Also, a theory of language teaching based on classroom observations seems more convincing than one derived from speculations by non-practitioners.

However, teaching being such a complex activity, a uni-dimensional approach may prove narrow. In addition to teaching, an L2 instructor is also a problem-solver. L2 teachers are indeed confronted not only with pedagogical, but also linguistic, social, sociolinguistic, and even psychological problems. Making informed decisions on those issues requires a breath of knowledge which stretches far beyond pedagogy and encompasses diverse areas of human knowledge. This study reflects the multi-dimensional view of teacher education.

Although CS in this investigation has mainly been approached from a conversation analyst’s perspective, the influence of disciplines such as sociolinguistics, SLA and educational psychology can also be perceived. The result of such a contribution is a better understanding of CS as it
occurs in an L2 classroom. For instance, the study has revealed three teachers' attitudes toward CS. The first is the notion that CS is to be avoided because it constitutes a handicap to effective language learning. The second is the awareness that CS is a natural communication strategy often used in bilingual community regardless of the level of its bilingualism, balanced or non-balanced. The third attitude, which is a mixed feeling between the two, seems to recommend the use of CS, but under some restricted conditions. This understanding of CS may have an impact on both planning and teaching second languages in general, and the French language in particular.

What implications could this study have for formal teaching French at the college level?

The answer to this question constitutes one of the most important outcomes of this study, and will, instead, be examined in relation with findings and recommendations in chapter 5. It will, nonetheless, be mentioned at this point that the main implication of this study relate to the issue of second/foreign language learning model. The question is about the extent to which L2 learning differs from or resembles L1 learning. The study argues that there are more divergences than similarities between the two processes.
Summary

This chapter has mainly consisted of answering the initial five research questions of the study. The answer to the first question regarding teachers’ attitude toward CS is that even though they have tried to avoid it, teachers sometimes have used French-English alternation as a teaching strategy or technique. Concerning the second question related to the functions of CS, French-English alternation was used as a means of (1) translation, (2) practicing discovery and rote learning, (3) explaining or expending a teaching point, (4) bridging communication gap and (5) enhancing students’ engagement in task. As for the types of sequencing in which CS is likely to occur, the analysis showed that CS occurred during extra-curriculum time (before or after class). In the lessons studied, CS was typically found during pair or group activities. The relevance of understanding CS in teaching French as a foreign language at the college may be found in a change of mentality by teachers. The change is the awareness that CS is a natural communication tool that can be used by all bilinguials, included L2 learners and teachers. Finally, concerning the implications of the study for the formal teaching of French
at the college level, it was argued that the question related to a broader issue of similarities and differences between L1 and L2, and that for this reason, it will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5
FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this concluding chapter is threefold. First, it presents the major facts identified during the observations. Second, it discusses the covert assumptions about the teaching performed in the three classes observed. Thirdly, the chapter tries to find out some pedagogical recommendations from the study. The chapter also addresses, above all, one of the most disputed issues in present day scholarship, the relationship between research and classroom find practice.

Scholars are sometimes divided into those who believe that research and practice are unrelated and those who hold the view that research without practice is irrelevant. The more fundamental question, however, relates to what research is all about. Richards et al. (1992: 4) define research as all activity that “seeks to discover scientific principles or develop general laws and theories.” In this sense, the purpose of research is to develop theory or what Ellis (1997:8) has named technical knowledge, that is, the kind of knowledge “acquired deliberately either by reflecting deeply about the object of inquiry, or by investigating it
empirically."

On many occasions, however, research does more than simply increase technical knowledge. It helps improve practical knowledge, the kind of knowledge gained through experience (Ellis 1997). But, this may be the exception rather than the rule, some scholars would argue. Hence, the gap between theory, symbolized by research, and practice still remains.

A commonly acceptable view on this debate nowadays seems to be the recognition of two major types of research. One is what may be called research for research’s sake (i.e., research for theory development). The other may be called research for practice change and improvement (e.g., action research). Each type is a scholarly activity on its own and has its own merits.

Language scholars have for a long time acknowledged and advocated the principle that research constitutes both an important component of effective teaching practice and a necessary base for language teaching theory. The history of language teaching includes records of efforts by researchers in order to bridge the gap between theory and practice. One of such endeavors is Frie’s (1945) development of the Audio-lingual Method on the basis of structural linguistics and behavioral psychology theories. As Richards and Rogers (1993) explained, Fries rejected the idea that language must be taught gradually and through exposure, and that grammar
should occur last in the process as the proponents of the Direct Method had claimed. Using the theory of structural linguistics, Fries identified the structure of the language with its basic sentence patterns. He then chose sentence patterns, representatives of grammar (or structure) as the starting point of teaching in the Audiolingual Method. Joining both theories of structural linguistics and those of behavioral psychology, Fries determined that language teaching must consist of habit formation by means of repetition and reinforcement. This perspective is exemplified in the audio-lingual method of the 1970s.

Another example of the connection between theory and practice may be found in the present day’s trend of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Originated in the early 1970s in Europe, CLT draws on the theory of language as a means of communication. Its key tenet is Hyme’s (1972) notion of communicative competence as opposed to Chomsky’s (1965) linguistic competence. The focus on communicative competence has helped researchers such as Halliday (1973), Widdowson (1978), Brumfit and Johnson (1979) develop a functional approach to language teaching. Thus, the basic teaching units, according to the approach, are categories of functional and communicative meaning as they appear in daily life conversations, not patterns of language structure symbolized by its grammar.

Rather than developing language teaching methods from a
diversity of theories, other researchers such as Ellis (1997) have investigated the relevance of findings by linguists and applied linguists to language pedagogy. This kind of inquiry has given birth to the discipline of Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Ellis (1997) noted that before developing into its present form characterized by a diversity of sub-fields, of which some are independent from L2 teaching, SLA was originally pedagogically motivated. This means “researchers conducted studies with the express intention of addressing pedagogic issues.” (Ellis 1997: 5). He went on to pinpoint what SLA researchers have found which may be useful to L2 practitioners, before showing how those findings may be implemented in L2 pedagogy.

Bridging the gap between theory and practice constitutes one of the main goals of the present study. How L2 pedagogy can benefit from the studies of CS by sociolinguists, linguists, conversation analysts and even L2 teachers themselves has been the stance taken in this study.

**Findings**

**Features of the talk in the classes observed**

This study has mainly consisted of an investigation of CS in a foreign language learning/teaching environment. CS, nonetheless, does not occur in a vacuum. It is found
within the contextual framework of talk. Thus, it may be useful to present the main features of the talk noticed in the classes observed, before an account of facts about CS itself is made possible.

The first characteristic is the teacher-dominated nature of the talk. As a general impression, the teachers in the class observed tended to do most of the talking during their interactions with the students. This is evidenced by the teachers’ long speeches to which students often had just a few words to react (see Appendix C). A possible explanation is the fact that more time was spent on the presentation phase of the lessons, rather than on activities that could allow students to react verbally.

The only opportunities where the students could freely express themselves were pair or group activities and class presentations. It was found that pair activities such as a peer review of composition drafts included a considerable amount of utterances in English. Hancock (1997) found a similar phenomenon in his investigation of CS with a group of Spanish-speaking students learning English as a foreign language.

Class presentations were only possible in FRENCH 104.03. The course, an introduction to French culture, took a seminar format, especially in its final stage. Working in pairs, the students had to investigate a topic of French history or culture and present it to their colleagues. The
use of overhead projector and videotape equipment contributed clarity and excitement to the presentations. The audience was allowed to ask questions during or after the presentation. Even though the language produced by the students during the presentations was far from being perfect (e.g., French spoken with an English accent and errors in the use of articles), communication was remarkable, and everybody's participation was active.

An important fact noticed during the presentations was the absence of CS. As an explanation, exhibiting almost the same level of proficiency in French, the students had no problems interacting on-record (Hancock 1997) with one another. Thus, English was unnecessary to supplement comprehension. Another explanation is the fact that students were eager to show off their L2 knowledge. That is why they opted for an exclusive use of the target language. CS could have been perceived as a lack of expertise in the French language by the audience.

Another feature of the talk observed concerns the students' listening comprehension. As a result of the teachers' long speeches, students seemed to have considerably developed their listening skill. This is revealed by the students' positive reactions to the teachers' multiple comprehension checks. The students' speaking skill, on the other hand, was a major problem. With some exceptions, short responses such "Yes" or "No"
constituted the bulk of the students' speech. Long sequences of talk such as those usually involved in elaborate explanations were rare and hard to achieve. This was particularly true in FRENCH 103.01 and FRENCH 104.03 classes where students' oral participation was mostly restricted to providing the French or English translations of vocabulary items.

Finally, two kinds of talk were observed. One aimed at solving practical class problems (e.g., management and administration problems), whereas the other was directed to the actual teaching the target language. The distinction is similar to McHoul's (1987) notion of informal versus formal setting. But, as argued early, the classroom is both an informal and formal setting. Hancock's (1997) investigation of how CS was used at two "layers" of L2 interactions provides some evidence to this dual characteristic of the classroom talk.

Hancock observed that classroom interactions operate in two different frames, literal frame and nonliteral. In the literal frame, participants do not behave as teachers and learners, but as individuals engaged in genuine interactions. The talk in this frame is usually off-record, that is, meant to be heard only by an individual or a small group of individuals. The unmarked code (i.e., the expected language of the interaction) is L1. In the nonliteral frame, however, the participants are role-playing. Each individual
behaves as either a teacher or a student, but never as both characters. The unmarked code is the target language and the talk on-record, meant for everyone in the audience to hear.

In the classes observed, the literal frame included not only group activities and class management, but also talk before and after official class time. As it was noticed, talk in those periods of class tended to be conducted in English, or involved a high amount of instances of CS if conducted in French.

Regarding CS itself, it was found that teachers sometimes resorted to CS in a variety of ways, even though they gave the impression of avoiding it. An important fact, however, was that CS had different purposes depending on the situation in which it was performed. Hence, the following distinction between communicational CS and pedagogical CS needs to be explained further.

**Communicational and Pedagogical Use of CS**

It was argued that class includes language features of both informal and formal settings. As a result, CS tended to be either informal or formal. An informal kind of CS may be related to Hancock’s (1997) literal frame. This means CS is more conversational-like or communicational in the parts of the lessons involving administration and classroom management (e.g., activities such as solving registration
Bon. Aussi- alors un petit rappel, eu:m vous vous OK. Then also a little reminder, u:m you
souvenez de cette demoiselle qui est venue nous remember about that young woman who came to tell
dire que il y a, vous pouvez aller, dans la us that, you can go, in the Cunz class
de Cunz (( )), et là, vous pouvez parler and there, you can speak
français, vous pouvez discuter des points French, you can discuss about grammar issues, etc.
de grammaire, etc. C’est GRATUIT. Free. C’est It’s charge free. It’s
GRATUIT. D’accord? Alors le lundi de vingt heure FREE. OK? So Monday from 8:40 pm
(TP1/ScB)

The above citation deals with a teacher’s reminder about the tutorial. The flow of her speech is relatively slow with several stops between phrases (see punctuation) to insure comprehension. The word “Free” (line 36), is an English translation of the French word “gratuit”. The teacher’s motivation for switching the code could be the feeling that the students do not know the word. A quick insertion of translation may help them understand the information being conveyed without interrupting the flow of the interaction.

Thus, the context is not a vocabulary lesson, but an introductory speech providing information about the class
administration. Even though the students may have learned a new vocabulary item, this however, is not the primary goal of CS. The role of the switch here is to facilitate comprehension rather than teach the target language. CS in this particular use is comparable to conversational CS in that it is mainly communicational and discourse-related.

Formal CS, on the other hand, relates to the situation in which the target language is being formally taught. It occurs when the non-target language is intentionally used to introduce, explain or practice the target language as shown in the following excerpt.

31. T: Les devoirs. Très bien. Et est-ce que devoir est
   Duties. Very good. And is duty
32. masculin ou féminin.
   masculine or feminine
33. S: Masculin.
   Masculine.
34. T: C’est masculin. La plupart des- I’ll say this in
   It’s masculine. Most of
35. English. Most nouns in French that are derived from
36. verbs like devoir which comes from the verb devoir
37. are masculine. There are exceptions () but most of
38. them are masculine. Numéro neuf. A female citizen.
   Number nine.
   A citizen.
40. T: Une citoyenne. Et le numéro dix, coupable.
   A citizen. And number ten, coupable.
41. S: Guilty.
42. T: Coupable is an adjective which means guilty but
The above section from a translation practice contains two switches to English. The first in lines 34-5 is a side-comment about a rule about gender in French. As argued in the analysis, given the scope of its content, the comment has been called an expansion on the language feature at stake, in this case the noun “devoirs” (duties). From a single noun, the teacher provides a rule of gender recognition for all nouns derived from verbs. The second switch in lines 42-3 is also a side-comment on the word “coupable” (guilty) which is as the same time a noun and an adjective in French. The comment has been named an explanation because of the short span of its scope. Both switches are found in a nonliteral frame (Hancock (1997) where the participants’ roles, teacher versus students, are obvious. The talk is on-record (e.g., intended to all the class) and aims at conveying new information about the target language. For all those reasons, CS here appears to be pedagogical.

It is important, however, to emphasize that communicational and pedagogic CS are often intertwined with one another so that there is no clear division between the two. Sometimes, talk performed in a literal frame may be on-record as shown in the following extract.
Bien. Donner un coup de main. C’est difficile
OK. Give a blow of hand. It’s difficult
comme expression. Donner un coup de main à
as an expression. Give a blow of hand to
quelqu’un, donner un coup de main à
quelqu’un.
someone, give a blow of hand to someone
Give someone help.
Oui d’accord? Un coup de main is not a schew
Yes, Ok? A blow of hand
(gesture)
Coup c’est en général a stab.
Blow in general is a stab
Non ( ) ou:: embêter quelqu’un. Vous
No or bother someone. You
avez
usually
l’habitude de dire je m’embête.
say I’m bothering myself
To bother someone.
Encore. Voyez ( ). To bother, c’est bien.
Again. You see that’s OK.
Bon. Le quai de la gare. Le quai de la gare.
Good. The platform of a railway station
(0.3). Non-non-non Davin. Davin me regarde.
No-no-no Davin. Davin is looking at me.
You’re dreaming. OK. Le quai de la gare.
The platform of the railway station.

The above excerpt includes two instances of CS, but only the first seems to fulfill the requirements of a pedagogic CS. In line 107, the teacher provides a quick translation of the word “coup” (stab). The purpose of the
switch is to distinguish the literal meaning of the word from the meaning implied in the French expression “Donner un coup de main (Give a helping hand). CS in this case is pedagogically-oriented.

In line 114, the teacher addresses an individual student who does not seem to participate in the lesson. The frame, therefore, is expected to be literal, the talk off-record and CS communicational. This, however, is not the case. Though occurring in a one-to-one interaction, the talk here is on-record and the participants involved are acting as teacher and student. There is enough evidence to believe that the teacher, through this particular student, wants to convey a message of attention and full participation to the whole class. Payne and Hustler (1980) argued that a teacher’s address to the cohort through an individual student aims at insuring class participation and maintaining discipline.

Thus, not every CS act performed in the classroom is pedagogical. Some functions of CS are communicational and may be compared to those of conversational CS. But, despite the difficult problem of their identification, communicational and pedagogical CS have each a pattern of its own determined above all by the kind of situation in which they occur. How situation, frame, talk and code (i.e., language in the present case) combine with one another to produce CS in an L2 classroom is summarized in the Table
below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Formal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Literal</td>
<td>Non-Literal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk</td>
<td>Off-record</td>
<td>On-Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked Code</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Target Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codeswitching</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communicational Pedagogic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.5. Configuration of Classroom Codeswitching

**Limitations**

The above discussion would be incomplete without acknowledging two major limitations of the present investigation. The first relates to data elicitation. CA (Conversation Analysis) was the only procedure used for data elicitation. Other means of data collection (e.g., questionnaire or interview) could be used alongside CA as a triangulation technique in the interpretation of the participants’ utterance. This, however, was not the case. The reason for such a choice was that the notion of sequentiality applied in CA constitutes an important tool to accurate interpretation of the speakers’ utterances. The use of only one procedure may be a limitation.

The second limitation is found in the language proficiency of the participants. As a reminder, the study
level investigated was intermediate. It was noticed that the classes were mainly teacher-centered, with most talk produced in a lecture style. This was evidenced by long sequences of speech in French without instances of CS in English. Perhaps, a more advanced level or a combination of different levels could have generated more CS. The delimitation of the study to just one proficiency level may also constitute a limitation.

Finally, 14 hours of class observation also constitutes a limitation. More observation time could have produced more instances of CS with a diversity of functions.

**Implications**

The major implication of the above findings in this particular setting is that the L1 is ever present during L2 instruction. Such an influence can be detected at two levels of language use, the language level itself and the pragmatic level. English, as seen in the analysis, was used in the classrooms observed for translation, practicing discovery and rote learning, explaining, expending, bridging communication gaps and enhancing class participation. Given the teacher’s dominant role in the classes, many of those functions were teacher-initiated.

Another implication is that it was teachers’ practical knowledge (e.g., experience), more than their technical
knowledge (e.g., theories of language or L2 teaching), which governed in-class performance in general, and the production of CS in particular. Teachers seemed to behave more according to what actually works in the classroom, than to what they had been told works. This could be seen through a wise selection of insights from different teaching methods, including the Grammar Translation Method, that composed the basis of their in-class practice. The negative characterization of the influence of L1 in L2 instruction seemed to have little impact on the teachers' actual behavior in class.

Concerning language learning as a process, the a major implication of the study is that the acquisition of L2 is highly dependent on L1, even though some SLA researchers, applied linguists and L2 practitioners may find it hard to admit. Stern (1992: 282) clearly expressed this reality when he wrote, “whether we like it or not, the new language is learnt on the basis of a previous language.” CS is one of the many manifestations of L1 within the process of L2 learning. Indeed, a recent study of bilingual first language acquisition¹ by Köppe and Jürggen 1995) shows that the CS phenomenon emerges as early as the age of two. Its early

¹ Bilingual first language acquisition is defined as a simultaneous acquisition of both L1 and L2 before the age of three (see McLaughlin 1984, Köppe and Jürgen 1995)
appearance mostly deals with the mixing of functional word such as dietic expressions (e.g., here/there), negative and affirmative particles (e.g., no/yes) and adverbials (e.g., more/less). The mixing later on becomes the confusion of lexical categories, mostly nouns. The study also suggests that early CS occurs not only at the structural (syntactic) level, but also at the pragmatic level. For instance, it was noticed that children sometimes changed language to adjust to a new participant in an interaction.

Köppé’s and Jürrgen’s (1995) study shows that the period of the emergence of CS in bilingual first language acquisition is the same as the period of monolingual first language acquisition. This suggests that bilingualism, like monolingualism, is a natural linguistic phenomenon. Consequently, SLA needs to be regarded as a process in its own right, rather than a deviation from the norm often associated with L1 acquisition.

The use of L1 in the class observed could also have involved switches at the pragmatic level. This means that cultural features of L1 could have been used as a resource in the process of L2 learning (see Blum-Kulka et al. 1989; Beebe et al. 1990). Students, in the present investigation, probably used both linguistic and nonlinguistic communication strategies of the American culture to interact with each other or with their instructors.

A previous study by Nzwanga (1994) revealed that a
group of graduate students from the University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, learning French as a foreign language referred to their American cultural background when expressing refusals in French. Three different groups of participants were investigated, (1) native speakers of American English, (2) native speakers of French and (3) native speakers of American English learning French as a foreign language. Refusals in American English and French as a foreign language were shown to be direct and less elaborate, compared to refusals expressed by native speakers of French. This was an indication of pragmatic transfer from American English to French.

The dynamics of pragmatics in the present study may be seen through the participants’ constant alternations between informal and formal frames. The changes reveal that students and instructors have some common background knowledge of communication strategies, most probably drawn from the American culture, which helps them determine not only what to say, but also how, when and to whom to say it, as Hymes (1972) would argue.

**Recommendations**

The above discussion may be summarized in the following statements. The first is that L1 is always present in L2 instruction. The second statement is that all attempts to ignore and avoid using L1 in L2 instruction as some teaching
methods have suggested is unrealistic. A more realistic approach to L2 teaching should therefore take into account the primacy of L1 over L2, and incorporate L1 in L2 instruction. Such a shift needs to be achieved at both the theoretical and practical levels. At the theoretical level, there is perhaps no better model to suggest than Cook’s (1999) Multicompetent Language User Model in L2 teaching; whereas at the practical level, some methodological guidelines are needed to explain how L1 may effectively serve L2 instruction.

The Multicompetent Language User Model

As argued earlier, a major influence of behavioral psychology in L2 teaching was the Audiolingual Method (ALM). The proponents of this method strongly believed that L2 learning mainly consisted of habit formation. To that effect, learning included the manipulation of the target language throughout drill exercises. Originated in the notion that learners’ errors were due to the influence of L1, the practice of contrastive analysis (CA) also played a key role in successfully promoting the ALM. Consequently, the co-occurrence of L1 and L2 in the same learning environment was not acceptable.

A number of studies, however, reveal that a native-like proficiency in an L2 is either attainable or elusive,
depending on a number of factors such as the learner’s age, aptitude, motivation and personality (Ellis 1992). The results of investigations on age factor (Dulay et al. 1982, Hatch 1983 and Stern 1983), for instance, have thus far been so diverse that no agreement could be reached among researchers. In addition, native speaker’s proficiency is often variable. Equal ability in all the four language skills, speaking, listening, reading and writing, is indeed hard to be achieved even by native speakers. Thus, judging L2 speakers on the basis of L1 alone appears inappropriate, as the reference for such a judgment is not accurate itself.

A solution to this problem can be found in Cook’s (1999) notion that the difference between L2 and L1 competence is not a deficit of the former. He first acknowledged the many differences between L2 and L1 competence. Those differences were mainly found on the area of thought processing where L2 learners have generally been found to be less effective than L1 speakers. On the other hand, bilinguals seem to have the benefit of brain-training which consists of developing a variety of mental skills such as creativity and analogical reasoning.

Second, Cook (1999: 190) coins the term *multicompetence*, which, in his own terms “implies that at some level the sum of language knowledge in the mind is relevant, not just the portions dedicated to L1 or L2.” In other words, L2 competence is the combination of two types
of linguistic resources, those drawn respectively from L1 and L2. The term also underlies the fact that L2 situation does not consist of learning alone, but also and perhaps more importantly of using the language.

Cook (1999) finally argued that the linguistic diversity of a multicompetent user reveals itself in many different ways including codeswitching. "Code switching", he wrote, "is the most obvious achievement of multicompetent user that monolingual native speakers cannot duplicate, as they have no language to switch into" (Cook 1999: 193).

The recommendation for L2 teachers at the conceptual level may be summarized as follows. First and contrary to a widespread view, the difference between L1 and L2 competence should not be interpreted as deficiencies of the latter, but as intrinsic features of each type of competence. Second, all efforts to get rid of L1 in a L2 learning situation is elusive, especially when the learners are adults. L1 is, therefore, an asset that needs to be incorporated in the L2 learning/teaching process.

This recommendation may not be accepted by some L2 practitioners, especially those who believe in the behaviorist view of L2 learning. Nonetheless, it is based on what was observed during this investigation. However, given the limitations of the present study and the possibility for CS to serve a variety of functions of CS in an L2 classroom, further investigations are needed in order to understand
better how the phenomenon can adequately fulfil teaching purposes.

**Methodological Guidelines**

One way of incorporating L1 in L2 classroom is to work along the lines of its natural occurrence as shown in Table 1.5. (see on p. 124). The basic distinction between the informal and formal situation of the L2 classroom which determines language allocation may be reflected in lesson plans. Thus, for instance, teachers would use L1 in the literal frame (i.e., one-to-one interaction or side comment) and leave L2 to be practiced in non-literal frame (i.e., formal teaching of the language). L1 may also be used as a metalanguage, that is, the language used to explain language.

On the other hand, the Multicomptence Language User Model, rather than the Native-Speaker Model, may be implemented throughout the choice of teaching materials. Listening material, for instance, may comprise speech samples including conversations and readings of successful L2 users. Conversation samples may even involve instances of CS. Likewise, extracts of successful L2 writers may serve as models in developing students’ writing skills.

Finally, setting appropriate goals for L2 users, as Cook (1999) suggested, may result in a more productive L2
pedagogy. Cook argued that L2 teaching goals may be divided between classroom-internal goals, on the one hand, and classroom-external goals on the other hand. Classroom-internal goals relate to what goes on in the classroom and includes activities such as students’ interactions with the teacher or with one another; whereas classroom-external goals refer to the real world outside the classroom and imply the native speaker as the ultimate standard and target. The two types of goals may not be explicitly related, but the fundamental difference between the two is that classroom-internal goals reflect more realistic L2 teaching, especially in a foreign language setting where the classroom is a small and different world from the real one which surrounds the student outside of the classroom.

Summary

The goal in this chapter was to present the major findings of the study, discuss their implications and make pedagogical recommendations. In terms of the findings, two important facts were revealed. One relates to the teacher-dominated nature of the talk in the classes observed. It was found that trained in the mainstream of Communicative Language Teaching Method, the teachers in the classes observed were expected to allow more interactions between them and the students, and among the students. This,
however, was not the case, except for one class, FRENCH 104.03. Teachers tended to be more dogmatic and students’ involvement seemed limited. In addition to the teacher’s dominance, some features of teaching methods such as the Grammar-Translation Method and the Audiolingual Method were also evident throughout translations and drilling practices. The other important revealed fact was the difference between communicational and pedagogical CS. The former was mostly found in the parts of the conversation that seemed less formal such as teacher-student or student-student interaction; whereas the latter occurred during formal teaching sessions. The major implication of those findings is that L1 is always present in an L2 teaching/learning situation, and it should not be ignored. Thus, it is recommended that methods which incorporate L1 in L2 teaching be used, particularly in situations where all the students in the class have a common L1. Such methods should consider successful L2 users as models, as well as native speakers. The chapter also recommended that more research be conducted on the use of CS in an L2 teaching/learning environment for a better understanding of its pedagogical and communicational usefulness.
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Appendix A

Instructor Information Form

1. Identity

   A. Name (or initials):
   ______________________________________________________________________
   (First)   (Middle)   (Last)

   B. Gender:  ____ Male   ____ Female

   C. Major/Dpt: ____________________________

   D. Degree.  ____ M.A.   ____ Ph.D.

2. Linguistic background

   A. Native language ____________________________

   B. Other languages spoken fluently

   C. Other languages in which you are less proficient.

3. Foreign language teaching experience

   A. Have you ever taught a foreign language before?
      Yes/No   Name of the language:
      For how long?   Where (country)? ______

   B. How long have you been teaching French at OSU?
      ______

4. Training

   A. Had you ever taken a foreign language teaching course
      before you started your present job? Yes______
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No_____

For how long ______ and
where_________________________

Course name and textbook(s) used:______________

Thank you for your participation
Appendix B

Student Information Form

1. Identity
   A. Name (optional) __________________________ (First) (Middle) (Last)
   B. Gender _____Male _____Female
   C. Major/Dpt __________________________
   D. Degree _____Undergr. _____MA _____Ph.D. _____Other (specify)

2. Linguistic background
   A. What is your native language?
   __________________________
   B. List any other languages that you speak (fluently or not)
      __________________________
   C. Have you ever taken a French course before? _____Yes _____No
      If "yes", for how long: _____ and where (country):
      __________________________
      Course name/number: __________________________
      Textbook(s): __________________________
   D. List reasons why you are taking this class:
      __________________________

Thank you for your participation
Appendix C

Glossary of Transcript Symbols
A condensed version of Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson's (1974) system quoted from Goodwin (1990: 25)

Example:

Bea: Twel-Thir<br>ree:n
Bea: ((Chanting) THIRteen (only) Thirtee(h)n.
(0.4)
11 12 13 14 15

1. **Low Volume**: A degree sign indicates that talk is precedes is low in volume.

2. **Cut-off**: A dash mark a sudden cut-off of the current. Here, instead of bringing the word "twelve" to a completion, Bea interrupts it in the mid-course.

3. **Overlap Bracket**: A left bracket marks the point at which the current talk is overlapped by other talk. Thus Dave's "Thirteen" begins during the last syllable of Bea's "Fourteen". Two speakers beginning to speak simultaneously are shown by a left bracket at the beginning of a line.

4. **Lengthening**: Colons indicate that the sound immediately preceding has been noticeably lengthened.

5. **Overlap Slashes**: Double slashes provides an alternative method of marking overlap. When they are used the overlapping talk is not indented to the point of overlap. Here Bea's last line begins just after the "Four" in Dave's "Fourteen."

6. **Intonation**: Punctuation symbols are used to mark intonation changes rather than as grammatical symbols:

   . A period indicate a falling contour.
A question mark indicates a rising contour.
A comma indicates a falling-rising contour.

8. **Latching**: The equal sign indicate "latching": there is no interval between the end of a prior turn and the start of the next piece of talk.

9. **Inbreath**: A series of h's preceded by an asterisk marks an inbreath. Without the asterisk the h's mark an outbreak.

10. **Rapid Speech**: Tildes indicate that speech is slurred together because it is spoken rapidly.

11. **Comments**: Double parentheses enclose material that is not part of the talk being transcribed, for example, a comment by the transcriber if the talk was spoken in some special way.

12. **Silence**: Numbers in parentheses mark silences in seconds and tenth of seconds

13. **Increased Volume**: Capitals indicate increased volume.

14. **Problematic Hearing**: Material in parentheses indicates a hearing that the transcriber was uncertain about.

15. **Breathiness, Laughter**: An h in parentheses indicates plosive aspiration, which could result from events such as breathiness, laughter, or crying.
Appendix D

Videotape Transcripts

TAPE 1: FRENCH 104.01

Section A

1. T: Alors. Aujourd’hui, mercredi quatre-ze, j’ai reçu So. Today, Wednesday fourteen, I’ve received
   une liste d’étudiants, qui doivent venir me voir,
   a list of students who must come to see me,
   dans mon bureau quatre-cent douze. D’accord?
   in my office four hundred twelve. OK?
   Vous avez signé, alors vous vous souvenez de ça?
   You have signed up, so you remember it?
   (O.2).

6. C’est pour discuter, de vous, anglais, français,
   It’s to discuss, of you, English, French,
   savoir d’où vous venez, etc. ((   )).
   to know where you come from, etc.
   tas de problèmes. Comment tu t’appelles?
   lots of problems. What’s your name?

9. S: Angy, (O.1). Angy,

10. T: Angy?

    Yes.

12. T: Tu n’es pas sur mon-
    You are not on my-

13. S: Non. Eum. ((   ))
    No. Um

14. T: Oui, tu veux-l, tu veux: être dans cette
    Yes, you want-t, you want to be in this class?
    classe?
15. S: Oui. Eum. (())
    Yes. Um

16. T: D'accord? Tu auras un papier-
    OK? You'll get a form-

    Um- Yes. No.

18. T: Non? 'K. Eum. Si tu veux vraiment assister à la
    No? 'K. Um. If you really want to be in this

19. classe, alors il faudra que tu t'inscrives.
    class then you must register first.

20. D'accord? Eum (( il faut )) que tu t'inscrives
    OK? Um (( it is a must )) that you register

21. donc il faut que tu e: ok (( )) a cette heure.
    so you must (( )) at this hour hour.

22. D'accord?
    OK?

Section B

23. T: Bon. Comme bientôt la classe va commencer,
    puisque
    Ok. As the class is going to start soon, since

24. ce n'est pas encore l'heure, mais très bientôt
    it is not time yet, but very soon

25. (0.1). ça va l'être. Alors en attendant-hmhm.
    it is going to be. So meanwhile-hmhm

26. Et puis rappelez-vous, ((noises)).
    And also remember,

27. Tu veux écrire ton nom s'il te plait? sur eu:m tu
    Would you like to write your name please? On u:m

28. veux écrire ton nom sur cette liste? Ça sera très
    would you like to write your name on this list?

29. gentil, à la suite, avec ton numéro de téléphone
    That'll be very kind of you, at the bottom, with
    your phone number.

30. (( )).
Bon. Aussi- alors un petit rappel, eu: m vous vous OK. Then- also a little reminder, u: m you
souvenez de cette demoiselle qui est venue nous remember about that young woman who came to tell
dire que il y a, vous pouvez aller, dans la trade Fascus class
us that, you can go, in the Cunz class
de Cunz ((        )), et là, vous pouvez parler and there, you can speak
français, vous pouvez discuter des points French, you can discuss about grammar issues, etc.
de grammaire, etc. C'est GRATUIT. Free. C'est It's charge free. It's
GRATUIT. D'accord? Alors le lundi de vingt Free. OK? So Monday from 8:40 pm
heure quarante, de dix-huit heure quarante cinq a dix- from 6:45 pm to
heure trente, donc il y a de l'espace, et le ((
10:30 pm, so there is some space, and the
)). Vous avez tous ce papier- je vous rappelle You remember this form- I remind you
c'est très pratique. (0.1). Je trouve. Bon. (0.1). It's very convenient I find. OK.
Questions? On va commencer- be: n on va sonner dans Questions? We'll begin the bell's going to
in a few seconds. Questions? No one? OK. So
voila, on commence. On commence par faire there we go. Let's begin. Let's take the roll
l'appel. first.
(T takes the roll then bell rings).

Section C
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46. T: Et ça commence. Un p’tit peu d’avance mais il y a
   And here we go. A little bit ahead of time but
47. beaucoup de choses à faire comme quoi. (())
   there are lots of things to do
48. C’est très important. (0.3). Alors. Bon. E::m quel
   It’s very important. So. OK. Erm what
49. temps fait-il aujourd’hui s’il vous plaît?
   is the weather like today please?
50. Réfléchissez, quel temps fait-il?
   Think, what is the weather like?
51. S1: Il fait froid.
   It’s cold.
   It’s cold yes? Yes.
53. S3: E:m il fait bon.
   Erm it’s good.
   It’s beautiful. Yes? Who likes this weather? Who
55. temps? Betsy?
   likes this weather? Betsy?
56. Betsy: Pourquoi Gerry?
   Why Gerry?
57. Gerry: E:: j’aime l’hiver.
   Err I like winter.
58. T: Tu aimes l’hiver? Ah-bon, oui mai:s tu aimes
   You like winter? How come, yes but you like
59. l’hiver humide? avec de la pluie? ou tu aimes
   a wet winter? with rain? or you like it
60. Ça.
   this (way).
   This (way).
   OK. Why do you like this weather.
63. John: J’aime la neige, ((  )).
    I like te snow

64. T: Tu aimes la neige, ((  )) wow-huhuhh.
    You like the snow,

65. Tu mm-OK. Tu aimes l’hiver aussi, Betsy? Pourquoi
    you mm-OK. You like the snow as well, Betsy? Why

66. tu aimes ce temps.
    you like this weather.

67. Betsy: Parce que j’aime l’hiver.
    ’Cause I like the snow.

    You like the snow. I’d like to LIKE the snow.

    Why do you like winter. Why.

70. Betsy: Pasque:: je pense que que c’est très joli. Je
    ’Cause I think it’s very beautifu. I

71. ne sais pas pourquoi, mais j’aime bien
    don’t know why, but I like winter.

72. l’hiver.

73. T: Tu ne sais pas pourquoi.
    You don’t know why.

74. Il faudra une bonne discussion pour que
    It will take a good discussion for me

75. j’arrive à aimer l’hiver. Je n’aime pas
    I don’t like winter.

76. to like winter. Big shoes, big coats,

77. l’hivers. De grosses chaussures, de gros
    who likes winter in this

78. menteaux, qui aime l’hiver dans cette
    who likes winter in this

79. classe? Qui aime l’hiver? Alors une, deux,
    class? Who likes winter? So, one, two,

80. trois oh::, ce n’est pas mal-hein? Je vous
    three Not bad. I will need your advise.

81. demanderai des conseils. Comment faire pour
    How do I do to
80. aimer l’hiver-huhuh-er. D’accord-bon. Je 
like winter. That’s OK.
81. n’aime pas l’hiver. 
I don’t like winter.

Section D

82. T: Alors un tout ptit peu de vocabulaire, e::: vous

So, a little bit of vocabulary, you
83. me regardez, c’est un warm up, Ok? On se look at me

Let’s warm up
84. rechauffe avec ce temps. Bon-alors. Vous me with this weather. Ok-then. You look
85. regardez, et je pointe. Je dois aller très vite at me, and I point out. I must go very fast
86. pour voir combien est-ce que vous connaissez. to know how much you know
87. Ce n’est pas mauvais. Alors par exemple. It’s not bad. For instance.
88. Je vous donne le français, vous me donnez une I give you the French (version), you give me
89. traduction en anglais. Ça vient de vot’ liste. a translation in English. It comes from your list.
90. Ce n’est pas la peine, ce n’est pas la peine, Don’t bother, don’t bother,
91. Alors ça va être très difficile si vous ((
So it’s going to be very difficult if you
92. Ce n’est pas la peine, ce n’est pas la peine, It is not worth it, it is not worth it,
93. S: Don’t bother.
94. T: Don’t bother, oui. It comes from the book so yes.
95. that I don’t need to make the sentence ((
96. Déranger quelqu’un, déranger, Bother someone, bother,
97. S: Don’t bother.
98. T: Oui c’est la même chose. Don’t bother. 
   Yes, it’s the same thing. Bother
99. C’est to bother. Dérange quelqu’un. Tu me 
   It’s Bother someone. You bother 
   deranges, d’accord? 
   me. OK?
100. Bien. Donner un coup de main. C’est difficile 
    OK. Give a blow of hand. It’s difficult 
    comme expression. Donner un coup de main à 
    as an expression. Give a blow of hand to 
    quelqu’un, donner un coup de main à quelqu’un. 
    someone, give a blow of hand to someone
104. S: Give someone help.
105. T: Oui d’accord? Un coup de main is not a schew 
   Yes, Ok? A blow of hand
106. (gesturing a punch). Coup c’est en général a stab. 
    Blow in general is a stab
107. Non (( )) ou:: embêter quelqu’un. Vous 
    No or bother someone. You usually 
    l’habitude de dire je m’embête. 
    say I’m bothering myself
110. S: To bother someone.
111. T: Encore. Voyez ((enco)). To bother, c’est bien. 
    Again. You see that’s OK.
112. Bon. Le quai de la gare. Le quai de la gare. 
    Good. The platform of a railway station
113. (0.3). Non-non-non Davin. Davin me regarde. 
    No-no-no Davin. Davin is looking at me.
114. You’re dreaming. OK. Le quai de la gare. 
    The platform of the railway station.
115. (0.20). OK-OK ((  )).
116. S: ((   )) something about ((   ))

117. Oui-oui-oui on va-
    Yes-yes-yes we'll-

118. T: Alors c’est?
    So, it’s?

119. S: The platform?

    Yes. Platform. People wait on the platform. Of
    course.

121. Le portefeuille. Le portefeuille, où vous mettez
    The wallet. The wallet, where you put
    votre argent. Le portefeuille, Anne.
    your money. The wallet, Anne.

122. Anne: Wallet.

    Yes, then. To lend money to your friend

    Lend money, Mary. Lend money.

125. Mary: To:: lend.

126. T: Oui. to lend. Bon. On dirait que le camarad- le
    Yes, to lend. OK. It seems that the camarad-
    the

127. le vocabulaire est assez bien su, d’accord?
    the vocabulary is known well enough, OK?

128. En général dans ma classe ça va vite comme ça et
    In general in my class it goes fast that way and
    tic-tic-tic tout le monde. Surtout le jour de la
    tic-tic-tic everyone. Especially the day of the
    leçon. Puisqu’on oublie-on oublie.
    lesson. Since one forgets-one forgets

129. (O.l). Bien. Alors e:: je répète, je rappelle
    So. Then let me repeat, I remind (you that)

130. vendredi nous avons un quiz, format du quiz,
    Friday we have a quiz, the format of the quiz,

131. grammatic, vous êtes SÜRS d’avoir quelque chose
    grammar, be sure that you’ll have something
sur savoir et connaître, vous êtes SURE
on to know and to know, be sure

((  )) déjà écrit.
already written.

S: Ecrit?
Written?

T: ((J’ai déjà écrit)), SURE d’avoir quelque chose
((I have already written)), sure to have

something

sur since for ago, depuis pendant, faites bien
on since for ago, since during, be careful when

attention quand est-ce qu’on écrit pendant et
we write during and since

we

depuis, faites TRES attention au temps, si
be very careful on tenses, if

l’action n’est pas terminée on utilise LE
the action is not ended we use the

présent, d’accord? Il faut toujours penser comme
present, OK? You must always think like

cela. Ce n’est pas la même chose en anglais.
that. It’s not the same thing as in English.

Et la dernière chose le conditionnel, qu’on va
And the last thing is the conditional, that

voir aujourd’hui. Donc les trois points de
we will see today. So, the three points of

grammaire, sont sur le quiz. Quelques liens
gramm, are on the quiz. Some cultural links

culturels, que l’on ((affectera)), ce que l’on
that we ((’ll add)), what we’ll

fera, plus un peu de vocabulaire. Comment se
do, plus a little bit of vocabulary. What the

présent le vocabulaire. Je vous donne un mot,

vocabulary look like. I give you a word,

et je vous dit en français, écrivez une phrase
and you say (it) in French, write a sentence

that shows that you have understood, the meaning of
mot. Par exemple je vous donne brouillon. the word. For instance I give you draft.

(0.1). Alors, une phrase j’ai un brouillon, So, a sentence I have a draft,

cça ne marche pas. Pourquoi? doesn’t work. Why?

huhuhuhuhhh-

Je ne sais pas si vous avez compris. Vous pouvez I don’t know whether you have understood. You can
tell me j’ai un brouillon, j’ai une valise, j’ai
une: j’ai un chat–j’ai un chien. Alors par a:: I have a cat–I have a dog. So, for
exemple e::m il y avait des fautes dans-mon-instance there were errors on-my-draft
brouillon. Je crois que vous avez compris. I believe you have understood.


Questions? Ça sera comme ceci. Exactement ça. Questions? It will be like this. Exactly that.

E:: lorsqu’on a lu le lien culturel en classe. Erm when we have a cultural link read in class.

Alors vous devez toujours revoir ça pour le test, Then you must always review it for the test,
le quiz. Si on n’a pas lu, on ne lit pas tous the quiz. If you haven’t read it, you don’t read
les liens culturels. On n’aura pas le temps, puis all the cultural links. We won’t have time, also
il y en a qui sont plus intéressants que d’autres, there are some that are more interesting than others,
alors ce n’est pas la peine de les lire en so don’t bother to read them at home.

prive, simplement ce qu’on fait EN CLASSE. Il est simply what we do in class. It’s useful
utile de refaire les exercices qu'on fait en classe. Je vous ai dit des exercices, souvent je draw sentences from exercises, and I just put just sur le quiz. D'accord? Bon. Fini avec le them on the quiz. OK? Good. That's all about quiz. C'est compris donc (( )).
the quiz. It's understood then

Section E

T: E:: composition. Vous devez avoir vos brouillons, E:r composition. You must have your drafts,

sortez vos brouillons. (0.2). E:: tu ne l'as pas?
take your drafts out. E:r you don't have it?

S: Erm.

T: (to another S) Oh pardon-pardon. D'abord.
Oh excuse me-excuse me. First.

S: (to S in line 184). Elle, nous avons alle au
She we have gone to

Cunz Hall erm c'te matin et nouz printer?
Cunz Hall erm this morning and we to print?

T: Imprimer,
To print,

S: Oui. Erm la brouillon,
Yes. Erm the draft'

T: Oui,
Yes,

S: Mais erm il n'aerm n'a pas (0.1) erm
But erm it didn't ermdidn't erm

T: N'as pas marché, n'a pas imprimé.
Didn't work, didn't print.

S: No erm

T: Non?
186. S: They didn’t open the computer lab.
188. S: They were supposed to open at nine. We were
189. T: OK. D’accord.
190. S: Until nine twenty.
       Good. OK.
201. S: It sounds like ((   )).
       Good. OK-OK.

Section F

       So. Pull out you drafts. How are we going to correct.
204. Vous vous mettez par deux. Vous comprenez?
       You put yourselves in pairs. You understand?
205. Deux par deux. Alors je prend un exemple.
       Two by two. So let me take an example.
206. (0.1). Martin, bon. Tous les deux vous allez
        Martin, OK. The two of you are going
207. ((   )), vous lisez un brouillon à la fois.
        you read one draft at a time.
208. DEUX personnes lisent UN brouillon. C’est
        Two persons read one draft. Is it clear?
209. clair? Et puis alors vous regardez et vous
        And then you look and correct
210. corrigez les fautes ((   )).
        the errors.
212. Oh, je ne sais pas. Ça me parait pas bien.
        Oh, I don’t know. That cannot work.
213. Qu’est ce que tu en penses. Si vous ne savez pas,
        What do you think of it. If you don’t know,
vous me demandez. Je vais juste être là pour you ask me. I’ll be her to answer
repondre à TOUTES les questions. D’accord? ALL the questions. OK?
Bon. Sept minutes pour un brouillon, puis OK. Seven mintes on a draft, then
vous changez. Encore. DEUX personnes sur UN you exchange. TWO persons on ONE
brouillon, it’s not exchanging a little bit, draft,
et-la même chose. D’accord? Alors. Deux par and-the same thing. OK? So. Two by two
Deux, vite vite, poussez vos chaises, Two, quick quick, pouch your chairs,
(Noises and pulling of chairs).
Bon. Tout le monde est prêt? Ne parlez pas OK. Is everyone ready. Don’t speak
anglais. Et puis j’ai entendu ici, j’ai English. And then I heard here, I heard
entendu I am. Qui a dit I am? I am. Who said I am?
S: OK.
question of exchanging. I explained that.
You read together one thing.

TAPE 2: FRENCH 103.01
SECTION A

(T. gives directions for a 10-minute quiz at the beginning of the class).

1. T: OK, il est dix heures, s’il vous plaît, prenez it’s 10 o’clock, please take
2. une feuille de papier et un stylo (0.3) ((  )). a sheet of paper and a pen

3. (0.33). Tout le monde est prêt? Les livres sont Everyone is read? The books are
fermés? closed?

5. (0.2). Bien OK (0.3). Si c’est en français, OK. If it’s in French

6. traduit le en anglais, si c’est écrit en anglais, translate it in English, if it’s written in
   English,

7. traduit le en français. N’oubliez pas d’indiquer le translate it in French. Don’t forget to indicate the
genre avec le ou la, ou un M ou un F si c’est un gender with the or the, or an M or an F if it’s a
substantif a noun. (0.3). Don’t forget to indicate substantive

9. the gender of the nouns. (0.3). Amusez-vous bien. Have fun.

11. Vous avez dix minutes. You have ten minutes.

Section B

(Ten minutes later, after Ss’ sheets have been collected, T corrects the quiz).

12. T: OK, ((  )) en français, comment dit-on democracy? in French, how do we say democracy

13. S: (0.4). Democracy with a T and I E.

14. T: Excellent. Démocratie est-ce masculin ou féminin. Democracy is it masculine or feminine.


16. T: C’est féminin. Numéro deux peace. (0.2). La- It’s feminine. Number two peace

18. T: La paix. (0.3). p-a-i-ex. Numéro trois le chômage. 
   Peace. Number three 
   unemployment.

19. Qu’est-ce que c’est que le chômage en anglais. 
   What’s unemployment in English.


   Very good. Number four. The 
   homeless.

22. abri.


   Number five.

   Overpopulation.

   Overpopulation. Number seven. Future.


   Number eight.

30. S: ((   )) les devoirs. 
   duties.

31. T: Les devoirs. Très bien. Et est-ce que devoir est 
   Duties. Very good. And is duty
   masculin ou féminin. 
   masculine or feminine

33. S: Masculin. 
   Masculine.

34. T: C’est masculin. La plupart des- I’ll say this in 
   It’s masculine. Most of-
   English. Most nouns in French that are derived from 
   verbs like devoir which comes from the verb devoir 
   are masculine. There are exceptions (( )) but most of 
   them are masculine. Numero neuf. A female citizen. 
   Number nine.
   A citizen.

40. T: Une citoyenne. Et le numéro dix, coupable. 
   A citizen. And number ten, coupable.

41. S: Guilty.

42. T: Coupable is an adjective which means guilty but also 
   used as a noun meaning guilty person.

SECTION C

(The correction of the 10-minute quiz has just been completed).

44. OK bien. Quelques remarques sur le vocabulaire, 
   Well. Some remarks on the vocabulary.

45. remarquez le mot les sans abri, vous savez, est-ce 
   Note that the word homeless, you know, do you

46. vous savez déjà de mot sans? Est-ce que vous savez 
   already know the word sans? Do you know

47. ce que ça veut dire en anglais le mot sans? 
   what the word sans means in English?

48. C’est quoi, Jeannette. 
   What is it,


50. T: Without. Et le mot abri, ça veut dire en anglais 
   What about abri, it means shelter

51. shelter. Bien je vous-eu: je voulais aussi rappel 
   in English. OK I (wanted) you-er I wanted to 
   remind you

52. des d’autres remarques. (0.2). OK. Le mot chômage, 
   about other remarks. The word chômage

53. ça veut dire bien-sur unemployment, un homme qui est 
   it means of course unemployment, somebody who is
unemployed, c’est un chômeur. Et une femme c’est
unemployed is a chômeur And a woman is a
chômeuse. OK. Etre au chômage ça veut dire être
chômeuse. To be au chômage means to be
unemployed. C’est ça l’expression si on peut le
unemployed. That is the expression if we can say
so.
dire. E:m. Vous avez aussi remarqué dans la section
Erm. You have noticed also in the section
sous le citoyen et l’Etat, on avait ces deux
under the citizen and the State, we had these
two
expressions ici. Le service militaire et le service
expressions. The military service and the national
national. OK. Ça indique deux chosss en France. Ça
service. OK. This indicates two things in France. This
voult dire tous les hommes d’à-peu-près l’âge de
dimalls men aged more or less nineteen
dix-neuf ans sont obligés de passer une période dans
these obliged to spend a period in
l’armée française. Ils ont en France comme dans
the French army. They have in France as in
beaucoup de pays d’Europe, un service militaire
many European country, a mandatory military
obligatoire. Ici aux Etats-Unis, les hommes
service. Here in the US, the men must
s’inscrire pour la conscription. Register for the
register for the draft.
draft. Mais nous ne sommes pas obligés de faire un
But we are not obliged to do a
service militaire s’il n’ y pas de guerre. En
military service if there is no war. In France
même en période de paix, les hommes sont obligés de
even in peace period, the men are obliged to
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faire une année, c’est exactement je crois que c’est spend a year, it’s exactly I believe that it’s

onze mois, (() ) passer une année dans l’armée twelve months, (() ) to spend a year in the French

française. Tous les hommes français sont obligés army. All French men are obliged
de le faire. Mais pour les pacifistes, ceux qui ont to do so. But the peace advocates, those who have
des obligations morales, contre la prise de la vie moral obligations against taking
de quelqu’un d’autre, alors donc ceux pour qui, ils somebody’s life, so those who morally
ne peuvent pas moralement faire partie d’une armée, can not join an army,
ont l’option de faire le service national. De fait, have the option to join the national service. In fact
le service national national c’est l’alternatif au the national service is the alternative to the
service militaire. Ceux qui font le service national military service. Those who join the national service
travaillent dans les entreprises charitables, work in charity enterprises, (or)
qu’elle chose comme ça, ils font des biens pour-le, something of that kind, they do good things
pour l’État. Ce ne sont pas des travaux militaires. for the State. These are not military ativities.

Est-ce que vous avez des questions là-dessus? (0.7). Do you have questions on this?
Pas de questions (0.6). No questions.
OK. Et dernièrement, la dernière chose eu: à And last time, the last thing
laquelle je voudrais attirer votre attention, vous
I want to draw your attention on, you
regardez à la page trois cent quarante trois, et il
look on page three hundred forty three, and there
y a là une pancarte (I spent 44 sec. drawing), Je
is a board  I’m not
suis pas artiste-huh, et c’est écrit touche pas à
an artist-huh, it’s written don’t touche
mot pote. (T writes).
my buddy
Ça c’est le dévise the slogan de l’organisation SOS
This is the slogan of the SOS Racism
Racisme. C’est une organisation surtout des jeunes
organization. It’s mostly a youths’ organization
personnes erm pour combattre les racisme en France.
fighting against racism in France.
C’est une organisation contre le racisme. Le devise
It’s an organization against racism. The slogan can
da traduit plus ou moins comme don’t bother my
be translated more or less as don’t bother my
buddy.

TAPE 3: FRENCH 104.03
Section A

T: Est-que vous avez des questions sur la lecture. Des
Do you have questions about the reading. Questions,
des choses, difficiles a comprendre, (0.1). Vous avez
things, difficult to understand. Do you have
questions? Non? OK. Alors. Ma question, je vous donne
le choix
questions? No? OK. So. My question, I give you the
choice
4. entre deux questions, d'accord, (0.4), vous avez le choix entre deux questions, OK, you have the choice between two
5. deux questions, (0.10). Alors. vous repondez a une seule question. So. You answer only one question
6. question. Alors une seule question. Alors qui etait Louis XIV et quelle est son importance dans l'histoire de la France? Ou and what is his importance in the history of France? Or
7. quelles sont les causes de la Revolution Francaise. Vous avez what are the causes of the French Revolution. You have the
8. choix, vous repondez a une seule question. Qui peut traduire les questions en Anglais. Qui peut traduire les questions en Anglais. questions in English. Who can translate the
9. choice, you answer only one question. Who can translate the questions in English
10. Numero un, qui etait Louis XIV et quelle est son importance dans l'histoire de la France. Oui? the history of France. Yes?
11. Number one, who was Louis XIV and what is his importance in the history of France.
12. S: Who is Louis Louis XIV and what is his importance in the history of France.
13. T: OK, c'est bon, vous avez compris numero un? Numero deux. OK, that's good, you have understood number one? Number two.
16. Quelles sont les causes de la Révolution française.
    John.

17. S: What are the causes of the French Revolution.

    Repondez a une
    OK? You have understood number two? The causes? OK.
    Answer only

19. seule question. Je vous donne dix minutes (avec ça).
    one question. I give you ten minutes (with that).