

TURN-TAKING IN MULTILINGUAL CLASSROOM INTERACTION

Brian Ramadiro
University of Fort Hare, South Africa

ABSTRACT

This paper takes a conversational analysis (CA) or sequential approach to multilingualism to document and analyse classroom participation structures created by specific types of turn-taking and languaging practices. The setting was selected Grade 6 to 9 English language and English-medium content lessons in rural classrooms in the Eastern Cape. Three named language varieties are used in these classrooms, i.e., isiMpondo, isiXhosa and English. The study identified five turn-taking patterns, described their features, and analysed their functions. The research finds that (i) turn-taking types and the varieties through which they are implemented are valued differently in a classroom setting from the way they would be valued in an everyday setting, and (ii) that classroom turn-taking and language use are shaped by broader institutional factors, such as institutional goals and participants' roles, rather than turn-by-turn sequential factors, as hypothesised by a CA approach to multilingual interaction. The paper concludes by presenting a summary of the study's conclusions and findings and a discussion of the implications of the findings for a CA/sequential approach to bi- or multilingual talking in classroom interaction.

KEYWORDS: turn-taking, multilingualism, conversation analysis, classroom interaction, rural

BACKGROUND

This paper takes a conversational analysis (CA) or sequential approach (Auer, 1984, 1995, 1998, 1999, 2009, 2019; Li, 1994, 1998, 2002) to multilingualism to document and analyse classroom participation structures created by using specific forms of turn-taking and languaging practices. It focuses on how teachers and learners take turns talking and how different varieties are involved in the management of turn-taking in whole-class formats of English language and English-medium content lessons in selected rural junior secondary schools in the Eastern Cape province of South Africa. A small number of studies have documented classroom multilingualism in rural classrooms, including Probyn (2009, 2012), Uys and Van Dulm (2011) and, more recently, some studies by Makalela (2015). However, these studies do not examine turn-taking involving isiMpondo, isiXhosa and English in rural classrooms. While some studies have examined classroom turn-taking in monolingual classroom talk (e.g., Hornberger & Chick, 2001; Lerner, 1995; McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Nomlomo, 2010; Seedhouse, 2004; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), Martin-Jones and Saxena (1996) in England are the only researchers I am aware of who specifically examine the intersection of turn-taking and classroom multilingual practices. Therefore, the initiation and significance of this paper rest on the located deficiency in the scholarly examination of turn-taking in multilingual classrooms where isiMpondo, isiXhosa and English are used, requiring both theoretical and practical attention.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Turn-taking

Turn-taking refers to how people in conversation or interaction take turns to talk (Schegloff, 2007; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1978). In essence, two or more people are involved in discourse, suggesting a multi-collaborative approach of alternating. Turn-taking is a social mechanism suffused with social norms about what is marked (unexpected) and unmarked (expected) (Levinson, 1983) ways of taking turns in specific activities, conversation types and institutions and therefore is one of the most effective ways through which participants in interaction point to, contextualise or index particular stances, roles or identities (Drew, 2013; Ten Have, 2007). In ordinary conversation, turn-taking is ‘locally managed’ (Sacks *et al.*, 1978: 7) by participants in the interaction. Typically, this means anyone can self-select as the next speaker; they can speak about whatever subject they like for however long they wish. The norm that the floor is held by one speaker at a time holds in an overwhelming number of cases. For example, Seedhouse (2004:27) has estimated that less than five per cent of speech in ordinary conversation happens with overlaps and that when an overlap occurs, it tends to be brief. When overlap is sustained over time, it is conversationally meaningful in some way. For instance, participants in the conversation could read this as ‘doing’ competition for the ‘floor’ (Levinson, 1983: 301).

In contrast with ordinary conversation, turn-taking in institutional conversation or interaction, such as occurs in a classroom, has distinctive features. Turn-taking in institutional talk tends to be controlled by the party who ‘represents the formal organization’ (Drew & Heritage, 1992: 3), such as a teacher in a classroom, a doctor in a clinic, or a judge in a court of law. The key features of institutional talk (Heritage, 1997: 224–225) include that it tends to be tied to institutional goals and the roles and identities of participants. Therefore, what is said or may be said in institutional talk is constrained inasmuch as it occurs in an institution. Participants use interpretive frames or schemas specific to that institution or institution type to create and understand meanings in institutional interaction.

Classroom talk or interaction is a classic example of institutional talk. Turn-taking in a whole-class format is largely teacher-managed (McHoul, 1978); therefore, it is marked, dispreferred, or unusual for a learner(s) to self-select as the next speaker(s). A teacher often directs who speaks, in what order, about what and for how long. It is important to note that it is not that learners cannot or do not self-select as next-speakers in whole-class formats, but that when they do so, this is noticeable (marked) and often sanctionable, that is, such self-selection is consequential for the interaction.

Teacher control of turn-taking usually produces the well-documented three-part initiation–response–feedback / evaluation sequence (IRF/E) of turn-taking (Mehan, 1979: 52; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975: 50). This sequence has been criticised on pedagogical grounds as authoritarian and a form of teacher-centred pedagogy (e.g., Cazden, 1988). However, as Mercer and Dawes have pointed out (2014: 436), the occurrence and relative frequency of IRE/F sequences in classroom interaction is not inherently evidence of poor pedagogy. It is not so much the IRE/F that is at issue, but the quality of elicitations, learner responses and evaluative actions that differentiates dialogic from conventional classrooms. At the most, the relative frequency of an IRE/F pattern can inform about the overall participation structure of a lesson. For the effect of IRE/F sequences to be judged properly, they need to be interpreted within their sequential contexts and in relation to the actions they implement.

Turn-taking and multilingual talk in interaction.

Per Linguam 2023 39(1):19-39
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5785/39-1-1027>

Turn-taking in multilingual classrooms is an important mechanism through which teachers orchestrate and manage different forms of classroom participation (Lerner, 1995), specifically who speaks, in what language, in what sequential context, and for how long (Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005). Teachers in multilingual classrooms often feel compelled to encourage or discourage the use of whichever language in response to some real or perceived demands of language policy or due to their personal language ideologies (Guzula, 2018; McKinney, 2017). As a result, teachers dedicate a considerable amount of classroom time to managing language use, while they could simply allow learners to learn through whatever language(s) they know best. The intersection of turn-taking and language use is, therefore, a significant vantage point from which to examine the value placed on different language varieties used in the classroom, the functions they perform, and the competencies of participants in the different varieties (Heller, 2007; Martin-Jones, 2015).

Expanding on Sacks *et al.* (1978), Peter Auer (1984) developed a CA/sequential approach to code-switching (CS) or bi- or multilingualism in interaction. The CA/sequential approach is founded on a set of three hypotheses. The first is that participants in conversation distinguish, on the one hand, between ‘code-switching’ and ‘transfer’ and, on the other, between ‘participant-related’ and ‘discourse-related’ language switches (Auer, 1995: 116). Auer (1995) employs the term code-switching to indicate only switches that generate local, sequential meaning on a turn-by-turn basis and transfer, as switches with no demonstrable local/interactional meaning; participant-related switches are an attribute of a speaker, such as a speaker’s language competence or speech style; and discourse-related switches contextualise shifts in footing or meaning in whichever aspect of interaction. Further, flowing from the above, the author formulates the additional hypothesis, namely that bi- or multilingualism is a ‘displayed feature of participants’ everyday behaviour’ rather than merely a ‘mental ability’ (Auer, 2019: 11–12, 1984: 7; Li 2002: 171). Bi- or multilingualism is primarily a social practice; therefore, the ‘discursive and linguistic practices’ (Auer, 2007: 337) of participants, rather than codes or conventional languages, are the primary objects of study for the CA approach. This is in contrast with the markedness model / rational choice approach (Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai, 2001) to bi- or multilingual language use in interaction, which takes the linguist’s or etic perspective to language use rather than the members’, participants’ or emic perspectives (Auer, 1998: 13). It is also quite a different hypothesis to that proposed by a translanguaging perspective, which avers that there are no separate languages from the individual speaker’s point of view (e.g., Otheguy, Garcia & Reid, 2015). Auer’s third and final hypothesis is that ‘prototypical code-switching’ (1999: 312–314) or sequentially meaningful code-switching occurs in sociolinguistic contexts where participants negotiate a ‘language of interaction’ (Auer, 1995: 125) early on in the conversation so that it is precisely by momentary deviations from the negotiated language of interaction that participants generate locally or sequentially meaningful switches.

Such a sociolinguistic context has the following features: A preference for one language at a time (i.e., it is possible to identify a ‘base language’ or ‘language of interaction’); its departure from the language of interaction signals a change in footing or contextual frames; code-switching is not a variety as such; and most switches occur at major syntactic and prosodic boundaries. This paper examines all three hypotheses as regards turn-taking in rural multilingual classrooms.

THE PRESENT STUDY

The fieldwork on which this paper is based was conducted in Mbizana municipality (now known as Winnie Madikizela-Mandela), Eastern Cape, in two rural junior secondary schools. Named language varieties used in the schools are isiMpondo, a vernacular and a variety of isiXhosa used by children and teachers in the schools and community; isiXhosa, an official variety taught in the local schools; and English, an official language and a medium of teaching and learning for content subjects in local junior secondary schools, albeit a variety not widely used on its own at school or in the community.

The excerpts analysed below were based on observations and audio recordings of lessons. The corpus of lessons comprised twelve lessons, encompassing lessons in the English language as a subject and English-medium social science and technology lessons. Even though the data included teacher interviews, the analyses presented below primarily drew on lesson transcripts to examine the intersection of turn-taking and language use. In CA methodology, analytic rigour hinges on the production of detailed transcripts, copious citation of excerpts, and fine-grained analysis of transcripts (Ten Have, 2007: 122–124). Consistent with this methodology, the analyses below were based on lesson transcripts produced according to CA conventions adapted from Jefferson (2004) (see Appendix A for transcription conventions). Teacher names (Anele, Sindi, Thami and Bamba) are pseudonyms and learners were anonymised and numbered as L01, L02 and so on.

This paper aims to accomplish the following: (i) Identify and describe patterns of turn-taking used in English language and English-medium content classrooms. (ii) Examine how turn-taking intersects with multilingual language use in classroom interaction. (iii) Discuss the implications of the findings for a CA/sequential approach to code-switching or bi- and multilingual classroom interactions. The data discussed in this paper form part of a doctoral dissertation at the University of London, ethical clearance reference number 2013-18.

FINDINGS

Overview

In this body of work, the interaction between teachers and learners in a whole-class format is managed in two ways: through turns initiated by teachers or through turns initiated by learners. Teacher-initiated turns are by far the most common, reflective of teachers' institutional role in managing classroom interaction. Teacher-led turns appear in four sub-types, labelled Type 1, Type 2, Type 3 and Type 4. See Table 1 below for an overview of the frequency of occurrence of the different turn types in the corpus of lessons. Type 1 turns are designed for bids and allocated to a single successful learner bidder. In Type 2, teachers cue learners to produce group or choral responses; in Type 3, teachers cue learners to co-produce a turn with them; and in Type 4, teachers allocate a turn to a learner without first soliciting bids from other learners.

Learner-led turn-taking is rare in this study, accounting for only six per cent of interactional episodes. Learner-initiated turns are labelled Type 5 turns in Table 1. As an indication of their rarity, more than half of all learner-led turns occurred in one lesson (Lesson 11) and within the context of learner-led, rather than teacher-led, small group discussions.

Based on analysis of the transcripts, interactional episodes are accomplished in a diverse form of languaging practices, i.e., convergent bilingualism, divergent bilingualism, a multilingual variety, isiXhosa or isiMpondo only, and English only. Convergent bilingualism involves language use where an episode begins in one language and ends in another. A teacher or learner,

for example, might start an episode in isiXhosa or isiMpondo and finish it in English, or vice versa. Many such cases involve pedagogical scaffolding (Vorster, 2008; Van der Walt, 2009), such as when a teacher assists learners to access new or complex content by first using a familiar language (e.g., isiXhosa or isiMpondo) and once the content has been explicated, switches to English to match the learners’ language use with the official/normative language of classroom interaction.

Divergent bilingualism involves language use where the teacher and learners use different languages throughout an episode. This often involves teachers using isiXhosa or isiMpondo on the one hand and learners using English on the other. Many such cases involve activities, such as learners reading an English text aloud and the teacher commenting in isiXhosa on both the content and manner in which the reading is conducted, when teachers create opportunities for learners to practise their English or design turns for learners to produce English responses.

Multilingual languaging practices in a whole-class teaching and learning exchange involve teachers switching languages back and forth, either or both within a turn and throughout an episode. This kind of constant language alternation within a turn or an episode marks the exchange as troubled in some way, such as when teachers and learners are working through new or complex ideas. In such episodes, learners rarely switch languages, and when they do, it marks the point in the episode as momentarily informal or off-task. The use of isiXhosa or isiMpondo only by both learners and teachers simultaneously throughout an episode is associated with non-curriculum interaction, such as the management of interpersonal relationships or as marking management of transitions between different activities. Lastly, the sustained use of English only by learners and teachers throughout an episode is associated with easy or familiar content, i.e., ‘safetalk’, as described by Chick (1996).

Table 1: Interactional episodes and turn-taking types

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

Type 1: Initiation–Response Evaluation/Feedback (IRE/F)

Although Type 1 only accounts for the second largest number of episodes in the corpus (460, or 39%), it is the *normative* form. It is the unmarked or normalised form through which classroom interaction in the corpus is conducted. Type 1 is unmarked in the sense that it is the normalised form in which classroom interaction takes place, as classically described by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), Mehan (1979) and, more recently, by Dawes and Mercer (2014). Type 2 might be ubiquitous yet marked outside of specific conversational exchanges, such as ‘doing confirmation’ or ‘confirming listening’. The other teacher-led turn-taking types make sense in relation to it and share many of its features in that they can be seen as deviations from Type 1—sometimes helpful and sometimes not.

A canonical version of Type 1 involves classroom participants making the following set of sequential interactional moves: The teacher performs an elicitation, which can be in the form

of an imperative, as in Excerpt 1 (40), a declarative, or an interrogative. Elicitations can also be made non-verbally through gestures, such as pointing at an item next on a list. Second, whatever the form of elicitation, learners interpret elicitation as an invitation to bid for a turn to talk. Learners bid for turns by putting up their hands, often accompanied by either or both finger-snapping and calling out to the teacher. Third, a teacher selects one learner as the next speaker. In general, after a turn is allocated to a specific learner, bidding peters out. However, when bidding continues after a turn has been allocated, it is often interactionally significant. It could mean learners do not believe the selected learner will produce an appropriate response, or they are eager to put their names on a teacher's 'scoreboard' of 'good' learners. In some cases, it could mean they are questioning a teacher's fairness in allocating a turn to a specific learner. Fourth, the selected learner produces a response. Lastly, if the response is deemed appropriate and complete, it is followed by implicit or explicit evaluation/feedback, bringing the episode to an end.

Excerpt 1 below is from a Grade 8 English language reading lesson. Learners read aloud from Oscar Wilde's *The Importance of Being Earnest*; the teacher allocates turns at reading, evaluates learner reading and comments on the content of the reading. This particular episode is enacted through a divergent language pattern, whereby a teacher uses one language and learners another to accomplish the episode. In this case, Anele, the teacher, uses isiXhosa in her turns (40; 44), and L01, the learner, uses English (42; 46), the official medium of instruction. This specific form of divergent language use, whereby a teacher uses isiXhosa or both isiXhosa and English, but learners only use English, is by far the most common way in which talk is conducted between teachers and learners in these English language and English-medium lessons.

Excerpt 1: Doing reading and managing reading—Divergent language use (isiXhosa and English) - Lesson 3

- 40 ***Anele: Yha.**
- 41 %trn: Yes.
- 42 *L01: There is just something I would like you know a::bout. I:s this a good
time to
- 43 speak with you? ((Reading.))
- 44 ***Anele: Uyabuza** (TCU1). **Eeh:** (TCU2.)
- 45 %trn: She/he asks. Yes.
- 46 *L01: Yes yes of course what is it? Whitney's mother wa::s quite concerned
((Reading)).

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

A close examination of Excerpt 1 follows. After competitive bidding for the turn (not shown here), Anele nominates L01 as the next speaker, or in this case, as the next reader. Anele manages the entire episode in isiXhosa: '**Yha**/yes' (40) and '**Eeh**/yes' (44, TCU2) evaluate the learner's reading and tell the learner to continue reading. '**Uyabuza**/she asks' (44, TCU1) is an elliptical comment about the contents of L01's turn (42–43). The comment does not say who 'she' or 'he' is because this is obvious from previous turns. The comment is meant to keep

learners engaged with the reading and telegraph that something dramatic is about to occur in the text.

L01 only uses English. This is partly because it is the language of the text and, therefore, for reading aloud (42; 46); it is also the language through which she is required to enact herself as a competent learner. L01 enacts the role of a competent English language learner by reading the text with appropriate pronunciation and fluency. On the other hand, Anele enacts her teacher role through a combination of control over turn-taking as well as her exclusive right to the use of isiXhosa in this context. Once a learner is selected to read, the acceptability of their reading is subject to constant appraisal by using evaluative continuers such as ‘**Yha**/yes’ (40) and ‘**Eeh**/yes’ (44). In this way, Anele continually renews L01’s right to the turn as well as her directorship of turn-taking. Furthermore, by conducting her turns in isiXhosa, she creates both opportunities and possibilities (Lerner, 1995: 111) for learners to practise their English while simultaneously constructing them as ‘English language learners’ who need practice. She constructs herself as competent in English by only using isiXhosa, a teacher, in contrast with the learner, and therefore, not needing to practise her English.

By examining the 12 lessons comprising the body of work, the researcher summarised the findings about how episodes initiated through Type 1 turn-taking are organised and used in multilingual classrooms as follows:

First, as in monolingual classrooms, such as those described in classic studies by Cazden (1988), Mehan (1979), and Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) in multilingual classrooms, Type 1 turn-taking (IRE/F) is primarily used by teachers to elicit and evaluate known information or knowledge. The choice of language through which a teacher elects to initiate and conduct an exchange can often inform about whether they consider the content to be addressed as easy or difficult. Hence, the use of English only both by teachers and learners to accomplish an episode is, in most cases, indicative of a teaching and learning exchange dealing with familiar or easy content. In contrast, their use of isiXhosa only or code-switching often marks an episode as addressing unfamiliar or complex content. Thus, the type of turn, together with the choice of language, can have an indexical function (Hanks, 2001) and can be regarded as forms of contextualisation cues (Gumperz, 1982).

Second, even though indexical meanings can be attributed to the use of whichever language during classroom interaction, as discussed above, the relationship between languages, on the one hand, and the contexts in which they are used and the actions they help accomplish, on the other, is not fixed. However, this is not to say that language use in the classroom context is interpretable only in terms of turn-by-turn sequential development, as would be hypothesised by the CA approach. The reason for this is that languages used in the classroom have different degrees of acceptability or legitimacy (Heller, 2001) and, therefore, carry dissimilar indexical meanings depending on *where* they occur in a sequence and *who* is using the language. In this case, *where* refers to something broader than an immediately preceding or following a turn constructional unit or turn. It refers to the lesson overall, i.e., the semantic content of turns and episodes, and crucially, either or both communicative and pedagogical actions accomplished in a specific episode. The *who* refers to the institutional roles of classroom participants, as a result of which teachers, for instance, have much more leeway to use all their repertoires, whereas, in contrast, learners are much more circumscribed. In addition to reflecting the different institutional roles, this reflects teacher and broader societal language ideologies that inform classroom practice (Guzula, 2018; McKinney, 2017; Martin-Jones, 2015).

Third, teachers mainly initiate episodes through Type 1 to produce English language safetalk. According to Chick (1996), safetalk is the interaction between teachers and learners in superficial English to conceal—primarily from the teachers and learners themselves—that very little learning of the English language and English-medium content is happening in the classroom. In safetalk, teachers do the bulk of the talking, which inevitably (if unintentionally) leads to a classroom culture characterised by teacher volubility and student taciturnity (Hornberger & Chick, 2001).

Lastly, while each language or variety used in the classroom must be examined in its sequential context per the strictures of CA methodology, in these classrooms, the use of languages other than English makes sense regarding how they contribute to ‘staging’ or setting up (Arthur, 1996: 25) English Type 1 exchanges. This is because English is the normative language of classroom interaction.

Type 2: Teacher elicitation, learner choral response

2 is the most common form of turn-taking in the lesson corpus, accounting for 46% of episodes initiated through this turn type. Teacher elicitations and learner choral responses are features of this turn (Lerner, 2002). Teachers signalled the turns through a small set of either or both recurring words, phrases and prosodic cues to do routine activities, such as to elicit background and known information or to confirm whether or not learners are attending to an ongoing interaction. On the other hand, learners sometimes used choral responses defensively, such as when they were uncertain of the answers and thus did not wish to bid for individual turns. In Excerpt 2 below, Type 2 turn-taking is used to check whether or not the teacher should continue with an exposition and to confirm understanding.

Excerpt 2: Checking and confirming listening – (multilingual language use) (Lesson 9)

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

Type 2 turn-taking occurs when teachers make lengthy expositions in lecture mode and need to confirm learner attention. Teachers and learners use various formulaic phrases to accomplish the checking–confirming exchange. In the excerpt, Sindi tags the isiXhosa phrase, ‘**siyevana?**/do you understand?’ (83) to the end of her English turn, producing a multilingual utterance that marks a momentary shift from doing an exposition to checking. Learners respond with a multilingual formulaic, ‘yes **mis(i)** / yes teacher’ (88). Other common learner formulaic responses to checking documented in the corpus include the multilingual, ‘yes **titshala** / yes teacher or sir’ and the English, ‘yes sir’.

Sindi's switch to isiXhosa offers the possibility for learners to switch to isiXhosa to ask a question, for instance. Asking questions in a whole class format is one of a few situations in which it can be momentarily linguistically unmarked for learners to use isiXhosa or a classroom multilingual variety in an English or English-medium classroom. However, learners rarely ask questions in these classrooms, and therefore, few opportunities arise for them to use isiXhosa in a whole-class format of a lesson. A combination of pedagogical practices that discourage questioning and dialogue, as well as language ideologies that stigmatise the use of isiXhosa in English and English-medium lessons, explains learners' very few switches to isiXhosa.

The 'linguageness' of items such as Sindi's, '**siyevana?**/ do you understand?' (83) is often not oriented to by participants; that is, such items are not oriented to as belonging either to language A or B. This is because such items are used frequently and pervasively in this exact format, regardless of whether they occur in a form of English, a form of isiXhosa or a multilingual turn. Such items are what Auer (1984:12) refers to as 'transfers in contrast to switches'. These language practices are closest to what has been described as translanguaging (Garcia & Li, 2014; Makalela, 2019). Other formulaic phrases from the corpus with an isiXhosa origin that do checking/confirming include, '**Siyayibona?**/Do we all understand?', '**Uyayibona?**/Do you understand?', '**Neh?**/Right?', '**Siyavana bantwana bam?** / Do you understand children?' and '**Niyandiva?**/ Do you understand?'.

Conducting periodic checking can also be thought of as a form of classroom 'cohorting' and 're-cohorting' (Içbay 2008: 79). At the beginning of lessons, teachers assemble (cohort) a group of learners into a class in session through practices such as greetings, being seated and so on. Subsequently, teachers use classroom formulaic language throughout the lesson to periodically re-cohort a class as a 'listening and instructed cohort' (Içbay 2008: 83). This is especially necessary when teachers make long expositions, as in Excerpt 2. Thus, Sindi's tag switch, '**Siyevana?**/Do you understand?' (83) and the learners' 'yes **misi** / yes teacher' (88)—in addition to checking—periodically and interactively re-cohorts the group as a class in session.

Excerpt 3 below is from an English grammar lesson focusing on transforming verbs into adjectives. Preceding this excerpt are a series of episodes conducted in English and using Type 1 (IRE/F) turn-taking. The episodes proceeded smoothly thus: Sindi put forward a verb she wanted the learners to transform into an adjective; the learners bid for the turn; she allocated the turn to the successful bidder; the bidder responded; the response was evaluated and accepted, and the class moved on to the next verb on the list. In Excerpt 3, however, the interaction runs into some difficulty.

Excerpt 3: Troubled episode (English-only, then isiXhosa-English divergent language use), (Lesson 2)

- 540 *Sindi: 'Attract'.
541 *LNS: A:TTRACTA:BLE.
542 *Sindi: **Andivanga?**
543 %trn: I didn't hear that.
544 *LNS: A:TTRACTA:BLE ((accompanied by giggles)). (2.0) Attracting
545 ((others)). Attractive ((others)).
546 *Sindi: ↑**YHO:: amanyala eklasini. Iindlebe zam (TCU1). Nanga amanyala azwiwa**

- 547 **zindlebe zam** () (TCU2). ↑ATTRACT (TCU3)?
- 548 %trn ↑OH NO:: such drivel in class. My poor ears. Such drivel I'm hearing
- 549 (). ↑ATTRACT?
- 550 *LNS: ((Hands up and learners offer various responses accompanied by
- 551 giggles and laughter)). Attractful ((some)). Attracting ((others)).
- 552 Attractive. Attractness ((others)).
- 553 *Sindi: Δ↑**Hha: yi bo** (TCU1). ↑**Hha: yibo** (TCU2)Δ. ((Laughter)) (TCU4).
Ye:s L23 (TCU5)
- 554 %trn: Δ↑No. ↑NoΔ. ((Laughter)). Ye:s L23.
- 555 *L23: Attractness.
- 556 *LNS: ((Giggles)).
- 557 *Sindi: Yes L20.
- 558 *L20: Attractive.
- 559 *Sindi: Ye:s goo:d. 'Attractive'. Attractive ((writing)).
- ((English = regular typeface; isiXhosa-isiMpondo = bold; isiMpondo = italics))

Excerpt 3 documents the use of both Type 2 (540–553) and Type 1 (553–559) turn-taking practices. On the one hand, learners wish to conduct the episode through Type 2 as a form of self-facilitative safetalk strategy (Chick, 1996). By producing group responses (541, 544), learners attempt to ensure that the responses cannot be attributed to any one of them individually. In this way, learners respond candidly and gauge the teachers' reaction before committing to go 'on the record'. The correct response, 'attractive' (545), is first offered as part of a group/choral response (545) and, eventually, in an individual turn (558). In contrast, Sindi seeks to conduct the lesson in Type 1 format (540, 554, 557, 559). In this case, the teacher and learners have different perceptions of the degree of difficulty of the task. This is partly expressed through different assessments about which turn-taking system is required for that task. Sindi regards the task at hand as relatively easy and, therefore, best accomplished through Type 1 turn-taking, yet the learners regard it as relatively difficult and try to accomplish it through Type 4.

From a language point of view, Sindi's switching to isiXhosa and isiMpondo simultaneously attempts to initiate repair (542); evaluate, reject and protest learners' responses (546, 547, 553); and seek to replace Type 2 turn-taking with the normative Type 1. Once she succeeds in re-establishing Type 1 turn-taking, she switches back to English to manage the remainder of the episode, beginning with TCU5 (553) towards the end of the episode (559). Simply put, when interaction proceeds smoothly in this classroom, only English is used; when it runs aground, a divergent language pattern is introduced, in which a teacher switches to isiXhosa while the learners continue using English. Once any stumbling blocks have been resolved, learners and teachers conduct the rest of the interaction only in English. Thus, a familiar language(s) is used as a tool to help learners access knowledge and facilitate classroom participation.

The findings about Type 2 turn-taking are: First, teachers cue turns of choral production in the following ways: prosodically, through questioning, as well as by code-switching to isiXhosa or isiMpondo. Second, Type 2 is the most commonly used turn type in the corpus, not because it is normative, but because it fulfils the function of helping teachers implement recurrent actions such as cohorting and re-cohorting learners as a class in session and checking/listening/understanding. Third, a small number of formulaic classroom phrases are used to elicit and produce this kind of speech exchange system. Teachers often use isiXhosa formulaic phrases to cue it. Thus, the simultaneous use of Type 2 turn-taking and isiXhosa helps to contextualise or index an episode as doing something distinct from preceding or subsequent episodes. Fourth, isiXhosa phrases used to cue choral production allow for the possibility for learners to ask questions in isiXhosa. However, learners rarely take this up in a whole-class format because learner use of isiXhosa is stigmatised in this context. Lastly, learners occasionally transform turns designed for individual responses (Type 1) into choral or group turns (Type 2). This conduct occurs when learners are uncertain about the appropriateness or correctness of their responses, demonstrating that learners exercise some agency, even in very traditional classroom cultures defined by teacher volubility and learner taciturnity.

Type 3: Co-production/turn-sharing

A third type of turn-taking system in this lesson corpus is co-production or turn-sharing (Lerner, 2002). A major difference between choral responses and turn-sharing is that the former can also be learner-initiated while the latter is teacher-designed and -initiated. Teachers initiate turn-sharing in the following ways: First, turn-sharing can be initiated through questioning; the teacher asks questions to which she expects learners to know the answers from previous episodes, previous lessons or their general knowledge. Second, teachers cue turn-sharing by designing their turns for learners to co-produce parts or all of a teacher's turn. Turn-sharing occurs at or near the end of constructional units or turns. Third, teachers initiate turn-sharing by designing their utterances such that learners are required to take part in completing the turn with the teacher. They cue this turn by producing items immediately preceding the turn or items intended for co-production with either or both rising intonation and elongated or stretched syllables, as shown in Excerpt 4 below.

Interactional actions performed through turn-sharing in a whole-class format include coming to an agreement, confirming listening, displaying understanding and showing orientation to what is going on during interactions. Through turn-sharing, participants (in this case, learners) simultaneously co-produce a turn or part of a turn by trying to match the 'words, voicing and tempo of the other speaker' (in this case, that of the teacher) (Lerner, 2002: 226).

Excerpt 4 below from a Grade 8 English grammar lesson is an example of how co-production and code-switching combine to accomplish episodes.

Excerpt 4: English to isiXhosa and to convergent language use—collaboratively closing an activity (Lesson 2)

444 *Sindi: Superlative degree. o:kay change ba:d to superlative degree.

445 *LNS: ((Hands up and fingers clicking)).

446 *Sindi: Ye:s L17.

- 447 *L17: Worst.
- 448 *Sindi: Ye:s di:d- (TCU1) That is the wor::st advertisement I have ever seen (TCU2).
- 449 Aw:ri:ght (TCU3). **Injalo ke into** ↑**yantoni**:? (TCU4) **Ye**-a:d[je:ctives] (TCU5).
- 450 %trn: Ye:s di:d- 'That is the wor::st advertisement I have ever seen'. Al:ri:ght.
- 451 That's how what works? A:dj:ectives.
- 452 *LNS: [adjectives] ((some learners)).

In Excerpt 4, turn-sharing is used to mark the end of the activity of transforming comparative adjectives into the superlative form, as shown in lines 444 to 448. A regular, unmarked IRE/F sequence (444–448) is accomplished in English; then, concluding the activity is achieved first through Sindi's switch to isiXhosa (TCU4, 449) and then through a multilingual turn constructional unit (TCU5, 449) designed for turn-sharing (449, 452).

In this case, the teacher cues turn-sharing in the following ways: By switching to isiXhosa (449), through the use of the interrogative 'yantoni?/of what?' produced with rising intonation and lengthened vowel (449), by stretching the first two syllables of 'a:dje:ctives' (449) as if waiting for learners to catch up with her, which they eventually do, to co-produce the target item (449, 452).

Here, turn-sharing is used to enlist learners' participation in concluding a current activity to begin a new one. By taking part in turn-sharing and co-authoring the ending of this activity, learners implicitly endorse Sindi's assessment that the class has reached a good enough understanding of how superlative adjectives work and, therefore, the lesson can advance. Teachers often interpret weak learner participation in co-producing target items—as in this episode (452)—as a call for more examples or either the elaboration or reformulation of teacher contributions. In this excerpt, Sindi interprets weak learner participation in turn-sharing as indicating a need for more examples, which she provides in subsequent episodes (not shown here).

There are two broad findings about Type 3 turn-taking. First, turn-sharing is brief, often involving one or two lexical items. Through turn-sharing, teachers establish whether learners are following a lesson and if they can move on to another topic or activity. This kind of turn-taking appears to be an attempt to address two problems common in rural classrooms, one of which is large class sizes. Large classes make it difficult for teachers to monitor and recognise indications of the degree to which learners follow and engage with a lesson. The other problem is a classroom culture in which learners hardly ask any questions, partly because lessons are conducted in English, a relatively unfamiliar language to such learners. One way teachers try to overcome this challenge is through turn-sharing. To wit, turn-sharing is an efficient way to assess the perception of a class about whether to end or extend an activity or start a new activity. The second finding is that code-switching helps implement sequences designed for turn-sharing. Turn-sharing is implemented through code-switching that operates on a turn-by-turn basis, as shown in the excerpt. A switch from English-only to isiXhosa-only and then to a multilingual variety, together with turn-sharing, marks the turn as doing something distinct from other turns in this episode. This type of language use constitutes a classic form of what Auer (1984, 2019) regards as sequential code-switching; that is, participants in the interaction

locally manage multilingual language use in interactionally meaningful ways. In sum, turn-sharing and code-switching operate within a symbiotic relationship to accelerate classroom discourse, specifically to address some of the pertinent problems in a rural classroom, as outlined previously.

Type 4: Turn allocation without bidding

Sometimes teachers allocate turns to learners without first calling for bids. This form of turn-taking usually occurs after the teacher has tried and failed to initiate an episode through other forms of turn-taking, especially after Type 1. Often, the turn is produced with delays and other markers of dispreference (Levinson, 1983: 333) and rarely occurs in this corpus. The form is dispreferred because it is a potentially face-threatening act, as defined by Brown and Levinson (1987) and is contrary to a carefully constructed and constantly renewed classroom culture of safetalk.

Excerpt 5 follows several attempts by Bamba to solicit learner bids for the turn. The episode is from a Grade 7 geography lesson. The beginning of the excerpt (643) follows a learners' turn in which learners confirm as a group that they know what a map grid reference is and also how to use this concept to find a location on a map. Yet, in the episode, the learners are reluctant to bid to answer a question about where grid references can be found on a map. The excerpt documents Bamba's frustration with the lack of bidding (643–651).

Excerpt 5: Frequent switching between isiXhosa and a multilingual variety—face-threatening turn-taking (Lesson 7)

- 643 *Bamba: ↑**KALOKU NDIYABUZA NJE UBA ZIPHI** (TCU1)? YOU CANNOT MENTION
- 644 **UBA ZIPHI ILANT0 I- I- I-RE- REFERENCES** (TCU2)? **ZIPHI** (TCU3)? **ZINDAWON(I) II-**
- 645 **REFERENCES** (TCU4)? **II-REFERENCES ZINDAWONI** (TCU5)? ((BAMBA calls on L27 to
- 646 answer the question. Note L27 did not bid for the turn). **HHE** (TCU6)? ((Bamba
- 647 paces around the classroom and then stops at L27's desk and selects L27 as a next
- 648 speaker even though L27 did not bid for the turn.))
- 649 %trn: **I HAVE JUST ASKED WHERE ARE THEY** (TCU1)? YOU CANNOT MENTION
- 650 **WHERE THE I- I- I-RE REFERENCES ARE** (TCU2)? **WHERE ARE THEY? WHERE ARE**
- 651 **THEY** (TCU4)? **WHERE ARE THE REFERENCES** (TCU5)? Yes (TCU6)? ((Bamba paces
- 652 about the classroom and then stops at L27's desk and selects L27 as the next

653 speaker even though L27 did not bid for the turn.))

654 *L27: ((Silence.))

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

TCU1 in isiXhosa (643) is a complaint. In these English and English-medium lessons, the use of isiXhosa is associated with the expression of strong emotion, either positive or negative. TCU2 (643–4) is started in English, developed in isiXhosa and concluded in English. Switching back and forth between isiXhosa and English and the repetition of 'I- I- I-RE' (644), a hesitation and word-search marker, underlines the teacher's frustration and difficulty finding the appropriate words and language to express it. A shift away from 'doing' frustration and complaining to soliciting bids in TCU3 (644) is marked linguistically by switching from a multilingual variety to isiXhosa. TCU4 (644–5) and TCU5 (645) are done in a multilingual variety—essentially, asking the same question. TCU5 repeats TCU4. Repetition underlines Bamba's resolve to press the learners to bid for the turn.

After several attempts to solicit bidding by pleading (TCU1), complaining (TCU2), sharp questioning (TCU3) and reiteration (TCU4 and TCU5), Bamba abandons soliciting bids and allocates the turn to L27—who has not made a bid for the turn—with a curt isiXhosa TCU 'Hhe/Yes' (646). Allocating a turn to L27 could suggest that switching between language varieties has failed or has not been successful. Allocating a turn to a learner who has not bid for it is rare, interactionally marked and face-threatening. As discussed, this form is used only after several failed attempts to initiate the exchange through Type 1. As it happens, L27 (654) responds with silence because they do not know the answer.

Another reason for the face-threatening nature of this type of turn allocation is that in these classrooms, it is strongly associated with discipline. Teachers sometimes allocate turns to learners whom they know do not know an answer to a question, as part of disciplining them, such as when a learner is found to be engaged in off-task behaviour like chatting during a whole-class format. Intended or not, this kind of practice is humiliating and can harm a learner's self-confidence.

While this form of turn allocation can be face-threatening, as shown in the excerpt, teachers can and indeed use it for the opposite purpose, that is, to produce safetalk moments (not shown here because of space limitations). When the turn type is used to create a safetalk moment, a teacher allocates a turn to a learner who she assumes can be relied upon to provide an appropriate response and thus help restore classroom safetalk.

The findings on Type 4 turn-taking are summarised below. First, this type of turn allocation takes two forms; the first is face-threatening, and the second can help restore safetalk. Second, it is produced with delays or dispreference markers. Delays are marked by several attempts by the teacher to allocate turns through Type 1—that is, first by soliciting bids and allocating turns to learners who have bid—before resorting to allocating turns without bids. Third, the face-threatening form has the following features: it follows repeated failure or reluctance by learners

to bid for turns; when learners eventually bid for the turn, they produce incorrect or inadequate answers. Because this form often occurs in contexts where teachers expect learners to know an answer or know how to apply a rule or procedure towards arriving at the answer, teachers regard learners' reluctance to bid as indicative of learners' failure to take their lessons seriously. For this reason, learners often experience this type as a form of punishment. Lastly, a problematic episode is not just marked by the turn-taking type through which it is initiated but also linguistically. In this episode, problems are also marked by the teacher constantly switching between isiXhosa and English and language mixing, accompanied by relevant prosodic markers.

Type 5: Learner self-selection ('speaking out of turn')

Literal, rather than figurative, speaking out of turn or learner self-selection occurs when learners speak in a whole-class teaching and learning episode/exchange when a teacher has not allocated them a turn to talk. As shown in Table 1, this form of turn-taking rarely occurs in these classrooms. One could argue that this reflects a teacher-centred classroom culture; however, it must be borne in mind that the IRE/F sequence and teacher control of turn-taking is the norm or the unmarked form through which to conduct classroom interaction. Key features of this form of turn-taking include (a) learners self-select as speakers; (b) learner utterances may be addressed to a teacher, another learner or be made in broadcast form to be overheard by any classroom participant; (c) learner utterances are overwhelmingly single words or short phrases; (d) this turn type is rare, and (e) when it occurs, it is noticeable and may be sanctionable.

A common form of self-selection is chatting among learners during a whole-class format, documented in Excerpt 6 below. With her back to the class (577), Sindi writes on the chalkboard. Learners interpret this action as a signal of the momentary suspension of a whole-class format and thus regard their chatting as private, 'off-stage' talk (578). Sindi, however, considers the whole-class format and its norms to be operative. She turns around to face the class and re-cohorts it as a class in session (579). She addresses the class in isiXhosa, a variety associated with disciplining in this corpus and reprimands learners three times in rapid succession. For extra emphasis, she delivers the last item with vowel lengthening, rising intonation and loud delivery.

Excerpt 6: IsiXhosa for maintaining classroom order 'off-stage' self-selection (Lesson 1)

577 *Sindi: ((Teacher with her back to the class writes on a chalkboard)).

578 *LNS: ((Chatting among learners)).

579 *Sindi: ΔNiyangxola niyangxola niyangxola niyangxo::↑LA..Δ ((Turns to face the

580 class.))

581 %trn: ΔYou are making a noise you are making a noise you are making a noiseΔ.

582 ((Turning her body to face the class.))

- 583 *LNS: ((Learners immediately quieten down. A few minutes later they resume
talk[ing] in
584 murmurs.))

The form of self-selection documented in Excerpt 6 is fairly common because it is conducted behind a teacher's back. It is also made in mass format, making it more difficult for teachers to identify individual offending learners. As a result, when teacher sanctions are directed to the group, as is the case here (579), they do not carry the same force as when directed to an identified individual.

Sindi reprimands learners for making a noise: '**niyangxola**/you are making a noise' (579). In truth, the learners are chatting in hushed tones, and therefore, her reprimand is not so much about actual noise levels but rather about talking out of turn. In large classrooms, chatting among learners in mass form is an abiding classroom management problem for teachers, resulting in rowdy classrooms that can be psychologically unsafe spaces for teachers. This is probably why teachers in such classrooms spend a significant part of lesson time periodically cohorting and re-cohorting a class, that is, making classrooms safe spaces.

Other instances of learner selection are noticeable but not necessarily sanctionable (an example of the form is not provided because of space limitations). When these learner selections occur, they align with or seek to support a teacher to achieve their goal(s) in classroom interaction. This often happens when a learner(s) volunteers an answer or provides an appropriate but unsolicited response, especially when a class is stuck.

The findings about Type 5 turn-taking are summarised below. First, in this body of work, this type of turn-taking is rare, noticeable and might be sanctionable. A continuum of noticeability and sanctionability can be observed. On the one end of the continuum are forms of learner self-selection that teachers consider disruptive and constitute a challenge to their authority. This includes chatting among learners during a whole-class session. Such actions are noticeable and sanctionable. On the other end of the continuum are forms of learner selection intended to align with and realise a teacher's pedagogical goals. While such self-selection is noticeable, it is often not sanctionable. Forms of self-selection in which learner talk is directed to other learners during a whole-class format lie somewhere in the middle of the continuum. This form is noticeable and, depending on the sequential context in which it occurs, as well as a teacher's classroom management style, might also be sanctionable.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The study makes the following major findings about turn-taking and multilingualism in classroom interaction. Regarding turn-taking, the findings are summarised as follows. First, the study's contribution is that it has identified, described and analysed five turn-taking mechanisms/types used to enact whole-class interaction that create very different participation frameworks (Lerner, 1995). Second, the study found that the turn-taking types are not symmetrical alternatives (Schegloff, 2007) but rather operate according to a specific classroom order of preference or hierarchy of normativity. For instance, Type 1 (IRE/F) is the most preferred/normative form, while Type 5 (learner self-selection) is the least preferred. Order of preference pertains to social normativity/acceptability rather than frequency count. The fact that Type 2 occurs more frequently than Type 1 tells not that the latter is normative or preferred but speaks to the kind of classroom culture and pedagogy on display. Third, learner-teacher

interaction in the lesson corpus is characterised by teacher volubility, learner taciturnity and low cognitive demand. The predominant use of the IRE/F sequence in this corpus is involved in the co-construction of basic information and knowledge between learners and teachers (Hornberger & Chick, 2001). A specific contribution of this study is the detailed description and analysis of how safetalk is produced and reproduced through specific forms of turn-taking practices.

The study makes three main findings concerning the intersection of turn-taking and multilingualism in classroom interaction. First, as in monolingual classrooms, teachers use turn-taking to manage when, on what subjects and for how long learners can speak, that is, to manage classroom participation (McHoul, 1990). In addition, in multilingual classrooms, teachers use turn-taking as a primary tool to encourage or discourage learners from using a language or variety in whichever context or moment during classroom interaction. Second, any language can be used in any turn type; that is, no language is tied to any turn type or specific context of use. However, as is the case with turn-taking types, languages in classroom interaction are not symmetrical alternatives; there is a hierarchy or order of language preference (Auer, 2019). The classroom order of language preference itself draws on and is informed by teachers' personal language ideologies, institutional factors such as (perceptions about) language policies (Guzula, 2018) and broader societal factors such as power relations between speakers of the languages involved and the uneven ways in which the speakers and their languages are underpinned by economic, political and cultural institutions (Alexander, 2014). These factors constitute the backdrop against which participants in interaction regard the use of whichever language as unmarked and normative in one instance and marked and deviant in another.

Finally, regarding the implications of the findings for the CA/sequential analytic approach to multilingual classroom talk, two tenets of a CA approach were confirmed. First, the findings confirm Auer's (1984, 1995) basic claim that the functions and relative statuses of multiple languages used in interaction can be explained in notable ways concerning the sequential circumstances in which they occur. Second, in contrast with the translanguaging perspective (Otheguy, Garcia & Reid, 2015; Garcia and Li, 2014), the data support the claim that conversational code-switching is possible precisely because participants distinguish between their languages in certain circumstances (Auer, 2019). In other words, distinguishing between participant-related vs discourse-related and code-switching vs transfer has analytic value in explaining multilingual classroom talk in interaction.

While the CA approach is a valuable theoretical and methodological framework for examining classroom bi- or multilingual talk in a South African context, the approach has several problems. First, while any language used in the classroom can co-occur with any turn type or vice versa, classrooms are not flat linguistic landscapes. Languages have different symbolic values (Bourdieu, 1991) and degrees of legitimacy (Heller, 2001) within a classroom. For example, due to the dominance and hegemony of English in South African schooling (Anglonormativity) (McKinney, 2017) and curriculum and assessment policy requirements, participants generally regard frequent and pervasive use of English as desirable and unmarked, and the use of either or both isiXhosa and isiMpondo as generally marked, particularly when used by learners in a whole-class format. Some teachers regard their own use of the latter varieties as marked and noticeable, yet a practically necessary if illegitimate pedagogical scaffold. The CA approach to multilingualism (Auer, 1995) regards divergent bi- or multilingualism (where Speaker 1 uses language A and Speaker 2 uses language B) as momentary language negotiation which ultimately culminates in speakers converging around one language, either language A or B. However, in multilingual classrooms, divergent bi- or

multilingualism is the norm and takes a specific form, reflecting both the linguistic competencies of the participants as well as their institutional roles, with learners using language A (English) almost exclusively and teachers alternating between languages A (English) and B (isiXhosa). This would intimate that when classroom participants ask themselves, ‘Why this, in that language, right now?’ (Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005), they are not only asking questions about sequential relevance but also broader questions about what is the appropriate language choice, given their own institutional goals and roles as teachers or learners and their orientation to a school’s and community’s linguistic market.

REFERENCES

- ALEXANDER, N. 2014. *Interviews with Neville Alexander: The power of languages against the language of power*. Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
- ARTHUR, J. 1996. Code-switching and collusion: Classroom interaction in Botswana. *Linguistics and Education*, 8:17–33.
- AUER, P. 2019. ‘Translanguaging’ or ‘doing languages’? Multilingual practices and the notion of codes. In MacSwann, J (Ed), *Language(s): Multilingualism and its consequences*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 1–31.
- AUER, P. 2009. Bilingual conversation. In Coupland N & A Jaworski (Eds), *The New Sociolinguistics Reader*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 490–511.
- AUER, P. 1999. From code-switching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 3(4):309–332.
- AUER, P. 1998. Introduction: Bilingual conversation revisited. In Auer, P (Ed), *CS in conversation: language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge, pp.1–28.
- AUER, P. 1995. The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In Milroy L & P Muysken (Eds), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 115–135.
- AUER, P. 1984. *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- BOURDIEU, P. 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- BROWN, P & SC LEVINSON. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CAZDEN, CB. 1988. *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- CHICK, JK. 1996. Safetalk: Collusion in Apartheid education. In Coleman, H (Ed), *Society and the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 21–39.
- DREW, P. 2013. Turn design. In Sidnell J & T Stivers (Eds), *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 131–149.
- DREW, P & J HERITAGE. 1992. Analyzing talk at work. In Drew P & J Heritage (Eds), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3–65.
- GARCIA, O & W Li. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- GUMPERZ, JJ. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GUZULA, X. 2018. Moving beyond artificial linguistic binaries in the education of African language speaking children: A case for simultaneous biliteracy development. *Perspectives in Education*: 36 (2): 1–15.

- HANKS, WF. 2001. Indexicality. In Duranti, A (Ed), *Key Terms in Language and Culture*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.
- HELLER, M. 2007. Bilingualism as ideology and practice. In Heller M (Ed), *Bilingualism: A social approach*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1–22.
- HELLER, M. 2001. Legitimate language in a multilingual school. In Heller M & M Martin-Jones (Eds), *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference*. Westport: Ablex Publishing, pp. 381–402.
- HERITAGE, J. 1997. Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In Silverman D (Ed), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*. London: Sage.
- HORNBERGER, N & JK CHICK. 2001. Co-constructing school safetime: Safetalk practices in Peruvian and South African classrooms. In Heller, M & M Martin-Jones (Eds), *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference*. London: Ablex Publishing, pp. 31–55.
- İÇBAY, MA. 2008. ‘The role of classroom interaction in the construction of classroom order: A conversation analytic study’. Unpublished PhD Thesis: Middle East Technical University.
- JEFFERSON, G. 2004. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In Lerner GH (Ed), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 13–31.
- LERNER, GH. 2002. Turn-sharing: The choral co-production of talk in interaction. In Ford C, Fox, B & SA Thompson (Eds), *The language of turn and sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 225–256.
- LERNER, GH. 1995. Turn design and the organization of participation in instructional activities. *Discourse Processes*, 19: 111–131.
- LEVINSON, SC. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LI, W. 2002. ‘What do you want me to say?’ On the Conversation Analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language & Society*, 31(2): 159–180.
- LI, W. 1998. The ‘why’ and ‘how’ questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In Auer, P (Ed), *CS in conversation: language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge, pp. 156–176.
- LI, W. 1994. *Three generations, two languages, one family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- MAKALELA, L. 2019. Uncovering the universals of Ubuntu translanguaging in classroom discourse. In W Li & AMY Lin (eds.), *Special Issue: Translanguaging. Classroom Discourse*, 10 (Issue 3–4): 237–251.
- MAKALELA, L. (Ed). 2015. *Shifting lenses: Decolonisation and education in the Global South*. Cape Town: CASAS.
- MARTIN-JONES, M. 2015. Multilingual classroom discourse as a window on wider social, political and ideological processes: Critical ethnographic approaches. In Markee, N (Ed), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction*. MA: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 446–460.
- MARTIN-JONES M & M SAXENA. 1996. Turn-taking, power asymmetries, and the positioning of bilingual participants in classroom discourse. *Linguistics and Education*, 8 (1): 105–123.
- McHOUL, AW. 1978. The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society*, 7: 182–213.
- McKINNEY, C. 2017. *Language and power in postcolonial schooling: Ideologies in practice*. New York: Routledge.
- MEHAN, H. 1979. *Learning lessons*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- MERCER, N & L DAWES. 2014. The study of talk between teachers and students, from the 1970s until 2010s. *Oxford Review of Education*, 40(4):430–445.
- MYERS-SCOTTON, C & A BOLONYAI. 2001. Calculating speakers: Codeswitching in a rational choice model. *Language in Society*, 30, 1–28.
- NOMLOMO, V. 2010. Classroom interaction: Turn-taking as a pedagogical strategy. *Per Linguam*, 26(2):50–66.
- OTHEGUY, R GARCIA, O & W REID. 2015. Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3):281–307.
- PROBYN, M. 2012. Learning science in Eastern Cape schools. In Wright, L (Ed), *South Africa's education crisis: Views from the Eastern Cape*. NISC: Grahamstown. 49–71.
- PROBYN, M. 2009. 'Smuggling' the vernacular into the classroom: Conflicts and tensions in classroom code-switching in township and rural schools in South Africa. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(2): 123–136.
- SACKS, H, SCHEGLOFF, EA & G JEFFERSON. 1978. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. In Schenkein, J (Ed), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction*. New York: Academic, pp. 7–55.
- SCHEGLOFF, EA. 2007. *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SEEDHOUSE, P. 2004. *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A Conversation Analysis perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- SINCLAIR, JM & RM COULTHARD. 1975. *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- TEN HAVE, P. 2007. *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide, 2nd Ed*. London: Sage.
- UYS, D & O VAN DULM. 2011. The functions of classroom code-switching in the Siyanda district of the Northern Cape. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 29(1):67–76.
- ÜSTÜNEL, E & P SEEDHOUSE. 2005. Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(3): 302–325.
- VAN DER WALT, C. 2009. The functions of code-switching in English language learning classes. *Per Linguam*, 25(1):30–43.
- VORSTER, H. 2008. Investigating a scaffold to code-switching as strategy in multilingual classrooms. *Pythagoras*, 67: 33–41.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Brian Ramadiro teaches language and literacy in the Faculty of Education, University of Fort Hare. His main research interests are bi/multilingualism and designing, implementing and researching literacy interventions.

Email address: bramadiro@ufh.ac.za

APPENDIX A: TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

[] (overlap)

ALL CAPS	(loud delivery)
=	(latched talk)
:	(syllable lengthening)
()	(brackets without text indicate talk. Brackets with text indicates uncertainty about what was said)
(())	(Researcher's comments)
Δ	(Fast talk)
∇	(Slow talk)
◦	(Soft talk)
\$	(smiley voice)
↑	(High pitch)
↓	(low pitch)
%trn:	(translation)
(.)	(micro pause, usually less than 0.2 seconds)
(0.4)	(Pause in tenths of seconds)
L01:	(Learner 01)
LNS:	(Learners)
VST1	Visitor1 (A colleague of mine)
Regular typeface	(English)
Bold typeface	(isiXhosa-isiMpondo)
<i>Italics</i>	(isiMpondo)
<u>Underlined</u>	(depending on the context, it refers to classroom formulaic language, Afrikaans or slang)