

**SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME
PRIORITY 7**

Citizens and governance in a knowledge based society
Call FP6-2004-Citizens-4

INTEGRATED PROJECT

DELIVERABLE 3.3: “WORKING PAPER 3”

Project acronym: **DYLAN**
Project full title: **LANGUAGE DYNAMICS AND MANAGEMENT OF DIVERSITY**
Proposal/Contract no.: **CIT4-CT-2006-02**
Operative commencement date of contract: **01/10/2006**
Date of preparation of D 3.3: **04/2008**

Authors: **Teams of Workpackage 3**

Nature: **O**¹
Dissemination level: **PU**²

¹ **R** = Report, **P** = Prototype, **D** = Demonstrator, **O** = Other.

² **PU** = Public, **PP** = Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services), **RE** = Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services), **CO** = Confidential, only for the members of the consortium (including the Commission Services).

INTRODUCTION	p.3
LUCI NUSSBAUM, WORKPACKAGE MANAGER	
RT3.1: UNIVERSITAT AUTONOMA DE BARCELONA	p.7
MELINDA DOOLY EMILEE MOORE LUCI NUSSBAUM (TEAM COORDINATOR) VIRGINA UNAMUNO VÍCTOR CORONA ADRIANA PATINO	
RT3.2: LIBERA UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLZANO	p.11
LORENZO SPREAFICO CECILIA VARCASIA DANIELA VERONESI ALESSANDRO VIETTI RITA FRANCESCHINI	
RT3.3: UNIVERSITÉ DE LAUSANNE	p.16
GABRIELE MÜLLER GABRIELA STEFFEN LAURENT GAJO (TEAM COORDINATOR) ANNE-CLAUDE BERTHOUD JÉRÔME JACQUIN JEANNE PANTET	
RT3.4: UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI	p.21
SEBASTIAN GODENHJELM SAARA HAAPAMÄKI JAN LIDSTRÖM TOM MORING (TEAM COORDINATOR) JAN-OLA ÖSTMAN MIRJA SAARI JENNY SYLVIN	
RT3.5: BEBES-BOLYAI UNIVERSITY, CLUJ-NAPOCA	p.25
STEFAN OLTEAN LIANA POP	
RT3.6 VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSELS	p.30
LAURE ALLAIN EVY CEULEERS PIET VAN DE CRAEN	

1. INTRODUCTION

This document presents the working papers written by all research teams in workpackage 3 (WP3), discussed during the internal workshop at CM5 (Barcelona, January 2009). The proposed task was to present the provisional results of the first 30 months of the DYLAN research project, taking into account the general objectives of WP3; that is to say:

- ▶ To analyse multilingual practices in educational institutions, focusing on higher education settings;
- ▶ To examine language policies and strategies at the national and institutional level;
- ▶ To investigate representations by different actors of multilingualism and of multilingual education.

WP3 also aims to contribute to transversal issues within the DYLAN project.

UAB, UBBC, UNIBZ, UNIL teams (and VUB team in secondary education contexts) have concentrated primarily on practices, whereas UBBC, UHE and VUB have focussed mainly or also on policies. All the teams have established relationships between their primary aim and representations.

2. TYPE OF OBSERVABLES IN RELATION WITH METHODOLOGY

Looking at policies and strategies, the diverse teams have gathered data including official documents, interviews, observations, websites and students' guides and have explored this data by applying discourse analysis and content analysis methods.

Regarding classroom practices, teams have collected data from lectures, seminars, pair/group work and students' notes and have analysed them using theoretical and methodological tools from interactional sociolinguistics and socio-constructivism. UAB and UNIBZ teams have also analysed data, drawing on tools from conversation analysis, involving non-classroom interactions, such as debates among teachers and workers at the university, work meetings, service encounters, e-mails, teacher-students interactions outside the classroom and informal interactions among students.

Representations have been examined using interactional data collected inside and outside classrooms, as well as via semi-structured interviews, narrative interviews, student diaries and questionnaires. These data have been explored using tools characteristic of content analysis and discourse analysis and by observing the way people categorise languages and activities related to language use.

3. FINDINGS

3.1. MULTILINGUALISM AS A SET OF ISOLATED MONOLINGUAL COMPETENCES

All the teams coincide in claiming that universities promote multilingualism (the individual competence to use diverse languages) in order to achieve different objectives: to preserve lesser-used languages; as a 'trademark' of a multilingual institution; to improve students' multilingual competences; to participate in student mobility programs; etc. In this regard, English takes on a significant role in the sense that policy documents sometimes attribute more communicative functions to English than to local languages. This may be related to the fact that the Bologna processes have put English forward as the major candidate for a lingua franca throughout European tertiary education settings. However, policies do not mention using more than one language in the same event as a possible way to establish relationships or to interact at universities. As will be seen, this issue contrasts with some of the observed practices.

3.2. MULTILINGUAL MODE AS A MEANS TO INTEGRATE L2 AND NON-LINGUISTIC KNOWLEDGE CONSTRUCTION

Observed practices in classroom settings run along a continuum that goes from strictly monolingual events to varying degrees of multilingual communication within the same event. Monolingual events imply a language regime under the 'one-language-only rule' and, in this sense, are oriented to policies and strategies that establish an official language for a subject matter, such as when English is used as a lingua franca (LF). In these cases, some observations suggest simplification procedures and, it follows, an impact of language choice on the process of knowledge transmission and construction (UNIL, BBC).

On the other hand, in multilingual-mode, or instances in which code-choice or code-switching phenomena can emerge, participants orient to the ongoing interaction and use their resources for practical purposes. Data analysis shows that this multilingual-mode can coincide with sequences in which people integrate metalinguistics activities and reflection on knowledge. Thus, it seems that the multilingual-mode is favourable for a more profound exploration of knowledge and for learning aspects of a discipline and of its specific discourse in the same task.

3.3. MULTILINGUAL MODE AS AN EXPERIENCE FOR PARTICIPATING IN MULTILINGUAL INTERNATIONAL PROFESSIONAL SETTINGS

Since policies are monolingual in the sense that they presuppose the application of the one-language-only rule, some teams in WP3 try to isolate issues that shape multilingual practices. External factors (official language established by programmes, speakers' institutional roles, etc.) do not serve to explain the emergence of multilingual interactions. Some teams find an explanation for the use of more than one language in certain sequences in the participation framework; possibly related, on the one hand, with the way participants categorise the ongoing interaction and, on the other hand, with the way they put their competences into play. Thus, the unfolding activity and the way people engage in it are closely linked to the emergence of multilingual-mode exchanges. At the same time, experience in multilingual interactions might be useful for students' future development in multilingual international settings. Further data sessions will allow the confirmation of this hypothesis.

3.4. MULTILINGUAL MODE ALSO IN PRACTICES OUTSIDE CLASSROOM

As has been said, only two teams have collected and analysed non-pedagogical practices. The results show, like in language classroom settings, a continuum that runs from monolingual events to multilingual ones. The 'one-language-at-a-time rule' operates in relation to social networks established by students, teachers and administrative staff, but also because, in service encounters, clients and providers orient to this mode of interaction. Nevertheless, monolingualism does coexist with code-switching practices. This suggests that, despite what is depicted in policies, actors may consider interactions outside of the classroom as instances of language learning, especially when these actors are students and teachers.

3.5. COMPLEX ARTICULATION BETWEEN REPRESENTATIONS, PRACTICES AND POLICIES

WP3 teams have not systematically and homogeneously explored representations; some of them have worked analysing practices, others analysing policy texts, others with questionnaires and interviews. In section 3.1, the way multilingualism is understood in policies has been mentioned. The actors directly implicated in practices (students, teaching and administrations staff) understand multilingualism in different ways when talking about it and when they interact with other people in intercultural or/and in classroom settings. In talking about it, multilingualism is seen by actors as a means to communicate and as a competence to be acquired. In that sense, actors' representations coincide with policies. However, the representations emerging in interactions are more complex and frequently multilingualism is seen as a repertoire without boundaries that can be exploited to accomplish multiple activities in a given situation.

3.6. ENGLISH IS LINGUA FRANCA, BUT NOT THE ONLY ONE

In tertiary education, English is largely considered the privileged means to communicate across Europe and between people coming from different places. This result aligns with Bologna policies that consider English as the lingua franca. However, in the data collected by WP3, other languages can also take on this role. For some people, mobility is an opportunity to learn other languages or to practice them. Exploring this willingness could be a basis on which to support European policies encouraging learning more than one foreign language.

4. CONCLUSION

WP3 has built up an ensemble of analytical tools to explore multilingualism in tertiary education institutions (and in secondary education in the case of VUB). Teams have collected a considerable amount of data involving practices both in monolingual-mode events in L2 and LF and multilingual-mode events in L2 and LF, as well as data involving policies and representations. Some of these data have been made available to WP4 in order to contribute to the exploration of transversal issues within DYLAN.

Teams have identified a set of factors affecting patterns of multilingual interaction modes and their relationship with knowledge construction. Some teams propose the hypotheses, based on their data analysis, that the use of more than one language in the same event could be a procedure for deepening the construction of knowledge when the object of discourse becomes dense or impenetrable. Furthermore, participating in exchanges in a multilingual-mode could be a useful means for improving professional competences in an interconnected world. The planned internal data sessions (June 2009) will be the occasion for in-depth discussions on these issues and for relating the results with official policies and declared representations.

1. INTRODUCTION

As established in wp 1 and 2, the UAB team aims to study the language dynamics at two Catalan universities in relation with new discourses emerging from the convergence of the Bologna process, globalised economic practices and previously prevalent language policies. Placing practices as the centre of our focus, the UAB team explores the visions of multilingualism illustrated through various observed interactions and their relationship with policies/strategies and representations in higher education institutions. Like other WP3 teams, the UAB team has centred on L2-medium academic content classes as a privileged setting for exploring language dynamics and for examining if multilingualism may be a resource for the construction of knowledge (or not). However, the UAB team has also examined other social settings to portray emerging day-to-day language practices and their possible relationship with classroom language use. As stated in previous wps, integrating different data types and sources will allow a broader and deeper understanding of multilingualism as a social process.

2. TYPE OF OBSERVABLES IN RELATION WITH METHODOLOGY

In constructing the research field, the UAB team adopts an ethnographic approach, based on both the team members' knowledge as insiders and on our field work over the past 30 months. Such field work has aimed at detecting instances where multilingualism is categorised (e.g. in official texts) or where multilingual practices are produced. From the most to the least accessible data, our corpus consists of:

- a. institutional language policy texts and web sites;
- b. public debates about language policy;
- c. in-service interactions;
- d. formal and informal interactions both inside and outside classrooms;
- e. interviews with students, teachers and decision makers;
- f. students' lecture notes.

In exploring the data, their dialogic nature and the specific socio-historical moment in which they emerged has been kept in mind. Interactional sociolinguistics and conversation analysis approaches are also adopted, with particular recourse to theories of code-switching and categorisation. We also draw on socio-constructivist approaches to exolingual communication to explore classroom data.

3. FINDINGS

In this section, the first results will be discussed in relation to the research questions (see wps 1 and 2).

3.1. POLICIES AND NEWLY EMERGING PRACTICES: TWO KINDS OF MULTILINGUALISM

Regarding new language practices at higher education institutions, ethnographic field work at both the UAB and at the UPC – an institution that has only just begun to be explored – reveals that new multilingual practices are indeed emerging, alongside already habitual bilingual practices (Catalan-Spanish). Such practices are linked to policies/strategies that promote the internationalisation of universities (teacher, researcher and student mobility and international communication) and English is positioned as the *lingua franca* for this purpose. The effect of globalisation and converging educational objectives (e.g. the Bologna process) creates intertextual discourses deployed as a rationale for this multilingual perspective that include the need a) to construct higher education institutions of excellence, to capture students from around the world, to promote research with companies, etc. and b) for innovative practices for the university community.

In official texts, these new practices are presented as monolingual in different languages. This conception, which is not at all new, can be observed, for instance, in course plans that claim classes will be taught 'entirely' in English, or in a new language policy proposal at the UAB that would require teachers to announce which language (in singular) their classes will be taught in. What is new is the fact that English takes on an important role in this multilingualism, with more varied functions than the other two languages:

- ▶ Catalan for institutional communication and for the majority of the undergraduate classes, to protect the language;
- ▶ Spanish for institutional communication outside of Catalonia (Spain and Latin America) and to attract Latin-American postgraduate students;
- ▶ English for student mobility, for certain courses or programs (mainly to attract foreign students), for postgraduate courses, for scientific communication (at conferences or in publications) and for administrative communication between international institutions.

Furthermore, a new language policy document at the UAB proposes new strategies in order to construct a 'multilingual university', including: English training for university staff; linguistic profiles for future staff contracts; English competence for university entry and exit; incentives for teachers promoting multilingualism in the classroom; assistance for writing scientific articles in English, etc. The roots of these plans can be found in the new higher education market, obliging institutions to compete and position themselves as 'modern' institutions capable of managing training and research in a single global language. However, the new language policy does not lose sight of its original aim to conserve and promote the use of Catalan.

The policies/strategies conceive multilingualism through the optic of a 'one language at a time rule' (see UNIBZ team's deliverable3) or 'mode unilingue' (see UNIL team's deliverable3 for the distinction between 'mode unilingue' vs 'mode plurilingue'); that is, participants use a single language in interaction. However practices, both inside and outside the classroom, are frequently plural ('mode plurilingue').

3.2. PLURILINGUAL MODE ALSO IN UNILINGUAL SETTINGS

Our team has collected classroom data in four different undergraduate educational sites (specifically, courses in teacher training, engineering, economics and psychology) in which English is presented:

- a. as a *lingua franca* for integrating international students;
- b. as a strategy to improve the language competences of local students. In all cases, classes are announced as being taught in English. However, in all of them, the plurilingual mode, or more than one language for the construction and transmission of knowledge, appears to an extent. The occurrence of this plurilingual mode is related mainly with:
- c. the student/s being addressed (local or foreign) and the purpose of the course (CLIL or ELF classes). In the case of CLIL classes for local students, the plurilingual mode (i.e. Catalan, Spanish and English) is more frequent; in classes taught in ELF for both local and foreign students, the plurilingual mode is less frequent.
- d. the participation framework: lecture vs. peer-group; lecture vs. teacher-student interaction sequences. In less formal situations, the plurilingual mode is more prevalent. Nevertheless, even in formal, teacher-centred lectures, the plurilingual mode is observable in the students' notes collected by the UAB team.

This particular insight into students' activity demonstrates that plurilingualism is inextricably linked to situated cognition in multilingual learning settings and that individuals use their plurilingual resources to construct knowledge. Our data analysis suggests that the plurilingual mode creates a favourable framework for dealing with both metalinguistic and metacognitive tasks in an integrated way and provides novel tools for the problematisation and for the construction of knowledge.

As already argued in wp2, this plurilingual 'reality' is not portrayed in any of the official documents at the UAB. That is, despite being a quotidian fact according to our

field observations, hybrid language uses are not recognised as a possible or desirable form of communication. Despite this, some teachers admit to plurilingual practices in carrying out different types of classroom activities.

3.3. PLURILINGUAL PRACTICES OUTSIDE CLASSROOMS

With regard to new non-classroom practices on campus, language choice, language negotiation and code-switching (e.g. between English, Spanish and Catalan and between multiple languages when foreign students are involved) are a prominent feature of our corpus. Likewise, despite the prominence of English, the data reveal the presence of other languages and, moreover, the emergence of Spanish as a *lingua franca* among students coming from different countries.

Despite institutional promotion of English as a *lingua franca* to facilitate international communication, sometimes, as observed in our corpus, individuals do not share this goal. On the contrary, our corpus suggests that they sometimes seek to display and/or improve their competences in languages *other than* English.

4. CONCLUSION

Our first results show that multilingualism is categorised by institutional policies/strategies as a competence for participating in monolingual practices in different languages. On the other hand, verbal practices are often hybrid, with speakers categorising their plurilingual repertoires as a resource for communicating and/or learning. Thus, the data analysed by the UAB team suggest that participants categorise their language repertoires as a set of resources which are locally deployed to resolve concrete communicative/learning activities and/or to show preferences or affiliations.

The challenge for European higher education institutions is how to take advantage of this linguistic capital in local and international languages and in those languages brought by immigrant and international students. By understanding language learning and knowledge construction as a social practice, the challenge for this research is to integrate both classroom practices and those that take place in other social spaces in an explanatory framework. We hope to fulfil this task with our work in coming months.

1. INTRODUCTION

The focus of UNIBZ research team is the analysis of communicative practices and representations of multilingualism at the Free University of Bolzano-Bozen, as emerging from face-to-face interactions among students, teaching and administrative staff within different contexts, as well as from interviews and official documents.

Given the analysis carried on so far on the key research questions stated in WP1 (§1), on a general descriptive level we are elaborating a map of patterns of language use along a continuum that goes from strictly monolingual events to varying degrees of multilingual communication within the same event.

On a micro (linguistic and interactional) level, the observation of both pedagogical and spontaneous data at FUB therefore requires an understanding of multilingualism also in terms of the impact of a multilingual context (e.g. institution language policy, degree of multilingual proficiency of speakers) on the use of single languages in *monolingual* communication (prototypically in native-non native interactions).

2. TYPE OF OBSERVABLES IN RELATION WITH METHODOLOGY

The UNIBZ-Research team has so far collected a variety of data within FUB in order to get a broad perspective on language and communicative practices performed by the various social actors studying and working in it, on their representations of languages and multilingualism, as well as on the language policies adopted by the institution itself as part of the team contribution to the current phase of the Dylan project. The corpus contains both audio- and audio/video-recordings, as well as written documents:

- ▶ pedagogical events (lectures and seminars);
- ▶ informal interactions among students;
- ▶ students' language diaries;
- ▶ narrative interviews on language biographies;
- ▶ service encounters at information desks;

- ▶ work meetings (library staff);
- ▶ samples of written communication within the institution (e-mails)
- ▶ official documents (study manifestos and student guides).

Audio- and audio/video-recordings are transcribed according to CA and CA-CHAT conventions.

The diversity of the data collected has called the use of different methodologies of analysis: a conversation analytic one, and a sociolinguistic one. Face-to-face events are analysed in terms of language use as resource for interactional purposes, whereas self-reported data are analysed in terms of speaker's repertoires and attitudes as discursively constructed and as connected to social network structures.

3. FINDINGS

The collection and the analysis of different types of data within the Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, carried out up to now, has allowed to acquire a picture of how multilingualism is managed and affects various social actors in this institution, described below.

3.1. CODE CHOICE IN PEDAGOGICAL CONTEXTS: ORIENTATION TO LANGUAGE POLICIES VS. ORIENTATION TO THE ONGOING INTERACTION

The detailed analysis carried so far for pedagogical events (5 lectures and 3 seminars) has shown that the official multilingual orientation of the Free University of Bozen-Bolzano is conjugated in quite different forms in practice: these are distributed along a continuum that goes from a strict monolingualism (one lecture at the Faculty of Computer Science) to the predominance of the official language of the activity (lectures and seminars) with an increasing degree of code-switching and/or code-alternation (general language and terminological transfers in lectures and seminars; transfers and code-alternations in seminars), with the end of the continuum being represented by the multilingual practices documented in one seminar at the Faculty of Design and Art (BB1, see WP2).

How can such differences in communicative practices be explained?

All lectures and seminars are officially defined as pedagogical events taking place in an institutional setting; in all of them participants' institutional roles (lectures/tutors, students) are assigned by virtue of the event type; for all events an institutional language policy establishes an official language to be used in interaction. Such contextual factors, which can be seen as external to the interaction itself, do in fact not help us any further in the analysis. Nor can the orientation towards monologicity *versus* dialogicity, as emerging from analysis, be seen as a clear element of differentiation: while some dialogue-oriented lectures do not present a consistent amount of code-switching (neither by lecturers nor by students), seminar BB1, which

is characterized by the alternation of students' expositions and common discussions and thus is highly dialogical, does take place in more languages.

Moreover, language competences alone do not suffice to explain the emergence of multilingual practices: rather, exploiting or not exploiting one's own linguistic repertoire (which in all cases includes at least two languages) seems to be connected with one's own view of multilingualism and of acting in a multilingual environment on the background of the institutional language policy, along with one's own assessment of the ongoing event and of participants' language competences.

Under this perspective the examined lecturers/tutors, who clearly orient interaction in ways that are typical of talk in institutional settings (opening and closing the event, selecting next speakers, choosing topics, etc.), also provide an orientation as to language use: by employing one or more languages themselves, by explicitly negotiating code-choice, as well as by converging or diverging from students' linguistic choices.

Students' contribution to shaping the event in terms of language choice is equally essential: this is clear in seminar BB1, where they exploit the 'linguistic space' potentially offered by the lecturer and the tutor chairing the event, in that they engage in language negotiation and select the language for their presentations, and exploit their competence in other languages to participate in common discussions. In lectures and in the other examined seminars, on the other hand, not diverging from the monolingual orientation towards the official language of the event does indeed ratify such choice, and the institutional policy behind it.

Different views of multilingualism are thus made visible, in which learning issues might also play a role: on the one hand applying the "one-language-only-rule" can be seen as a way for participants to create a further context for language learning (potentially facilitated by the way lecturers shape their discourse lexically, semantically and pragmatically) beyond language classes (and indeed the multilingual orientation of the university is mentioned as one of the reasons for studying at the FUB in some of the students' interviews collected for the project); on the other, the fact that interaction is managed by lecturers/tutors so that code-alternation and code-switching are not excluded or even encouraged allows the active participation of potentially every student and leads to the emergence of patterns of language use which might be considered useful for students' future profession in multilingual international contexts.

Preliminary analysis of semi-structured interviews carried on with students and academic staff reveal individuals' language biographies marked by previous contacts with foreign languages, as well as positive attitudes towards studying and working in a multilingual environment; a further, more detailed examination will help to explore the relationship between representations and practices as to the adoption of one or more languages in the classroom.

3.2. COMMUNICATIVE PRACTICES AND SOCIAL NETWORKS OUTSIDE THE INSTITUTION

A preliminary description of students spontaneous interactions allows us to put forward the hypothesis that when the students are outside the class and can choose their communicative contexts and participants, they tend to develop social networks on a mono-linguistic ground, according to the "one language at a time rule" mentioned above. Nonetheless even from an exploratory analysis of the corpus of data (taken from spontaneous interactions of two students) a varied range of (subtle or gross) linguistic outcomes are likely to emerge under the effect of the multilingual environment: and more specifically code-switching practices (between South-Tyrolean German dialect and Italian), native – non native communication (in German or in Italian), communication among non native speakers (e.g. English as lingua franca among students from abroad).

3.3. MANAGING TRILINGUALISM IN SERVICE ENCOUNTERS

The observation of service encounters at the advisory, the careers advisory, the library and the international relations office desks also shows that speakers orient to the already mentioned "one language at a time" rule. Since most of the times the first to speak in those encounters is the service seeker and not the service provider, language choice is left to the seeker and providers align to her/his choice with exceptional code-negotiations. And when it is the provider that starts speaking by greeting and offering availability s/he rather prefers to guess the linguistic identity of the interlocutor and offer just one language for the interaction. These encounters therefore take place in all three official languages of the University and in the local dialect (one at a time), with few instances of code-alternations.

4. CONCLUSION

By exploring language use in various communicative settings within the FUB, the research team has provided a first, data-driven general description of an officially multilingual institution of higher education, which was established only in recent years and is still working out and consolidating models of multilingual interactions.

Both multilingual and monolingual events have been observed and hypotheses about factors affecting language choice were elaborated, such as the role of lecturers and tutors as promoting multilingual practices, which could prove beneficial both in terms of knowledge co-construction and of an actual consideration and enhancement of existing linguistic diversity.

The examination of monolingual events has shed light on the usefulness of investigating the features of such languages, in order to see if and how they are

employed and designed for linguistically varied conversational partners, as in the case of simplification phenomena.

Furthermore, some events document the use of vehicular languages (not necessarily only English as *lingua franca*) as means to reach communicative and interactional goals beyond language norm; a fact that provides some insights as to how language diversity in Europe can be exploited in a functional way.

1. TÂCHE DE RECHERCHE

Nous analysons les pratiques plurilingues dans l'enseignement tertiaire et la recherche, dans le but de comprendre les effets du plurilinguisme sur les processus de construction, de transmission et de mise en oeuvre des connaissances (effets cognitifs et stratégiques). Nous étudions également l'articulation entre ces pratiques, les représentations des acteurs impliqués (sur leurs propres pratiques, sur le plurilinguisme et sur la diversité linguistique) et les politiques linguistiques des institutions concernées.

2. TYPES DE DONNÉES, OBSERVABLES ET MÉTHODES D'ANALYSE

Nos trois types de données – interactions didactiques plurilingues (1), entretiens semi-directifs avec leurs participants (2), documents de politique linguistique de leurs institutions (3) – sont analysés selon deux dimensions, soit pratiques (A) et représentations (B):

DIMENSIONS DONNEES	Pratiques	Représentations
Interactions didactiques	A1 Pratiques d'enseignement	B1 Représentations mobilisées dans l'action
Entretiens semi-directifs	A2 Pratiques de l'entretien	B2 Représentations déclarées
Documents de politique linguistique	(non pertinent)	B3 Représentations inscrites (prescriptions des instances institutionnelles)

L'analyse conversationnelle, l'analyse du discours et le recours aux théories du bi-plurilinguisme constituent nos outils principaux. Pour B2 et B3, la priorité va à une analyse de contenu (traitement des langues, du plurilinguisme, des savoirs académiques), mais la dimension discursive demeure pertinente. En B3, par exemple, un document pourra recourir à une directive pour mettre en place certaines normes. En A1, nous nous intéressons aux objets de connaissance, à leur construction et au positionnement mutuel des participants au sein des interactions plurilingues. Un accent particulier est mis sur les marques transcodiques (Lüdi & Py, 1986) dans le discours. B1 concerne le repérage des représentations à l'œuvre dans les interactions didactiques.

Nos analyses contribuent, pour l'essentiel, à mettre en parallèle, d'une part, A1 avec B1/2/3 et, d'autre part, B1, B2 et B3 entre eux, ceci afin d'identifier des décalages, des renforcements, des contraintes, sources de sédimentation ou de changement. La question du plurilinguisme comme ressource (ou limitation) est ainsi traitée dans chacune des cases et dans leurs articulations, grâce à une diversité de terrains (variété d'institutions, de disciplines, de formats pédagogiques et de langues).

3. RÉSULTATS

Nos résultats se situent à plusieurs niveaux : éclairage nouveau de nos questions de recherche (3.1), premières réponses à nos questions (A1: 3.2, 3.3; B2/3: 3.8, 3.9), mise en place de concepts opératoires (3.4, 3.5) ou de grilles d'analyse (3.6, 3.7) émanant de A1 ou de la mise en relation de A1 et de B1/2/3.

3.1. DIVERSITÉ DES PRATIQUES DANS L'ENSEIGNEMENT TERTIAIRE

Comme nous travaillons sur des données provenant de différents *settings* dans plusieurs institutions en Suisse, nos analyses montrent avant tout la diversité des pratiques plurilingues dans l'enseignement tertiaire. Elles tentent aussi d'en cerner la particularité, dans le sens où les paradigmes de connaissances sont interrogés autant que les connaissances elles-mêmes, le recours à plusieurs langues pouvant contribuer à ce travail.

3.2. IMPLICATIONS COGNITIVES ET STRATÉGIQUES DES PRATIQUES PLURILINGUES

L'analyse des interactions didactiques a révélé une série d'implications des activités plurilingues – et de fait du travail linguistique – sur l'élaboration des savoirs (dimension cognitive) et l'organisation des activités (dimension stratégique) des acteurs, ces deux dimensions étant dissociées pour des raisons pratiques mais fortement imbriquées dans notre perspective théorique et méthodologique :

- ▶ **implications cognitives:** nous observons que certaines pratiques plurilingues semblent favorables 1) à un travail extensif et intensif à la fois sur la langue et sur la discipline, 2) à l'ouverture de paradigmes de connaissances dans lesquels les objets traités sont intégrés et 3) de ce fait, à la probable stabilisation du savoir ;
- ▶ **implications stratégiques:** l'alternance des langues peut servir à inclure/exclure des participants des activités en cours, par exemple dans des cas de prise de décision ; de ce fait, le plurilinguisme intervient dans la gestion concrète du travail (p.ex. rédaction de rapports ou expériences scientifiques) et dans la mise en place du *leadership* dans des groupes de travail.

3.3. MODE UNILINGUE, MODE MULTILINGUE ET IMPLICATIONS SUR LA CONSTRUCTION DES SAVOIRS

Il s'agit de définir plus clairement ce que signifie pratique plurilingue, car elle peut se réaliser dans deux modes différents:

1. en mode unilingue (notamment les cours en L2 *lingua franca*), certaines observations suggèrent un impact de la langue sur les processus de construction et de transmission des connaissances en termes de simplification ; la question est d'établir si celle-ci contribue à l'explication de contenus complexes ou tend à réduire cette complexité ;
2. en mode multilingue (lorsque plus d'une langue est utilisée dans la construction et la transmission des savoirs), la confrontation des langues est une ressource pour les séquences explicatives autour des savoirs ; on y observe une thématization particulière des phénomènes langagiers (activité métalinguistique), des micro-alternances (code-switch) et/ou des méso-alternances (changement de langue pour aborder une synthèse, un résumé, etc.), la macro-alternance relevant plutôt d'un mode unilingue (activité conduite entièrement dans une langue donnée, même étrangère).

Le mode multilingue permet de travailler langue et contenu de manière plus directement intégrée, tandis que le mode unilingue se focalise en général sur le *contenu*.

3.4. LA "SATURATION" COMME CONCEPT OPÉRATOIRE POUR L'INTÉGRATION LANGUE/CONTENU

Pour analyser les modalités de rencontre entre le traitement des enjeux linguistiques et disciplinaires, nous recourons à la notion de saturation des savoirs (Gajo & Grobet, 2008). En mode multilingue, les savoirs disciplinaires semblent plus facilement atteindre leur degré de saturation dans un balayage plus complet des paradigmes de référence. En revanche, en mode unilingue, on observe régulièrement une sous-saturation des savoirs.

3.5. PLURILINGUISME COMME OBJET/PLURILINGUISME COMME MOYEN

En mode unilingue, et dans les interactions plus monologiques (ex. : cours ex-cathedra), si le plurilinguisme cesse de fonctionner comme moyen (ressource cognitive et stratégique), il peut devenir objet de discours (ex. : phénomènes plurilingues ou interculturels comme objets d'un cours de marketing). Prendre le plurilinguisme comme objet de réflexion disciplinaire témoigne alors d'une certaine conscience linguistique de l'enseignant.

3.6. FACTEURS PERTINENTS POUR UNE ANALYSE COMPARATIVE

Toujours dans un souci de clarification et de mise en perspective de nos données, très diversifiées, nous avons élaboré une grille identifiant des facteurs qui influencent potentiellement la relation entre la dimension plurilingue et ses effets observés au niveau cognitif et stratégique: le type d'enseignement (travaux pratiques, groupe de travail, cours, etc.), son objectif 1) décrit dans le programme officiel, 2) déclaré par l'enseignant et 3) relevé dans la pratique; la "macro-pratique" dans laquelle la pratique spécifique s'inscrit (filière bilingue ou non); le nombre de participants et la constitution linguistique du groupe/de la classe; le "mode participatif" (pratique plus ou moins dialogale); le "régime de langue" (mode plus ou moins multilingue); les effets de la dimension plurilingue déclarés par les participants (dans les entretiens).

3.7. RÉGIME DE LANGUE ET MODE PARTICIPATIF : 2 FACTEURS SAILLANTS

En ce qui concerne les effets du plurilinguisme observés dans les données, nous avons pu identifier un lien apparemment très fort aux facteurs "régime de langue" (mode unilingue/mode multilingue) et "mode participatif" (plus ou moins dialogal). En effet, l'impact de la dimension linguistique semble non seulement dépendre du degré de multilinguisme dans la pratique, mais aussi du degré d'interactivité, permettant ou non la co-construction des savoirs.

3.8. RELATION ENTRE PRATIQUES ET REPRÉSENTATIONS DÉCLARÉES

La confrontation des interactions didactiques (A1) et des entretiens semi-directifs (B2) a révélé une articulation complexe entre ces deux dimensions. Face à des représentations assez sophistiquées, nous trouvons des pratiques disciplinaires qui intègrent peu la dimension plurilingue comme moyen. En même temps, les participants peuvent avoir des discours relativement stéréotypés, tout en ayant des pratiques intégrant la dimension plurilingue comme ressource à de multiples égards. Néanmoins, une vision transparente de la langue, c'est-à-dire la considérant comme

simple véhicule du contenu sans influence sur ce dernier, semble défavorable à une mise à profit de la dimension plurilingue.

3.9. LES DOCUMENTS DE POLITIQUE LINGUISTIQUE

L'analyse de ces données est encore exploratoire.

4. IMPORTANCE DES RÉSULTATS

Nos résultats actuels constituent à plusieurs égards un pas important dans l'atteinte des objectifs visés par notre tâche et ceux du projet:

1. Nous apportons des résultats originaux d'analyses qualitatives qui, dans un premier temps, identifient une série d'effets cognitifs et stratégiques du plurilinguisme et qui, dans un deuxième temps, aideront à comprendre l'impact de la dimension plurilingue sur l'enseignement tertiaire à plus large échelle.
2. Nos réflexions théoriques et méthodologiques contribuent à affiner les outils d'analyse.
3. Nos résultats, en particulier l'élaboration d'un catalogue de facteurs, nous permettent de mieux saisir les conditions ou les scénarios au sein desquels le plurilinguisme constitue un atout pour l'enseignement tertiaire (p.ex. mode multilingue + degré élevé d'interactivité + vision non transparente du langage).

1. INTRODUCTION

The UHE team's research questions and objectives are divided into four parts. The *first* part, the overall WP3 task, includes the analysis of language practises, policies and representations in educational systems and how these changes are reflected in legislation and lower level regulations. Focusing on the University of Helsinki the UHE team will identify the implications of language policies and practises of the state and administrations for educational systems. The *second* part, a particular task of RT 3.4, includes the examination of the impact of language policies on institutional strategies at European, national and regional levels in order to identify inefficiencies reflected in the existing policies and strategies of educational systems. The *third* part, the present key UHE research question, examines the outputs of these policies at the different university levels. This analysis will, in a next stage, develop into an analysis of the outcomes of the policies.

2. TYPE OF OBSERVABLES IN RELATION WITH METHODOLOGY

The UHE RT departs from an input-output-outcome policy analysis model. The *input analysis* illustrates legislation, policies and strategies affecting the use of languages. The analysis includes mapping of relevant, overtly formulated policies in order to frame the environment that higher education operates in. Interviews are conducted in order to validate observation of overt policies, and to clarify also covert policies that might affect the policy outputs or actions taken.

The *output analysis* illustrates the measures taken to implement the policies. The outputs are categorized into four different types of policy actions ranging from *direct* to *indirect*, and *monetary* to *non-monetary* actions.

Based on the premises set by the input-output analysis, the *outcome analysis* focuses on actual interaction. This is based on linguistic analysis (conversation and discourse analysis of focus groups and participant observation). The research results are

expected to highlight the *capacity, opportunity, and desire* to use different languages in higher education.

3. FINDINGS

The UHE team has collected already to some extent analysed data related to outputs based on language policies that we have structured according to the predefined four categories of policy actions mentioned above.

At University of Helsinki, where most data so far has been collected, we have been focusing on three languages: the two national languages Finnish and Swedish; and English. The 38,000 students of the University are Finnish speaking (89,5%), Swedish speaking (6,5%), and also increasingly from other language background (4%). Students need to pass a language test in both national languages as well as in English as a part of their studies. The 11 at the university are all engaged in multilingual education, but to varying degrees.

The university also offers education of other languages, carried out by a specific language centre. In addition there are institutions and departments that carry out research and education in and of different languages. These are not included in our analysis, which focuses on education *in*, not *of* languages.

Findings regarding *direct, monetary* outputs that language policies produce show that direct funds are allocated in order to secure the status of both of the national languages as well as the English language. The Swedish language education, for example, receives direct monetary funding which is divided between the faculties. This funding links with the university's language strategies, but also indirectly relates to the Finnish language Act.

Also the English language education receives direct monetary funding through start-up funds that are directed towards institutions establishing new English master level programmes.

Our research shows that the University of Helsinki in 2007 provided approximately 4% of all its courses in Swedish and 4% in English.

Regarding language proficiency, interviews conducted by the UHE RT has indicated that, due to changes in the basic school education, there are growing problems with respect to the level of language skills that new students have in Swedish. In order to pass language requirement standards, additional education is needed that leads to considerable additional costs.

Available data on teaching language of courses given in Swedish and English was found to be misleading in some cases. The question of what constitutes a course language has not been clearly defined. The UHE RT, together with University of Helsinki administrative bodies, is currently validating the data. Until this validation is completed, detailed information cannot be reported.

Regarding master level programmes in English, we found that the amount of programmes offered has been rapidly growing. However, future funding of the master

level programmes is unclear. Programmes that have been started with extra funding may risk being shut down when this funding ends. Interviews suggested that, especially at master's level, continuation of English programmes in some cases may be at the cost of course offerings provided in the national languages.

Findings regarding *indirect, monetary* outputs that language policies produce show that such outputs are to a great extent based on education that fulfils specific national criteria for the education of personnel required by the Finnish public sector. The output is mainly based on the existence of professors responsible for education in the other national language, Swedish. In 5 of the 11 faculties, such criteria are set, supporting education in several subjects such as medicine and law. The policies establishing this are indirect, monetary outputs, as the need for education in other than the primary language is set by the society, not by the University itself. (In addition the University can include quotas for new Swedish students in order to ensure enough educated future personnel.)

The right for all students to use their own language (statutory guaranteed for the two national languages Finnish or Swedish) when consulting university bodies or when receiving services provided by for instance campus service centres exemplify *non-monetary, direct* outputs of language policies. At least partly in apparent contradiction with this requirement, however, our interviews show that the main focus when recruiting personnel is on their English skills as it is perceived as more important.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS BASED ON A COMPARISON OF UNIVERSITIES IN NORTHERN EUROPE

The comparative approach of the UHE research allows us to relate policy observations from UHE to observations in some other universities in Northern Europe. Our comparison is at this stage preliminary. It includes the Universities of Södertörn and Flensburg, and the Sami University College.

Departing from the goals that have been tabled in the Nancy-declaration, we note that a general awareness of the importance of language education exists. However, in practice this takes many forms. Particular policies in support of lesser used languages are inherent in the basic brief for some universities, such as University of Helsinki in Finland (for Swedish), University of Flensburg in Germany (for Danish) and the Sami University College in Kautokeino (for Sami). In these universities also English is present as a teaching language. As the majority language of the states are usually mastered, in these settings the aim of communicating skills in at least two languages other than the first language would appear to be fostered, at least to some extent. However, in practice the knowledge in the language spoken by the minority may not be fully developed (as exemplified by the situation of Swedish in University of Helsinki, see above). We have also so far not been informed about any systematic quality assessment of the level of language used in courses offered in English in the institutions that we have studied.

At University of Södertörn in Sweden that does not have a particular language brief, the principle of one plus two languages is not stimulated in the same way. This university has a high proportion of students with not typically Swedish backgrounds. Their particular language skills stemming from their backgrounds are, however, not

sustained by the University. Earlier policies of maintaining teaching in big immigrant languages have been terminated as part of rationalization of language education; students who so wish are requested to attend language courses at other universities. This points to a shift of priorities (overt monetary) that go against multilingual skills.

An observation, which still has to be validated, is that the Bologna process in some cases may have been counter-final with respect to multilingual education, as course programmes have been squeezed (example: University of Södertörn) and components such as language teaching or student exchange has become more difficult to carry out in practice (example: university of Flensburg). These examples point to negative consequences of covert and non-monetary policies.

Other foreign languages than English are apparently non-existent in content education in the institutions that we have studied. In the cases where courses are taught in more than two languages, one of them always appears to be a minority- or lesser used national language.

New or emerging language strategies at national levels in Sweden and Finland give a heightened attention to (the relatively small) national languages of these Nordic states. Thus such strategies in defense also of the national languages that are spoken by a majority of the population appear to emerge among the primary goals within language policy.

4. CONCLUSION

The UHE RT found that the outputs produced by the language policies to some extent are unclear and the analysis of their actual outcome worth examining. In addition to national languages and in some cases minority languages English language is at all universities studied so far being regarded as the primary (in practice also) international language in which courses in other subjects are taught in higher education.

The role of the national languages is undergoing new developments that may change the balance between priorities in a nearby future. In some cases this heightens attention to the language spoken by the majority of the population (Sweden and Finland), in other cases it affects languages spoken by a minority (Norway and Finland), the consequences of which are still unclear.



UBBC PROVISIONAL RESULTS

STEFAN OLTEAN
LIANA POP

1. INTRODUCTION

The research undertaken by the Babeş-Bolyai University (BBU) team within *Dylan project* has addressed the following aspects relating to the language policy of this university, its multilingual learning practices and the prevailing representations associated with these:

1. The positioning of BBU's language policy in relation to policies of other Romanian or European universities;
2. What are BBU's good practices in the teaching **of** foreign languages (LSP) and in the teaching **in** foreign languages (CLIL)/ or in regional languages, and how can these practices be assessed?
3. If the representations of these practices are convergent with/divergent from the practices and if they can lead to changes of the policies.

2. TYPES OF OBSERVABLES IN RELATION TO METHODOLOGY

The description of BBU's language policy and of the university's multilingual practices was preceded by the analysis of the context in which the language policy was made and of the documents of this policy, which sanction the 1 + 2 language formula, set level B2 in the first foreign **language** as the necessary proficiency level for acceptance to the BA exam, contain provisions for teaching full specializations in widely spoken foreign languages (English, French, German and Italian), and define BBU as a multicultural and multilingual university with three study-lines – Romanian, Hungarian and German –, in which BA, MA and doctoral programs are organized.

We have tried to identify good multilingual practices at BBU and to assess the attitudes to / representations of these among students, academic staff and academic leadership and thus design indicators by

- ▶ administering questionnaires to a representative sample of students taking LSP classes or CLIL specializations, and to academic staff;
- ▶ conducting interviews with academic leaders and academic staff; and
- ▶ video-taping LSP and CLIL classes.

The interviews and videos were transcribed and interpreted with the help of various methods: analysis of attitude indicators, discourse and conversational analysis in relation to types of competences, sequential analysis – delimitation of sequences consistent linguistically, cognitively and metalinguistically, or metacognitively.

3. FINDINGS

3.1 LANGUAGE POLICY

The analysis of BBU's language policy has indicated that it fits into the European framework, while evincing a number of national and regional features. It is based on EU recommendations and on CEL/ELC documents, as well as on provisions made in national documents (Romanian Parliament, Government) and in local BBU documents. This policy not only endorses the study of two European languages and the development of communicational competences and (inter)cultural competences, but it also makes explicit references to LSP. What is very significant is that, in addition, it highlights the importance of minority languages as constituent parts of the European cultural and linguistic heritage by promoting education in Hungarian and German along its study-lines (Romanian, Hungarian, German), in accordance with the multilingual and multicultural character of the province of Transylvania. For BBU German occupies a position where the two directions (study *of / in* foreign languages and study in minority languages) overlap, the German study-line being attended both by students whose first language is German and by students for whom German is a foreign language acquired through instruction. Thus BBU's language policy lives up to the requirements of bilingualism and / or multilingualism, it promoting an education (1) in the national language, (2) in a regional language and (3) in an international language, simultaneously.

3.2 ATTITUDES AND REPRESENTATIONS

The questionnaire and interview results indicate that there is **convergence** between the undergraduate / graduate students and the academic staff / leaders on the importance of studying foreign languages at the university, number of languages to be

studied (the majority suggest two languages), languages to be studied (English, followed by German and French, then by Spanish and Italian), the importance of language proficiency certificates. There is convergence, too, on its study-line structure, as well as on the importance of CLIL specializations (the majority are for English) at PhD, MA and BA levels (decreasing importance).

The **justifications for CLIL** range from informatory effectiveness to cooperative effectiveness, or equity in access and competences, including linguistic, communicative and cultural competences.

There are **divergences**, too, between students and academics on: duration of language study (six semesters for students, four or three for academics; this may reflect different interests: academics are more interested in securing room in the curriculum for the specialized topics, or in reduced costs associated with foreign language training; students are more pragmatically oriented); language competences (general or specific) to be developed at BA and MA levels: most students indicate both competences at BA level, while the academics stress the importance of general competences at BA level and specific competences at MA level (students seem to be less aware of the importance of widely spoken modern languages for study and research, but consider them important for free movement and equal chances on the job market with other European citizens).

Critical points and suggestions. While almost all students indicate that CLIL courses improve foreign language proficiency, there is divided opinion on the impact of teaching in a foreign language on knowledge transmission (for some the impact is negative, for others knowledge transmission is intact). Likewise, students list problems associated with CLIL, which are to do either with their own language proficiency, or the instructor's language proficiency ("fluency"), or with the teaching methods (lack of clarity, of teacher-student interaction, reading the course). These indicate that there exist difficulties in communication and, possibly, in the sharing of knowledge in the case of CLIL specializations, but these could be eliminated by raising teachers' and students' language proficiency (general and specialized language). Good LSP practices would thus be important for good CLIL activities.

3.3 CORPUS ANALYSIS

3.3.1 INFORMATORY-COGNITIVE AND COMMUNICATIVE SIGNIFICANCE

The use of genuine materials in foreign languages in the classroom and the capacity of students to deal with these in terms of listening, reading and writing comprehension competences, and of speaking competences (in verbal interaction and in monologic discourse) are significant not only from an informatory-cognitive point of view (by assimilating content from sources in other languages), but also communicatively. We consider that these correspond to good teaching practices both in the case of LSP and CLIL.

3.3.2 COMPARISON OF LSP AND CLIL CLASSES

To our knowledge this has not been made elsewhere up until now, so it may yield useful information on how the two differ in terms of the targeted goals.

The analysis of the CLIL class leads to interesting conclusions on how useful it is to teach specializations in foreign languages. It substantiates our belief that the informatory-cognitive aspect is more significant in this kind of situation, as shown by the instructor's greater emphasis on explaining and reformulating the content. The sequential analysis applied to the discourse ("micro" level) furnishes concrete information on how knowledge is transmitted: the linguist can identify definition operations (everyday definitions vs. scholarly definitions), exemplifications (examples from everyday life that help the understanding process and the retention of the new information), classifications and naming / categorization operations, as well as metalinguistic and metacognitive operations. Thus, with regard to naming, we have observed metalinguistic and interlinguistic strategies. Implicitly, we have observed that the discourse of the instructor features at least two styles of encoding the specialized content (colloquial, and formal academic style). The comparison with LSP classes points to a quantitatively more modest contribution of the students in CLIL classes as compared to the instructor, since the discourse of the latter monopolizes the activity. His concern is not to make students have extensive contributions, as is the case with LSP, and thus cultivate their scholarly expression in the foreign language, but rather to secure an efficient transmission of knowledge. The analysis of the forms of CLIL questions points to complex strategies on the part of instructor, whose almost exclusive purpose is to structure the content; as a result the students' responses seem to have only a feedback role. Unlike this, questions in LSP classes repeatedly recreate the informational circuit, sometimes successively by several students and with imposed forms. The quantity of information stays at a modest level, but the effect on the students' communicative competence is greater.

As compared to classes in the native language, classes in foreign languages (LSP, CLIL), with their high redundancy and the rephrasing strategies, seem to have greater cognitive benefits, since such operations (defining and categorizing, classifying, explaining and exemplifying, resuming of the content in LSP and in CLIL) enable better fixing of knowledge. Last, but not least, with LSP classes the teaching aids consist mostly in written or audio support (the goal is provision of linguistic materials), with CLIL these are visual (cognitive goal).

3.3.3 IMPACT OF PRACTICES ON LANGUAGE POLICIES

- ▶ new LSP textbooks and materials: <http://granturi.ubbcluj.ro/autodidact>; useful for self-training as well (distance learning, etc.);
- ▶ new forms of language proficiency certification (flexible formulas for language proficiency tests in the language centres of BBU);

4. CONCLUSIONS

The aim of our research has been to identify the way in which language policies and institutional strategies impact multilingual practices in HE institutions. Our case study indicates that BBU language policies live up to the European, national and regional requirements of multilingualism, and that practices and representations converge with these policies. However, while the convergence of LSP practices with the policies is neat in most respects, CLIL practices still need better accommodation, as it emerges from the analysis of representations (questionnaires, interviews). Thus, while language policies lead to practices, representations of practices lead, in their turn, to changes in the policies.

1. INTRODUCTION

In our research the question whether language and educational policies filter through in classroom practices is addressed by looking at code-switching during CLIL-lessons in a Dutch-speaking school in Brussels. The key research question that is addressed is: to what extent are linguistic and classroom practices informative about the underlying ideologies and representations of the pupils and the teacher? This research question is operationalised by looking at: Who codeswitches when? Is codeswitching accepted? Why do participants alternate between languages?

2. TYPE OF OBSERVABLES

Observations demonstrate that codeswitching forms an integral part of the learning process in multilingual classrooms (see e.g. Martin-Jones 1995). The study of codeswitching in the classroom provides insight into the mostly implicit and not seldomly ideologically inspired rules that structure classroom practices and language practices. These rules are not self-evident and are constantly negotiated. It is argued that by studying them, the relationship between practices and policies can be revealed in the sense that they show which language practices are considered as 'good, normal, appropriate, or correct (Heller & Martin-Jones 2001: 2)' and consequently whether they are experienced as being in line with the ideology of the participants. The data gathered by the Brussels' team focuses on policy discourse as well as classroom practices. The results of the discursive analysis were addressed in WP 2. The document that was analysed is the policy document of the Flemish minister of education: the language plan (Vandenbroucke 2007). In the following paragraph, a number of results are presented based on the analysis of naturalistic data. The interactional sequences were recorded during a CLIL-lesson in a Dutch-speaking school in Brussels. The aim of this analysis is to uncover implicit ideologies and representations and in doing so to unveil the influence of macrolevel policies on microlevel practices.

3. FINDINGS: LANGUAGE PRACTICES IN A CLIL-CLASSROOM

3.1 PSEUDOTRANSLATIONS

A first observation is that the teacher alternates more often than the pupils. However, this is not that surprising since she speaks more than the pupils. Her alternations are relatively short and are usually transfers, in contrast with the pupils who use codeswitching more often. The difference between transfer and codeswitching is that transfer does not entail a re-negotiation of the language in which the interaction occurs. The part of the conversation that takes place in the other language has a clear beginning and end point. Conversely, when one codeswitches, the switch to the other language implies an invitation of the initiator to continue the conversation in that language. In case the switch is not accepted by the interlocutor, this might be interpreted as a refusal to follow the language choice of the first speaker (Auer, 1984, Auer, 1988). The teacher often provides pseudotranslations for concepts related to the subject matter. According to Auer (1984) such translations can have different functions: to stress something, to orient oneself towards a possible difficulty of the receptor to understand the concept in the other language, and to make a distinction between a previously mentioned element and the central component of the message. The majority of the pseudotranslations aim at stressing something. The concept that is being stressed is not the French concept, but the Dutch one. This becomes clear when we consider the fact that more time is dedicated to finding a Dutch translation in comparison with the time dedicated to finding a French translation. This suggests that the teacher finds it important to underline to what language a certain concept belongs. On the other hand, it is also possible that by explicitly marking a language switch, the teacher wants to make sure that the pupils do not only remember the French term but also the Dutch one, since the testing occurs only in Dutch. Knowledge of the subject matter in French is not taken under consideration for the evaluation. This suggests that when a school decides to implement CLIL, the organisational choices have a clear impact on the classroom practices.

3.2 VOICE OF AUTHORITY

Codeswitches that are initiated by the teacher occur less frequently and mostly aim at changing the participant constellation. This for example occurs when the teacher reprimands an individual student because he or she is talking too much. These kinds of reprimands are always short and entail a lower volume of voice. During our observations it became clear that the teacher gives clear indications about which language that she expects to be used. The pupils meet her continuous demand for translations. Questions that require a longer answer are answered in the language in which they are asked. When the pupils cannot answer a question, the teacher gives the answer herself or changes her questions into a translation question. Translations given or asked by the teacher are almost always marked as belonging to one or the other language. The pupils also mark a language switch if it results from word finding

difficulties. This seldom occurs explicitly, but mostly non-verbally, by a hesitation or by looking around.

3.3 ASIDES

The pupils spontaneously switch to Dutch when they formulate asides and when they reformulate a subject that is not directly related to the subject matter. Many teachers and principals who try to impose the monolingual norms in Dutch-speaking schools in Brussels are surprised when they notice that pupils speak Dutch spontaneously in a situation where the use of French is allowed. Research on the experience of teachers in the STIMOB-project (Allain 2004) showed that they reported that CLIL-pupils used Dutch more often in comparison with non-CLIL pupils. The fact that they spoke Dutch among each other during French classes, was highly surprising. Our hypothesis is that pupils, when they are confronted through CLIL with a situation in which their own language (or their 'we' code) is legitimized and valued, they are more willing to adjust to a policy with a strong focus on the knowledge of Dutch.

3.4 TEACHER CORRECTIONS

The pupils switch to Dutch when they ask the teacher to clarify something, and also when they correct the teacher. This mostly occurs when the teacher has given an assignment and the class is quiet. A possible explanation of such a language switch is to make the remark less face-threatening for the teacher. In general, the interactional data that has been gathered so far does suggest that the pupils fairly consistently switch to Dutch when a situation occurs that is potentially face-threatening for the teacher. When such a correction occurs, the teacher usually continues in French which can be interpreted as 'boundary maintaining', while the choice for Dutch by the pupil can be seen as 'boundary-levelling' (Heller, 1988). By continuing the lesson in French, the teacher maintains the existing role distribution teacher-pupil. By switching to Dutch to formulate a remark that is potentially face threatening for the teacher, the pupils signal that they respect the norms that are valid in the school context.

4. CONCLUSION

Some of the alternations can be explained by known sociolinguistic processes: changing the participant constellation, word finding difficulties, etc. Other alternations cannot always be explained that easily. One of our hypotheses is that pupils sense that the use of Dutch is more appropriate in certain situations (e.g. corrections). By switching to Dutch, the message becomes less face threatening because they comply with the norms that are valid in the monolingual Dutch context of the school. Indeed, Dutch seems to be that important and dominant, also for these French-speaking pupils, that it is used as a rhetoric aid to express politeness and agreeability. In other

words, these practices suggest that Dutch is much more dominant and stronger in this context than is traditionally assumed by educationalists and policy makers.

The data that is presented in this paper shows that macrolevel policies filter through in the practices of a CLIL-lesson. In contrast with what is generally assumed by policy makers and educationalists (see WP2), our data suggests that the position of Dutch in Dutch-speaking schools in Brussels is that strong that other languages can be used to increase the knowledge and use of the language. This would simultaneously increase the multilingual potential (and the opportunities) of the pupils, instead of reducing it to one language. When considering the central aim of DYLAN, namely investigating the conditions under which plurilingual practices are an added-value, we suggest that the practices in a CLIL-classroom are highly revealing with respect to the representations of the interlocutors about what they consider to be good and/or appropriate language use. Unfortunately, because these representations underly the organisational aspects of the CLIL-project, the conditions under which the plurilingual potential of the pupils can fully thrive, do not seem to be entirely fulfilled.

REFERENCES

- Allain, L. (2004). Meertalig onderwijs en etnografisch onderzoek in Brussel: twee uitzonderingen op de regel. In: A. Housen, M. Pierrard & P. Van de Craen (Red.), *Taal, attitude en onderwijs in Brussel*. (pp. 145-181). Brussel: VUBPress.
- Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Auer, P. (1988). A conversation analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In: M. Heller (Red.), *Codeswitching: anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 187-213). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, M. (Red.) (1988). *Codeswitching. Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, M. & Martin-Jones, M. (Red.) (2001). *Voices of authority: education and linguistic differences*. Greenwich, CT: Elsevier.
- Martin-Jones, M. (1995). Code-switching in the classroom: two decades of research. In: L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Red.), *One speaker, two languages: crossdisciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 90-111). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vandenbroucke, F. (2007). *De lat hoog voor talen in iedere school*. Brussels: Ministerie van onderwijs