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ABSTRACT

In language contact situations such as that precipitated by human migration and globalization, heteroglossia and language shift occur where traces of what had been two or more “separate” linguistic codes begin to mix. And because language and identity are inextricably intertwined, this language mixing has serious implications for the construction of identities of the peoples caught in the linguistic borderlands. The history of US involvement in Central America and the current economic dependence of Costa Rica on the United States have created a certain ambivalence among Costa Ricans regarding English because while those who speak English wield enormous cultural and economic capital in a rapidly changing global economy, there exists a resistance to “becoming American”. In order to understand how this tension impacts the construction of identity one must take a critical eye to the issues of linguistic dominance and resistance in ESOL classrooms. This dissertation examines examples of intertextuality and how the L1-Spanish students at an elite bilingual school in rural Costa Rica utilize code-switching to entextualize the English texts present in advertising and popular music into their discourse. Further analysis focuses on the code-switching strategies these students use to construct their
own and others’ identities in interaction. In the analysis, I have identified three participant roles mediator, model student and compañero, and I examine how the students go about co-constructing those roles in interaction. I look closely at participant constellations (who's talking to whom and their assigned and perceived role in the class), topic of interaction (both discursive and metadiscursive) and the sequential or functional triggers of code-switches. The final analysis chapter looks at negotiated code-switching strategies bilingual students utilize to scaffold for one another in interaction. The study offers a new way of viewing “competence” of bilingual speakers that does not devalue the multiple linguistic resources that the children bring with them to the classroom.
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CHAPTER 1

STUDYING CODE-SWITCHING IN THE CLASSROOM CONTEXT

(Pre)text:

One day last year at the Escuela Interamericana, a private bilingual elementary school in Turrialba, Costa Rica, I asked a student to run an errand for me. It was a rather simple errand, I thought, something had spilled and I asked the 10-year-old Costa Rican fourth grader, in English, to go ask Doña Olga, the custodian, to bring me a towel to clean up the mess. Because the classrooms have screens all along the side of the room from about chest height to the ceiling, I was able to hear the child on the breezeway outside when she reported to Doña Olga that: “Teacher Paula necesita un paño para limpiar un reguero”. At first the incident didn’t strike me as odd, perhaps because it was so “normal”, but on reflection, I marveled at the multifaceted complexity of the task that the child had done. Her act was remarkable not only because of the absolute ease with which she had flawlessly translated my statement into Spanish but the fact that she had done it, apparently effortlessly, without anyone having to tell her that she should – because Doña Olga spoke no English and would not understand my message if it were not translated.

The cognitive, pragmatic and linguistic processes involved in that brief and seemingly simple task are daunting; nevertheless, despite (and perhaps because of) the fact that they are commonplace in language contact situations, the how’s and why’s involved in choosing to use a particular linguistic code are little appreciated or understood even in situations where on-the-spot translation or switching from one language or linguistic code to another is a continual necessity.
Like many other linguists who study bilingualism and language acquisition, I became interested in code-switching and code choice behaviors while watching my own daughter, Aurora, and her bilingual language development. Perhaps partly because of concern sponsored by monolingual naysayers (among them educators, doctors and other professionals) that warned me of the cognitive, social and academic repercussions of bilingualism, and partly because she was learning both her languages at the same time in a “natural” setting and I had begun learning my second language in a much different setting (in school, in adolescence) I was extremely sensitive to the nuances of her speech development.

When she was very small, her L1 vs. L2 language use was fairly clearcut: she spoke English with or around monolingual English speakers and Spanish with or around monolingual Spanish speakers which was relatively easy to accomplish since we lived in a predominantly monolingual Spanish environment and I was the only one who spoke English to her regularly. Oddly, although I am bilingual and the language of her environment was Spanish, Aurora always spoke to me in English regardless of who else was around. She rarely code-switched or mixed the two languages. However as Aurora grew older and I watched her grow into a more social/verbal being, and especially after she began formal schooling at a Spanish/English bilingual institution, I became aware that although she spoke English and Spanish equally well, she was sometimes unwilling to speak one or the other. I began to wonder what conditions or factors motivated this refusal and if she was unique in this behavior. Because I was a teacher at Aurora’s school, I was able to watch her and my students negotiate language use in class and in their social encounters and became very curious about when they used their home language and when they used their second language (Spanish and English respectively for most of them). I noticed that children who were Spanish dominant but had some English would sometimes
choose to speak in English, even when the other interlocutors spoke Spanish fluently, while other children (like my daughter) who were English dominant but fluent in Spanish would sometimes resist speaking English even if the other interlocutors spoke English and they were addressed in English. Heller’s (1995) studies of French/English code-switching in Quebec indicate that language loyalty or politics often has more to do with code choice than ability even does. Alvarez’s (1990) study in Galicia, Spain corroborates these results.

In her study of Australian high school students, Miller (2000) challenges older theories which suggest that non-native speakers will code-switch because “they just don’t know enough” of the L2, and indicates that ESL students in Australia will often speak a great deal and exclusively in English with other non-native speakers, where they might retreat into silence with native speakers. In light of this and after looking at the children at my school, I began to realize that the puzzle of L1 vs. L2 language use in language contact situations went beyond the simplistic conclusion that people prefer to use the language they are “more competent” in or that, in the case of bilinguals, they will divide their language use cleanly according to whom they are speaking: for example speak English with English speakers and Spanish with Spanish speakers.

My reflections led me to a conclusion that has been touched on in the literature on bilingualism but has not been widely addressed in the traditional literature on Second Language Acquisition: that there is fundamental difference between linguistic competence and language choice and while competence limits choice, choice is not wholly dependent on competence and often functions independently. That is to say, that while a speaker may have relatively “low competence” in a language by monolingual standards he or she may prefer to communicate in that language under certain circumstances whereas other speakers, with measurably high-levels of competence may choose not to speak or use a language at all. So if language choice is
constrained by linguistic resources but not controlled by it, then it begs the question: What determines when, why, how and with whom an individual uses a particular language in their repertoire? I believe this question is fundamental, now more than ever, as globalization brings more and more linguistically diverse people into contact with one another and the construction of ethnic and national identities is increasingly played out and reflected in the way people use language. Furthermore, because schools are one of the main avenues by which developed societies (re)create social norms and identities, I believe that classroom discourse analysis can be a valuable tool to analyze the construction of individual and group identities, language accommodation, resistance and creativity.

The purpose of this dissertation is to shed new light on code-switching and L1/L2 language use within classrooms using an ethnographic approach and the tools of discourse analysis to better understand how children use their multiple language resources. My hope is to contribute to the literature studying Second Language Acquisition and to develop a theoretical framework that takes into account the many and varied portraits of language competence viewed within their local and global contexts in order to understand bilingual classroom discourse and create practical strategies for classroom language teaching/learning.

**Grounding Assumptions:**

This research’s guiding hypotheses are put forth based on the following assumptions about language and discourse which are based on the premise that language use and acquisition are emergent phenomena that develop through negotiated interaction among participants (Gass, 1998).
• Language choice is impacted by setting, participants and participant goals which may be academic and/or social
• Language acquisition is an emergent social process that with few exceptions can only be accomplished within a community of speakers
• Language use is intimately bound up with identity
• Analysis of multiple layers of context is essential to understanding discourse in a specific time and place
• Individuals identify themselves and others in relationship to one another and those specific social relationships which are tied to specific code of language
• English language use in Costa Rican schools is impacted by the historical, political and economic relationship between Costa Rica and English-speaking countries/entities and globalization. This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

Guiding Hypotheses of this Research:

• Bilingual school students employ code-switching and unique uses of L1 and L2 to construct group and individual identity
• Individual language choice can express alliance or resistance to the L1 or L2
• Linguistic imperialism is evidenced in language choice of bilingual students in a “post-colonial” country. For a more detailed explanation of these terms see Chapter 3.
• Bilingual school students will utilize all their language resources (from both L1 and L2) to access meaning in negotiated classroom interactions with bilingual peers
Code-switching: Previous Research and the Limitations of our Knowledge

Code-switching is a complicated concept to define, as the term has been used by researchers coming from widely-varying theoretical perspectives to describe a broad range of speech behaviors. A basic (though still debateable) definition of code-switching is: the alternation of a bilingual speaker between two or more languages in a single conversation. The study and description of code-switching behaviors has been the focus of much research in recent years, but it is problematic for a variety of reasons. Although groundbreaking research on code-switching in the 70s and 80s has attracted the attention of researchers from a wide-range of linguistic perspectives so that now, instead of being viewed as “possibly a somewhat peculiar …act” (Luckmann 1983: 97), it has developed into a subject that gives us new tools to tease out answers to fundamental linguistic questions about everything from group identity construction to Universal Grammar (Auer 1998).

However, while much empirical data has been accumulated in a variety of language pairs over the last 30 years, the reasons given for code-switching behaviors are as disparate as the fields from which they come and a lack of consistent definitions and terminology, and conflicting and contradictory theoretical frameworks hinder the development of a comprehensive theory on the phenomenon. To further complicate the issue, most of the initial studies on bilingualism or multilingualism were carried out by monolinguals whose theoretical frameworks took monolingualism as the norm. Within these frameworks, bilingualism, and by extension code-switching behaviors, were assumed to be aberrant behaviors. Recent code-switching studies have approached the phenomenon differently, recognizing that it is frequently the norm in language contact situations (which are becoming more and more common worldwide), but there is still much disagreement as to who can code-switch and why and when they do it.
I believe that it is important to point out that in other approaches to linguistic research (i.e. mainstream SLA research) code-switching behaviors would have different names and be seen very differently i.e. as a deficiency. Language Deficit models have serious implications for the success of bilingual students, especially in countries or communities where there is a dominant language combined with a strong monolingual ethic and the students’ home language is not the dominant language. Additionally, trained monolingual linguists have developed influential theories such as the theory of semilingualism developed in Canada and Sweden that have affected educational policy. This theory posits that children who come into school with little academic foundation in their home language and little support in their L2 may end up with so little competence in both of their languages that they are unable to excel academically in either. While this theory has been used as support for some excellent best-practice pedagogy (i.e. sheltered instruction and heritage language literacy programs), it has also been misinterpreted and used to further stigmatize already marginalized bilingual groups (Grosjean, 1982).

On the other hand, some sociolinguists have tended to view code-switching as an emergent phenomenon which is a product of social interaction (Gumperz, 1982) and a means to construct identity or (re)affirm group membership (Heller, 1988). However, there is little agreement about when code-switching can happen and who can do it. Some argue that code-switching, can only occur in “stable bilingual communities”, like those in countries like Belgium and Switzerland. However, some researchers (Zentella, 1997) have troubled the essentialist model of traditional diglossia which posits that the two languages used in a community are relegated to certain social situations which are clearly defined and mutually exclusive. In fact, recent studies have begun to focus on other language contact situations, where code-switching can also occur (Gallindo 1996, Rampton 1995). These “linguistic borderlands” like cities with
large immigrant populations, borders between countries or territories and schools with large and
diverse ethnic populations are rife with individuals, with varying degrees of bilingualism who
alternate from one language to another as a matter of course. But these borderlands, with their
shifting linguistic landscape, muddy the monolingual-based analysis waters and pose serious
theoretical problems to structuralist frameworks designed to analyze code-switching because
these depend on the integrity of discreet language systems. Gardner-Chloros (1995), in her work
on Alsatian code-switching advocates a (re)viewing of the theoretical assumptions behind the
terminology used in code-switching research. She forcefully argues that the commonly accepted
concept of “code-switching” implies two inherently separate “standard” languages and asserts
that we must remember that all “standard languages” are hybrids.

But linguists are not the only ones troubled by code-switching. Language education is
also challenged by code-switching behaviors because methods and pedagogy are often based on
prescriptivist, monolingual “standards” that rarely admit to the legitimacy of other varieties of
one “Standard” language much less a “mixed variety” of two or more. Much of the original work
on code-switching described it as deficient, and (like many who took up the semilingualist
banner) those who code-switched as unable to speak either of the contributing languages well.
As a consequence of these theoretical trends, before the 80’s little work had been done to
examine the complex social conditions that impact code-switching and to frame the phenomenon
as normal in language contact situations rather than aberrant or deficient.

Gumperz’s (1982) work on bilingual interactive strategies was terribly influential in that
it flew in the face of all previous theories that suggested that code-switched or code-mixed
speech was deficient and grammarless. He pioneered the idea of code-switching as a resource
and viewed the functions served by these code choices in the context of participants, setting and
topic. His research has been the philosophical if not the theoretical base for much of the research carried out today. Zentella (1980) in another study of Puerto Ricans in New York, subscribes to the “pragmatic trigger functional model” whereby code-switching behavior signals meaning. i.e. to indicate reported speech, a change of participants, side-comments, reiterations, emphasis, topic shift, topicalization etc. This model stems from Gumperz and Blom’s influential Norwegian study of standard/dialect code-switching in which they coined the terms “situational switching” (triggered by a change in situation) and “metaphorical switches” indicating a comment on the situation.

Joshua Fishman’s (1971) ground-breaking work was one of the first, and most influential, studies of code-switching taking a sociolinguistic approach. Fishman looked at language loyalty in New York Puerto Ricans. He introduced the concept of “domain”. Domain analysis is a macro-approach that assumes that there are overarching cultural structures which constrain and shape individual behaviors. Fishman also proposed the “one-language/one-activity” model as a functional approach to code-switching analysis. Under this theory, a speaker uses one language for certain purposes and the other for other purposes.

Fishman’s work was also pivotal because it drew together sociological perspectives and the education context. He posited that social and contextual factors within the classroom must be taken into consideration when analyzing code-switching in bilingual classrooms, because classrooms vary enormously in their structure, methodologies, theoretical grounding, and social context. He argued that, “social dimensionality must be recognized within the bilingual education classroom, rather than merely outside of it in “the community” and “in society”. Societal factors dictate much of what is taught and to whom; as well as how it is taught and by whom; and finally how all of those involved in the teaching-learning process interact with each
other.” (1977, p. 32) And as Martin-Jones suggests, “We need to be able to show how code-switching in bilingual discourse is shaped by the social conditions operating in different types of classrooms and how differing views about the value and purpose of bilingual education are manifested in bilingual discourse practices.” (1995, p. 108)

Definitions of Terms as Used in this Dissertation

As noted in the section above, the same terms are often used by scholars to describe many different behaviors or ideas. This phenomenon often causes confusion about what exactly any given term means. Therefore, in the spirit of clarity, in this section I will endeavor to define the way I have used several complex terms that have multiple definitions. I do not claim that these definitions are in any way the “best” ones, but they are how I have conceived of these terms for the purposes of this dissertation.

*Code-switching:* I have used the definitions from previous literature as outlined above as a basis, but considering that this study focuses on the L1 and L2 language use strategies children employ to communicate and construct their identities in relation to their peers and teachers, I will be referring to code-switching behaviors in this dissertation as the intentional and unintentional switching back and forth between a given speaker’s L1 and L2 in any given utterance or more extended interaction. This switching can be based on patterned habits of mind, framed by social constraints and informed by social interaction. Although I argue that when, why and how a speaker uses his or her L1 and L2 is based predominantly on social and pragmatic motivations, not all of these behaviors are consciously done. Therefore, some behaviors which might be referred to as Code Choice, particularly in Chapter 5 which deals with individual agency, will be included under this rather larger umbrella of Code-switching.
Frames: I use the term “frame” as Goffman (1981) suggests in his discussion of participant frameworks, to refer to the overarching set of social practices that constrain and shape individual behavior in specific contexts. These frames shift very slowly over time and are the basis for recognizable cultural patterns and practices. Within this study, the two frames that are most often in contrast are that of being a Spanish-speaking Costa Rican student and that of being an English-speaking Costa Rican student.

Entextualization: This process is of particular interest when discussing code-switching and the processes of cultural and linguistic decontextualization and recontextualization. Bauman and Briggs (1996) define entextualization as the process of:

rendering discourse extractable, of making a stretch of linguistic production in to a unit – a text- that can be lifted out of its interactional setting. A text, then, from this vantage point, is discourse rendered decontextualizable. Entextualization may well incorporate aspects of context, such that the resultant text carries elements of its history of use within it. (73)

In this study a discussion of the entextualization process becomes particularly salient in the analysis in Chapter 4 which looks at the types of English texts that are incorporated into the students’ repertoires and the corporate sponsorship that they imply. For example, the students will lift fragments of English songs or advertisements and insert the texts into their speech giving them a new context and therefore a new meaning but with residues of the former contextual meanings attached.

Research on L2 Acquisition in the Classroom

Many recent studies on L2 acquisition in the classroom using a social-interactionist frame have been ethnographic in nature, which have taken a more interactive and Discourse Analysis
(in many of its varying permutations) approach to analyzing teacher and student language use and its implications for identity, power relations, language learning etc. but still focussing on teacher/student talk. Zentella looked at when students and teachers used their L1 in the classroom and for what purpose. Using a Conversational Analysis framework, Zentella (1981) developed the concept of Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) to analyze code-switching behaviors among Puerto Ricans in a multilingual classroom in New York. The study found that the teachers used code-switching to mitigate reprimands, make asides etc.

Unlike Zentella’s functional approach to analyzing L1/L2 use, Camilleri (1996), in her study of code-switching in bilingual Maltese high schools, looks at the comparable prestige of Maltese and English. She sets the analysis against the historical and social background of the island. This view considers the effects of post-colonialism and “linguistic imperialism” on the construction of social identity by students and teachers through the use of code-switching. She concludes that because English is still viewed symbolically as the language of education and economic power, code-switching is not just a communicative resource used to construct knowledge, but a means by which the teachers construct an “educated” yet still Maltese identity. In her discourse study of student home language use in multilingual classrooms and its relationship to identity construction, Bourne (2000) challenges the commonly accepted idea that home languages are only used by bilingual students for “off-task” chats. She argues that children use complex and sophisticated discursive strategies to construct identities utilizing both the L1 and the L2. She underscores the positive role of code-switching in language socialization and acquisition. And Chick and McKay’s (2002) study on the construction of a multilingual identity in South Africa is notable for what they did not find. They expected to find much evidence of Zulu use and code-switching (80% of the population has L1 Zulu) but they did not. In the
“flagship” schools studied in Johannesburg, English is still held as the language of education and discipline and efforts to construct a multilingual identity have been stymied in spite of recent language policy changes advocating multilingualism.

Further supporting Chick’s conclusions, Arthur’s (1996) ethnographic study of bilingual classrooms in Botswana found that while teachers could code-switch to Setswana to encourage participation, students could not switch from the “onstage” language of English. These studies support the idea that motivation and language attitudes have much to do with language choice and trouble the one language/one function approach to code-switching. Arthur concludes that the reasons individuals choose one language over another have to do with issues of power and participant roles within the classroom; teachers have more power within the school institution and therefore have the freedom to code-switch, but students are bound to English language use. This is made even more curious by the fact that instruction is only in the native Setswana until the 4th grade. Finally, Marshad (2002) argues that because students with more than one language will use whichever one fits a particular function they will often combine them to form a “new” language. This calls to the fore the issue of emergent language use. One of the best ways to observe and analyze these emergent phenomena and the contextual structures around them is through the use of ethnographic techniques.

**Ethnography and Need for Contextual Analysis**

Ethnomethodology is the study of methods used by social actors in interpreting their everyday lives (Garfinkel, 1972). Social structure is not an independent variable which exists outside social practice but an emergent product of interaction in which social actors produce culture by applying native methods of understanding and communicating who they are and what
they care about. Interactional Sociolinguistics is based on the assumption that language use indexes and constructs the social contexts where it is used. Gumperz and Hymes were pioneers in interactional sociolinguistics. Gumperz (1982) work is concerned with language contact issues and language diversity. Beginning with his work on dialect differences and social stratification in Michigan and dialect/standard differences in Norway, Gumperz has asserted that participants in a communicative event must be able to infer from contextual cues (which imply an understanding of cultural background and social expectations) the meaning of what is said and how to proceed. Contextual cues include: prosodic features (stress, intonation, volume) paralinguistic features (laughter, rhythm, code choice).

The Ethnography of Speaking was developed by Dell Hymes (1974) as a means to address the role of language in the study of human relations and thereby fill the gap between linguistics and anthropology. Historically, linguists had underestimated the role of context and social norms and activities in the interpretation of language, while anthropologists had looked closely at social norms and activities with little attention given to the role language itself plays in social construction. Hymes’ theory is informed by the basic question: what does a speaker need to know to understand and be understood in a given speech community and how does he/she learn it? Hymes called this “communicative competence” arguing that in order to understand and be understood, a speaker needs a great deal more than a native feel for syntactic correctness. While the eventual goal of the ethnography of communication is to find a set of universals for interpreting and understanding human interaction, Hymes rejects the validity of any attempts at finding universally applicable theories of cultural interaction (i.e. Grice, 1975) since interaction is both situated and emergent in each individual culture.
Peter Auer (1995) advocates sequential Conversation Analysis (CA) of code-switching behavior as a means to understand the political and language loyalty stances that might not be evident from a purely pragmatic or functional approach. Conversation Analysis seeks to understand how we make sense of the world. Like the ethnography of speaking, it moves away from the psycho/cognitive approaches to linguistic research that attempt to determine the causality of action and focuses instead on how conduct is produced and understood in situ. CA views talk as social action. Conversation Analysis originated in the 1960’s with the work of Sacks, Schegloff and Sudlow who were all students of Goffman. After meeting Garfinkel (the founder of ethnomethodology) in 1959, Sacks wanted to develop an empirical, “naturalistic”, descriptive approach to analyze human interaction. Sacks (1975) began taping and analyzing the phone calls at a Suicide Hotline. In his analysis, he noticed two interesting features: the categories the callers and volunteers used to describe themselves and others, and the sequential organization of the discourse. Contemporary Conversation Analysis has tended to focus more on sequential organization.

Conversation Analysis differs from other analytic approaches because it rejects a priori researcher stipulated questions or codings – for example, a conventional researcher may code for age considering that age is “always” a relevant factor, however, a Conversation Analyst is concerned with the relevance the participants place on age in that specific interaction. Similarly, rather than subscribing to a theory of rules which explain human conduct, Conversation Analysis treats rules as situationally, contextually specific norms that are part of the fabric of the activity they help to explain. This requires that the researcher understand the multiple layers of context surrounding any given interaction in order to understand the meaning of what is being “said”. Conversation Analysis takes particular interest in the context of the action, the values the
participants place on those contexts and the sequence of an interaction. Conversation analysis was also one of the first formal framework for analyzing informal talk that looked at “normal” everyday discourse as something of value which could shed light on our understanding of human interaction and that therefore merited analysis (Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998).

CA’s goal is to analyze and explain the shared methods interlocutors use to produce and interpret their own and others actions. Meaning depends entirely on context – which encompasses temporal organization (i.e. sequence), and an understanding of the setting, type of occasion, participants. In other words, CA looks not just at what was said, but who said it to whom and their relationship to each other, when and where it was said and how discourse happens. CA understands that any of these variables can and will shift. For example, on September 11, 2001, a student came into the Language Variation seminar I was attending to inform us that the twin towers in New York had been blown up. The “seminar room”, that moments before had contained “students” and a “professor” discussing Labov, shifted to a room full of individuals from all over the world worried about their families, their home countries and what was going to happen next. Suddenly our ethnicities, family ties and cultural backgrounds mattered and were now the central focus of our identities and our conversations. CA is concerned with these shifts and how they are reflected and constructed through language.

Toward a Contextualized Analysis of L1 and L2 use in the Classroom

The purpose of this study is to analyze the code-switching behaviors of children in an English classroom in a bilingual private Costa Rican elementary school using conversational analysis and ethnographic techniques to shed some light on how issues of identity construction and meaning negotiation affect language choice within a multilayered historical and social
context. If, as Miller (2000) suggests, identity sits at the center of a triangle made up of group membership, language use and context, then how we as researchers and educators approach bilingualism in general and code-switching in particular, is critical in the development of methods, and perhaps more importantly attitudes, which will encourage multilingual learners to excel where mastery of a “standard” majority language is expected. An understanding of historical and social context are key to this analysis. Issues of power, politics, language attitudes and identity cannot be ignored, especially now, as migration caused by economic demands and political shifts across the globe are precipitating a dramatic increase in multilingualism.

Analyses of this type are critical at this moment in history because, as Bourne (2001) argues “whether it is officially accepted in education policy and school curricula or not, where bilingual children are present in classrooms, so are their languages, and those languages are put to use in their learning”(103). Language research and educational policy need to reflect this concept and treat bilingualism as a resource, not a deficiency, if the growing bilingual population in the United States and outside it are to be served across the globe.

Why this School?

Most studies conducted on English language learning in the classroom focus on immigrant populations in developed countries. Furthermore, most of these studies concentrate on populations who are socio-economically and socially marginalized and perhaps most importantly, they are learning English as a “necessity”. This study differs from those studies and fits within a growing body of research conducted on L2 English language learning within a school environment that focus on English language learning in post-colonial countries where English is not the majority language, but is still considered to have cultural capital.
In this study, the participants are learning English as a privilege. Like the immigrant and first generation ELL’s learning English in developed countries, the participants of this study speak their L1 at home and are learning English in school; however, while L2 English language learners in the US (for example) are affected by linguistic isolation, the majority language of the community, country and region in which the study participants live is Spanish, their home language. Nevertheless, competence in English is regarded as an economic necessity and access to English remains within the scope of the economically and socially elite. Therefore, unlike their ELL counterparts living in the United States, the children in this study tend to be on the highest socioeconomic rung. They are enrolled in the Escuela Interamericana, a private bilingual school, the most expensive in the area, because their parents feel that English is a means by which they can succeed economically.

Having English and going to the CATIE\textsuperscript{1} school give these children a social “calling card” that other children attending public schools will not possess even if they achieve higher degrees. Most of the parents of the children enrolled in the school are professionals (doctors, lawyers, university professors, etc.) which impacts the attitudes they have about education and the academic support the students get at home. Nevertheless, a very small percentage of the children have parents or relatives (with the exception of siblings that also attended the school) that speak English. This means that for the most part, the only place these children speak and interact in English is at school. All of them speak Spanish as their first and home language (one child in the study has one L1 English parent (father) and one L1 Spanish parent (mother). Although the specific social, cultural and political circumstances surrounding the English language learning of these children differs from those surrounding ELLs in the United States or

\textsuperscript{1} CATIE is an acronym for Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza. For a more detailed discussion of CATIE’s history see Chapter 3.
other majority English speaking country, I would, nevertheless, argue that English language education in Latin America is part of a global trend of linguistic imperialism which impacts ELL’s language use and code-switching patterns in both developed and developing countries.
CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

Introduction to the Methodology

On beginning this analysis I am reminded of the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle: the principle in physics that states that one cannot measure both the speed and the position of an atom at the same time; it’s a Catch-22. The problem is that in order to measure the atom’s speed, you have to allow for it to move, and therefore change position. And in order to measure the position, you have to stop the atom and look at it at one particular place in time and space. In many ways, discourse analysis has similar limitations; one can look at what is being said at a any given moment and what it means at that place and time (within that particular context), or one can focus on the development and change in the discourse of an individual or group evident over time. It is difficult, if not impossible to look at both variables at the same time (not even considering the other multiple layers and variables involved).

I have chosen, in this study to look at “frozen” moments in conversational time and what they mean in their immediate and extended contexts at that moment. This does not mean that I believe it is not valuable to analyze an individual speaker’s language-choice progression or change over time, simply that I have decided to focus on these context –specific “snapshots” of language use in this specific ethnographic setting with the hope that I might identify larger patterns of language use which are not necessarily speaker but context specific. I do this with the goal that this analysis will lend insight that makes it easier to understand the dynamics of code-switching behaviors in the classroom in general. Because an individual speaker may construct
many different roles (see the three classroom participant roles that I have identified in Chapter 3) at different times depending on the context, the participants and their emerging identities at that given time and place, or align him or herself with his or her L2 and what it represents at some times and at other times resist it, it is important to be able to view the different identities or stances each speaker takes on not as anomalous but as normal. In this context, this method of analysis also frees me as the analyst to see the identities of individual speakers as fluid and not iconic. Having said that, it seems appropriate that I outline the larger framework within which I conducted my data collection.

**Framework for Data Collection:**

Data collection for this ethnographic research was conducted over a 9 month period at the *Escuela Interamericana* in Turrialba, Costa Rica where I worked as the English language arts, reading and composition teacher for the 4th, 5th and 6th grades (second cycle). The data analysis is predominantly ethnographic within a conversation analysis framework and endeavors to analyze and compare the discourse strategies and language choice patterns of children in the classroom setting as they negotiate meaning, and attempt to forge social bonds and identities within their local, historical and social context. The arguments used in this analysis are founded on two basic premises: 1) the idea that individual and group identities are not static but in flux and are cooperatively constructed through interactive communication; and, 2) that meaning is context dependent and co-constructed by the members of a speech community. Furthermore, language acquisition is a social process that with few exceptions can only be accomplished within a community of speakers and is constrained by the resources available to each individual and the group as a whole.
Specifically, this study was designed to analyze and compare language use patterns of L1 Spanish children in regular English class activities in a bilingual school, paying close attention to code choice behaviors. The study examines the implications of language use in the construction of individual identities, the expression of alliance and resistance to the L2 and the multiple facets of language competence. Special attention is paid to the social and interactional role of L2 use by non-native speakers. Within the context of this study, I define “native speaker” as an individual who has been exposed to, and participated socially in a given language on a daily basis (since the age of 2 or younger), with a parent, caregiver or in the surrounding community (if it is the dominant language). For the purpose of this study, a non-native speaker would be a child whose only exposure to the L2 began at school and has been limited to the school setting.

Participants:

The participants of the study were the 4th, 5th and 6th grade students at a private, English/Spanish bilingual school in Costa Rica. There were a total of 30 students in the three classes, which comprised native and non-native English-speaking children aged 8-10, however, for the analysis I elected to focus on the speech of only three students from each grade. This selection was based on the students’ academic achievement; the children with the highest grades in the classes offered in English were chosen (See descriptions below).

The children at the school receive 13.5 hours of instruction in English (Math, Science and English) per week compared to 14.5 hours of instruction in Spanish (Spanish, Social Studies, Physical Education, Computers, Music and Art). Rather than having one teacher per grade who is responsible for teaching all the core subjects, there are 3 teachers per cycle (1st cycle is 1st

---

See Higgins (2003) for a detailed chronicling of the problematical nature of the NS/NSS dichotomy. In this dissertation I selected the age of 2 as the determining age because it was before school age.
through 3rd grade and second cycle is 4th through 6th grade) in order to ensure that the students receive classes from native speakers in each subject. There is one native English speaker in first cycle and one in second cycle who teach Math and Science. One native English speaker for first cycle and one for second cycle who teach English language arts, reading and composition. And one native Spanish speaker for first cycle and one for second cycle who teach Spanish and Social Studies. The children stay in their classrooms for all their core subjects (Math, Science, English, Spanish, and Social Studies) but the teachers move from class to class. As the English language arts, reading and composition teacher for 4th, 5th and 6th grades, I saw each student for approximately eight to nine hours per week (16 to 18 thirty-minute class periods) in class.

Although my homeroom class was 4th grade, I spent the same amount of time with them weekly as I did with the 5th and 6th grades (an average of 2 hours per day per class), however my daily schedule varied. For example on Mondays I met with 4th grade for the first two hours of school but on Tuesdays I met with them for only one hour just before lunch. This affected my results in that I did most of my recording on Mondays and I met with the 4th graders first thing in the morning, the 5th graders during the two periods before and after lunch and the 6th graders in the late afternoon during the last two periods of the day. In general, the 4th graders were fresher and more attentive during the first two hours of the day than the 6th graders who were, by then tired and ready to go home. The 5th graders were also affected by the fact that our class period was split by lunch and, therefore, the lesson was split and at the end of the first hour, many were more concerned about the time and getting out to lunch than they were with what we were doing. This is reflected in the types and quality of language used. In another study it would be interesting to do a comparison of the kinds of language used by the same students in the same
participant constellations at different times of day to see if that variable affects code-choice in any discernable way.

**Theoretical Basis for Study Methodology: Ethnographic Approach to Classroom Research**

Contemporary Ethnography originated in the field of anthropology with the work of Boas and Malinowski (described in Hymes, 1974) and is primarily concerned with describing and analyzing the social organization, activities, rituals, symbolic and interpretive practices that are characteristic of a particular group of people. This is usually accomplished by living in and among a group of people for a length of time and observing and participating in the community’s social life. Classroom ethnography as an outgrowth of this initial methodological approach, considers that an important location of social reconstruction is within the school and classroom setting. Therefore, classroom ethnography involves the intensive, long-term observation, recording (using anecdotal notes, audiotapes and videotapes where possible) and analyzing of interactions between and among students and between students and the teacher within a classroom setting. One assumption of ethnographic frameworks is that the context of the interaction is critical to understanding the meaning of the interaction. Therefore, multiple layers of context and how they interplay must be made evident and clear in order to understand individual utterances. Furthermore, these contextual frames must, as far as they can be, be clarified and understood from the standpoint of the participants as well as the participant observer. This taking into consideration the participants’ point of view or understanding of the interaction is a significant departure from traditional anthropological or linguistic analysis and it casts in bold relief the concept of analytic objectivity.
In ethnographic fieldwork, a tension exists for the researcher between the “objective” (etic) or outsider’s view and the subjective (emic) or insider’s view. The goal of the ethnographer is to attempt to strike a balance between the two and become a “participant-observer”. The ethnographer’s intentional attempts to achieve a subjective, or emic, view stem from the theoretical perspective that true objectivity is impossible to achieve and that without some subjective identification with the social political and moral stances of the community, the researcher cannot make relevant observations. One important concept of ethnography is that the relationship between the ethnographer and the group he or she studies necessarily changes both. Ethnography is descriptive and a constant process of observing, writing, interpreting, transcribing and often translating (and now, with technology, recording and videotaping). I used the classroom ethnographic approach to collect the data for this study. I audio-taped\(^3\) and analyzed the speech of 4\(^{th}\)-6\(^{th}\) grade students at the CATIE Escuela Interamericana where I worked as an English teacher.

**My Role as Researcher/Participant**

For the year that I conducted this study I was responsible for teaching reading, writing, and language arts in English for the 4\(^{th}\)-6\(^{th}\) grades. I would like to underscore that I was at the school not just as an objective observer, but as a member of the school and the classes within which I was collecting data. I came to know each child as an individual and had the privilege to observe, over time, how each acted and reacted with me and with their peers. Because I am fluent in both English and Spanish, I was able to understand both the students’ codes as they used them (although I confess that because of occasional references to contexts beyond my realm

\(^3\) While I did videotape 6 hours of class, the bulk of my data was from audiotaping. See further discussion and explanation in the sections on Procedures and Data Collection and Data and Transcription.
of experience – like video games - there were times that although I understood the words, I had little idea what they were talking about!). My inclusion in the school and class community has surely impacted my analysis of their language use because through this familiarity with the students, I became privy to many of the sometimes subtle undercurrents of meaning that run through the students’ conversations and interactions. With luck this has helped me to have a better understanding of the participants’ understanding of different interactions. It is also important to note that when I began my data collection, I already had a long history at the school and within the community.

When I began teaching at the Escuela Interamericana in 2004, I had already lived in Turrialba for 10 years, and knew many of the children’s parents and older siblings. I had worked at the school previously from 1994-1996 and had taught some of the children, or their brothers and sisters before. My daughter was also a 3rd grade student at the school while I was teaching 4th, 5th and 6th grades and she was friends with many of the students in my classes. My fluency in Spanish also opened doors for me with both the students and their families. Because of this history and because of the tight knit nature of the community, I was often invited to the children’s homes for coffee or special events like birthdays or first communions, and I frequently ran into the children and their families in town. I was known by the students as a teacher, the mother of one of their peers and a member of the community.

General English Curriculum and Structure of the Class

Because English was not a core subject tested for on the National 6th grade exit exam, I was given a great deal of freedom in designing the curriculum. In general, I designed classroom activities to focus on four areas: listening, speaking, reading and writing. I worked in close
collaboration with the English language arts teacher from first cycle to develop cross-aged projects and collaborative reading and writing groups between first and second cycle. These cross-aged projects were extremely effective as a means to improve the self-esteem and encourage English language use, particularly for those second cycle children less competent in English or who were reluctant to speak or use English with their peers because it gave them the opportunity to be the “expert” with the younger children. I mention these projects because I believe they had an impact on the attitudes the children had about English and whether or not they would use it, although I have no mechanism by which to measure these impacts in the present study.

We used a literature-based set of readers called *Celebrate Reading* published by Scott Foresman (1993). This set of readers comprised a compilation of authentic texts which had not been abridged from their original published format and included all original artwork. Because the series was designed for native speakers from the United States, and not for English language learners living outside the United States, this choice of readers sometimes posed problems and underscored gaps in background knowledge among the students. As a means to mitigate this issue, the school’s board of directors decided to use a tactic applied by many bilingual schools in Costa Rica: use 3rd grade readers with 4th graders, 4th grade readers with 5th graders etc. Nevertheless, being able to use these readers was a tremendous boon from the standpoint that it was authentic literature written in English and access to texts in English in Costa Rica is extremely limited. These texts provided the children with a sample, albeit limited, of “real” context from which to build background knowledge and vocabulary in English. Additionally, the cross-aged reading program allowed the older children to read at a reading level that was appropriate for them without feeling embarrassed, because they were reading to the younger
children. The school also has a small library and I required that every child check out books or magazines and read texts that they had chosen for a minimum of 20 minutes per day and keep a reading log.

**Procedures and Data Collection:**

At the beginning of the school year (February, 2004), I met with the parents and the students/participants and informed them that I would be conducting this research on bilingual language use in class throughout the year and asked for and obtained their signed permission to tape-record the children’s voices and film the children in the classroom during normal class activities in order to better understand language use by English language learners (See Appendix 4 for copies of IRB letter of consent). I stressed that in order to participate in the study, the children did not have to do anything differently from what they normally did in class and that their participation would not affect their grades or negatively impact them in any foreseeable way. Furthermore, they would be in no way penalized for not participating and had the right stop the tape during the recordings, choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time.

I then distributed a written questionnaire with questions about English language use in the household as a source of secondary data (see Table 1) and asked that the children fill it out with their parents at home and bring it back to school. Although the students had completed the questionnaire and I had begun taking anecdotal notes in February, we did not begin recording until June. From June to December (excepting the month of July when the school was on mid-year break) I recorded each of the three classes on Mondays during their English lessons. I chose to record on Mondays in part for logistical reasons - I met with each of the classes for an equal
amount of time and because every Monday - and in part for study consistency reasons - each class participated in the same activity on Mondays, the Weekend Review.

Because the school-year had begun in February, the students were quite accustomed to the Weekend Review when we began taping it. The class-sizes were small – only 9-15 students – and the classroom atmosphere was relaxed and informal. I would divide the students into groups of three to four, usually by counting off, so the groups were rarely repeated. This random shifting of participant constellations made for interesting differences in individual speech behavior impacting all the areas of analysis and underscores the importance of participant constellation on code-switching. I distributed four microcassette recorders and lapel microphones plugged into three-plug splitters among the students and they plugged in their microphones and started the tapes. After a short time, this became routine and the children became very adept at plugging in and turning on and off their microphones and the microcassette players. I chose to use microcassette recorders because they were more unobtrusive and more portable than standard cassette recorders.

The children always had the freedom, without impunity, to turn off the tape recorder at any time they felt uncomfortable. For the most part the children interacted as they would normally, without taking overt notice of the tape recorders. At the beginning, some students fooled around with the microphones (pretending to be singers or newscasters) but quickly settled down to the group activity. On one or two occasions (where a child was playing with the microphone in a way that could potentially damage it or the cassette recorder) I intervened and told a child that if he/she did not stop his behavior I would take the microphone away. In general I did not have to interfere with the activities at all except as a teacher clarifying task instructions or answering “English” questions.
Data and Transcription

I audio-taped a total of 64 hours and video-taped a total of 6 hours of interaction among the three classes. I did not videotape more often because I had limited access to a video camera. Also, because of the nature of the classroom teaching and the fact that I moved from class to class throughout the day I could not just leave the machine set up in one class because it was a nuisance for the other teachers and setting up and taking down the video camera was difficult and time consuming as I moved from class to class and was very disruptive. After taping, I labeled each tape with the date and the names of the students in the group and filed the tapes in a bag, one for each class. I then numbered each tape by class and by tape number i.e. 4-1, 4-2, 4-3 or 5-1, 5-2, 5-3 etc. After selecting which participants I wanted to focus on (see section below on Participant Selection) I made a tape chart and began listening to the tapes on which the children I had identified were recorded (See Appendix 1).

After identifying the tapes with the selected participants, I listened to each tape in its entirety without transcribing immediately, but describing interesting passages in the chart and tagging the descriptions with color codes and noting the time indicator on the tape. After transcribing, I studied the passages and the notes I had taken looking for patterns of L1 and L2 use paying close attention to participant constellations, topic and turn-taking triggers. Then I would go back and transcribe only those passages that I had identified as illustrating the discursive behavior I had chosen to analyze (see Outline of Analysis Chapters below). The participant constellations were not at all consistent and so frequently there are interactions on the analyzed tapes between the study subjects and other members of the class. In my analysis I have tried to describe these other children and their relationship with the main children in the study as it is important for understanding the study subjects’ speech behaviors.
The transcripts are labeled with the tape number and the side of the tape, the grade, the names of the participants, the name of the activity, and the date of the activity. Then within the body of the transcription, each transcribed section is labeled with the tape number and side and the time on the tape taken from the tape counter. The lines from each transcribed section are numbered sequentially beginning with the number 1 for ease in describing within the body of the analysis. Therefore the same complete tape transcript could have several sections beginning with line 1, but each would begin a different section whose location on the tape is identified by the tape counter number.

Transcript Tape 5-6 Side A
5th Grade
Rajit, Carlo and Lorenzo
Weekend Review
June 15, 2004

5-6.A:001
1  Carlo:  I’m gonna put the title - Sentences
2  Rajit:  I was in my house.
3  Carlo:  Yesterday I saw. Tomorrow...I go...to

Samples of complete tape transcriptions can be found in Appendix 2. As a source of secondary data, I had distributed a questionnaire at the beginning of the year to all the students in 4th – 6th grade that I asked the students and their parents to fill out (See Appendix 3 for a compilation of answers) which I used to help refine my analysis of the speech data.

Within the transcription, I have used standard spelling conventions and have indicated paralinguistic features such as intonation by using standard punctuation conventions (see transcription key in Table 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol or font indicator</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>()</td>
<td>Italicized texts in parenthesis indicate background sounds, or comments on paralinguistic features such as: laughter, etc.</td>
<td>(chuckles) (rising intonation) (Tape turned off)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Unitalicized texts in parenthesis represent interjections by participant other than indicated speaker i.e. (uh, huh), For example:</td>
<td>A: I was thinking (un huh) that we could do three questions each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicates overlapped speech:</td>
<td>A: I want go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Long dash indicates short pauses (less than two seconds)</td>
<td>A: Then I went—I went</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>Elipses indicate longer pauses: one period for each second of the pause.</td>
<td>A: I had a …a party at my grandmother’s house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>Asterisks indicate unintelligible speech that cannot be understood because there is too much background noise, the speakers were talking away from the microphone, or because the speakers overlap to the point that individual words cannot be distinguished.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[]</td>
<td>Spanish speech is translated into English and in brackets immediately below the Spanish text.</td>
<td>A: Esperen, vean, vean los números que le tocan a Ud. [Wait, look you guys, look at the numbers that you have to do.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Spanish speech is bolded but English Speech is not.</td>
<td>A: Abajo! [Below!]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Rising intonation is indicated by a question mark</td>
<td>A: Is my turn?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>Falling intonation is followed by a single period</td>
<td>A: You go now, Marcelo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!</td>
<td>Emphatic speech is followed by an exclamation point</td>
<td>A: Abajo! [Below!]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPS</td>
<td>Stressed syllables or words are all capitalized</td>
<td>A: que MUNDO verdad Roberto? [What a WORLD, right Roberto?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ “</td>
<td>Text read aloud is enclosed in quotation marks</td>
<td>A: This one teacher, “he asked himself”-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis

When listening to the data, I isolated and identified different types of interaction and text for each chapter (see discussion below); however all the texts analyzed evidence code-switching behaviors. Once I isolated the examples of code-switching, I then categorized the examples and tagged them according to where they fit as evidence based on the apparent motivation of the participant, the surrounding text, participant constellation and topic of the discourse.

For Chapter 3, which is an analysis of the effects of globalization on English language use and intertextuality, I chose examples based exclusively on topic. These texts focused specifically on references to English songs, movies, advertisements or commercial brand names. The analysis of the texts traces these references to mass media within the larger context of US influence in Costa Rica and reveals the impact globalization and linguistic imperialism has had on the “national psyche” and on English language use in the classroom particularly. I have focused on student discussions about American businesses, shows and products (e.g. Going to Disneyland or McDonald's and all that implies socially) and examples of heteroglossia as demonstrated by the intertextuality of English song lyrics or advertising jingles in speech.

Chapter 4 delves into how the students use language choice as a tool of individual agency to construct their own identities. That is to say, it attempts to answer the question: how do different children in this particular context use English and Spanish to construct the interactive roles that I have categorized as: mediator, buddy and model student. These roles are explained in detail in Chapter 4. To analyze the interactions by which the participants construct these roles, I isolated code-switching examples that show switching triggered by previous turns, divisions between on-task and off-task talk or asides, etc. I also analyze participant constellations (who is talking to whom in the groups, paying particular attention to gender and academic successfulness
of participants), topic (on-task or not, home or school related subjects, exclamations etc.), what is taken up or not in following turns and by whom, and the relationship between who says what, in what language, and how that might affect the construction of individual identities and social alliances.

For Chapter 5, I isolated code-switching examples that evidenced negotiated interaction and scaffolding. I analyze how, in conjunction with their peers, individual students appropriate their L2 in a classroom setting and make it their own by melding two or more languages, cultures and backgrounds. This chapter attempts to contextualize some uses of language that might otherwise be examined as "errors" in more standard SLA research and (re)frame them as contextually appropriate and creative attempts to construct meaning. Several code-switching strategies that the children use to negotiate are identified including: 1) Code-switching to Translate; 2) Extension of L1 semantics into L2 as a resource; 3) Code-switching to talk about talk; 4) Code-switching for spelling in L2; and 5) L1 + L2 linguistic play. These strategies are explained in detail in Chapter 5.

The Observer’s Paradox and Limitations of the Study:

Having only audiotaped recordings presents a major limitation in the study in that when the groups work together there is often a lot of interaction going on through paralinguistic features such as head-nodding, gaze and writing in response. Plus talk overlap and interference from other groups sometimes makes it difficult to decipher who has said what without video data. I would include video data in future studies.

Another limitation of written transcriptions of speech data is that it is very difficult to show the multileveled nature of the discourse within and across groups. Because the data was
always collected during class group work, the participants were, sometimes engaged in many lines of conversation at the same time within the groups and even among members of different groups on occasion. Therefore on transcribing the data, I have tried to separate the different threads and record only the turns that follow one another. This is complex and precarious business, because turns which often appear random are in fact in response to other exchanges within other groups that are not picked up by the recorder. Furthermore, one turn may appear not to precipitate the one that follows it, however, due to the overlapping and intersecting threads of interaction, it could lead to a response some turns later in the conversation.

Self-consciousness of the participants is certainly a limitation of the study although the scope of this limitation is unclear. There are several places where the students comment about the tape players and the fact that the tape is running. There are also other moments where the students talk into the microphone deliberately pretending to be movie stars, newscasters, etc. In those moments and others when the students talk with each other about whether or not the microphone is on or warning each other to be careful because the tape recorder is recording, the effects of the recording process are entirely transparent. However, while constantly present, these effects are not always so clear and therefore harder to analyze or pinpoint.

The Activity

Some of the data collected was taken during group reading comprehension, grammar or vocabulary activities, which are rich in examples of scaffolding and meaning negotiation (see Chapter 5); however, most of the data I collected was recorded during the “Weekend Review” activity. Every Monday – Weekend Review day – the children would wait to be separated into groups of three to four to begin the game we developed over the year.
The Weekend Review started as a means to give the children a chance to tell me and their peers their weekend stories in English in a productive and structured way. Each child would have three to five minutes to tell the class what they had done over the weekend and then I would ask the class at large questions to quiz them on who had done what. This exercise was designed as a pedagogical tool to promote oral English and listening skills embedded in the framework of an activity that would have a high level of interest on the part of both the listeners and the speakers because they were telling their weekend narratives.

Halfway through the school year (in August) in an effort to allow the children to practice question formation, the “Weekend Review” evolved into a team question game where teams of two to three students would tell each other what they had done over the weekend, develop a list of questions based on these activities and then ask the other groups to guess about who had or hadn’t done what. The other groups had to guess who had done what based on their knowledge of the individuals in the group and their skills in tracing evasive strategies. The “Weekend Review” was, hands down, the children’s favorite regular English class activity in all three grades.
Overall Description of the Study Participants

Although the majority of the students at the *Escuela Interamericana* are from the Turrialba area (as opposed to being foreigners living in CATIE), they are still among the area’s elite (see Appendix C). Most of the families own their own homes in the city of Turrialba or the surrounding rural areas, although some rent houses within CATIE (at rates that are exceptionally high for the area). Nevertheless, contrary to what might be the “normal” perception of renters in the United States, those who rent CATIE houses are considered more elite than those that own their own homes in town because of CATIE’s association with the United States and wealthy foreigners. Most of the students’ parents are professionals with post-secondary degrees. A high percentage of the students have both mothers and fathers that work which is still not the norm in Costa Rica. Although the parents of these children recognize the need for English and are paying to ensure that that children have the opportunities literacy in English can provide, the vast majority do not speak English themselves or speak very little. Most of the students have traveled to the United States and many have lived for a period of time in the U.S. because their parents were either working or studying at an American institution.

With the exception of the children of CATIE’s graduate students, most of the children at the *Escuela Interamericana* began schooling there in Pre-K and will stay to graduate from 6th. That factor, coupled with the intimate size of the classes, creates tightly woven social units that do not easily permit entrance to new students, especially foreign students, even if they are native speakers of Spanish. This has an interesting and sometimes dramatic effect on language use in the classroom and can be seen in the way that new or relatively new students interact with the other students and vice versa. Another result is that the group dynamics and ascribed identities of individual students are constructed and reconstructed very early on until they become “fixed”
making it very difficult for individual students to break out of those roles or modify the
established interactive dynamics once they are in the upper grades. This phenomenon is noticed,
if not openly acknowledged, by staff and parents. I had one 4th grader’s mother approach me at
the beginning of the school year begging me to see her child for what he was and not just believe
how he had been “labeled”. This process of identity “fixing” of the established students gets
shaken up somewhat when a new student comes into the mix or when someone leaves and
thereby changes the dynamics. Curiously, students who have left are frequently discussed and
reminisced about, so that they seem almost to still be a part of the group.

Selection of the Study Participants

Almost all the children in the school speak Spanish as their first language and English as
their second language. Only one of the students selected for close analysis has a parent who is a
native speaker of English because I wanted to focus primarily on L1 and L2 use among non-
native speakers of English. However, in order to eliminate some of the questions that might be
raised about whether or not a particular student’s use of English was based more on
“competence”, or lack thereof, and not choice, I have selected the three most academically
successful students in each of the three classes for analysis. Each of these students earned the
best grades in English (as well as most of their other subjects) and has strong skills in each of the
four areas: reading, writing, speaking and listening in English as measured by formal and
informal assessments.

Nevertheless, each of them, in spite of their abilities and success in the language,
sometimes chooses to use Spanish in English class which raises questions about L1 use in a
“designated” L2 setting and calls into doubt the conclusion that a child’s command of a language
will be a clear indicator of his or her choice to use it. Moreover, this phenomenon causes one to ask if L1 and L2 use might not have more to do with an individual’s desire to use the language appropriate to the circumstances, including setting, interlocutors, time, place and purpose. The purpose of this dissertation is to analyze when and how these students use English and Spanish when talking with their peers and their teacher in English class and to propose some grounded explanations for why these “good, capable English students” might choose to use Spanish, in spite of the class injunction to use English.

Much of the following general information about each student was gleaned from a questionnaire that I distributed at the beginning of the year to the children and their parents (See Appendix 3) as well as from anecdotal notes that I collected throughout the year.

Selected Participants - 4th Grade

All four of the 4th grade children included in the analysis began attending the Escuela Interamericana at the same time and have been in the same class for all 5 years since they started. All were born in Turrialba and have lived in Turrialba all their lives. All have extended families that live in Turrialba. Three of the students have the highest grade point average among the 4th grade students and excel on all written and oral English tests of grammar, reading comprehension and composition. One is included precisely because his was the lowest average in the class. His scores rarely exceeded 70% and there was some discussion about holding him back. I have included him in the analysis because although his scores are low and his tested competence minimal, he makes an extraordinary effort to speak English at every opportunity illustrating that choosing to speak a language can sometimes have little to do with “ability” in that language.
Antonio is a smart, outgoing, competitive boy that excels in athletics as well as academics. In 2004, when I recorded this data, his father was one of the managers at the Conair plant just outside Turrialba and his mother owned and ran a *librería* which although is commonly translated as bookstore is more like a stationary and school supply shop in the United States. Antonio is well liked and looked up to by the other students and is widely considered and referred to by the students as “the smartest one in the class”. His best friend is Guillermo. His family lives in CATIE. No one in Antonio’ family speaks English and the only consistent opportunity he has to interact in English is at school. He has never lived or traveled in an English speaking country.

Marcia is a studious, affable, even-tempered girl. She is well liked by everyone and is often called upon by her peers to act as a “peacemaker” to settle disputes. Marcia’s mother is an accountant and at the time of this study was working on her masters in accounting. Marcia’s father is a high-level administrator for the Costa Rican National Parks office in the Limon province. He is of Afrocaribbean descent and speaks English although he does not converse much with Marcia as his job requires that he live away from home Monday through Friday. Marcia’s paternal grandmother speaks fluent Caribbean-style English and her three aunts and uncle all speak English at varying levels of proficiency, but only one aunt speaks to her in English with any frequency. Marcia lives in town. She has never lived or traveled in an English speaking country, and although she visits family in the Limon province at least once a year, most of her cousins speak with her in Spanish.

Guillermo is a very conscientious student who prides himself in being neat and accurate with his work. He is quiet and not as outgoing as Antonio although he is equally competitive and well liked. He speaks English very well and does exceptionally well on written and reading
evaluations, however, he speaks only when absolutely required to. His father once expressed concern to me that Guillermo outright refused to practice speaking English with him at home. Guillermo’s mother is a bank manager in Turrialba and his father is a successful businessman. No one in Guillermo’s family speaks English, although his father has taken English courses and likes to practice speaking. Guillermo has never lived or traveled in an English-speaking country. Guillermo lives in Turrialba but spends a lot of time at Antonio’ house in CATIE.

Marcelo is a sweet boy and although he is well-liked, he is frequently the butt of jokes and the target of Marcelo mischief. He has been diagnosed with attention deficit disorder and therefore is often being called to task for not paying attention in class, forgetting materials and not being neat, etc. Marcelo’s written and reading English skills are quite poor, but he makes constant sincere efforts to speak in English both inside and outside class with me or the other native English speakers at the school. Marcelo’s mother owns a flower and novelty shop in Turrialba and his grandmother has a clothing store next door. Marcelo was born in Turrialba and has lived there all his life. All his extended family lives there. He has never visited an English speaking country.

Marcelo had to deal with some terribly traumatic events in his life during the study year. His father, who had been a police officer and had been incarcerated for murder in 1996 was released from prison. His uncle was shot and killed by the police in Turrialba, in the only shooting that I had ever heard of in the town in the ten years I lived there.

Selected participants - 5th Grade

Three of the 5th grade children, Lorenzo, Rajit and Mario, included in the analysis began attending the Escuela Interamericana at the same time and have been in the same class for all 6
years since they started. All were born in Turrialba and have lived in Turrialba all their lives.

Lorenzo and Mario have extended family that lives in Turrialba. The fourth student that I have included in the analysis, Carlo began at the Escuela Interamericana in 2003. These four students have the highest grade point average among the 5th grade students. Abby was included because she was a girl and because she had extremely good English both written and oral but her skills were not reflected by standard means of assessment.

Carlo is a funny boy. Physically, he is very small and his nickname is Hormiga (Ant). He loves to play soccer. He excels in class though he does not apply himself. Carlo was born in Costa Rica, but he lived four years and attended K-3rd grade in Miami. His mother is Costa Rican but grew up in the United States and speaks English. She runs a feed and seed store in the nearby town of La Suiza. Carlo’s father is Venezuelan. Although his parents are married, Christian’s father lives and works in Florida because of his job as an airline mechanic. He visits his family in Costa Rica every 3 months or so. Carlo lives in a house just outside Turrialba in Santa Rosa. Although both his parents and his brother speak English, he rarely speaks English at home. His maternal aunt and grandparents live in Turrialba and he has extensive extended family on his mother’s side in Costa Rica.

Lorenzo is very competitive in everything he does. He is very precise about his work but does not tolerate being wrong and does not like being shown how to improve his work to the point of becoming belligerent. Lorenzo is Marcia’s (from 4th grade) cousin. His mother is Marcia’s father’s sister and is a very successful dentist/orthodontist in Turrialba. She is of Afro Caribbean descent and she understands English but refuses to speak it. When I asked her why, she said she didn’t like making mistakes. Lorenzo’s father is an engineer for the national power
company. Lorenzo has visited Disneyworld on vacation, but has not visited or lived in any other English speaking country. Lorenzo lives in a palatial house outside Turrialba.

Rajit is a very bright and creative student but he tends to do only the minimum necessary to get by. He participates in a Brazilian martial art called capoeira and excels at it. He and Lorenzo are best friends. Rajit’s father is a physician. He is Indian and speaks Hindi but Rajit does not speak or understand Hindi. Rajit’s father also speaks and reads English and was educated in the United States but he does not speak English with Rajit. Rajit’s mother is Costa Rican and although she is trained as a teacher, she does not work. Rajit has traveled to the United States on vacation but has not visited or lived in any other English speaking country. Rajit lives in a house in CATIE.

Mario has the highest grade point average in the class. He is extremely competitive and does not like being corrected and often becomes sullen and withdrawn. Unlike most of the other boys, he does not like soccer and does not participate in games with other children during recess. He spends a great deal of time alone, but has a very strong scientific curiosity and is constantly designing scientific experiments. Although his written English is native-like and very creative, his spoken English is stilted and when he speaks he likes to coin new words and deliberately pronounces English words with Spanish inflection and phonetics. His mother is a certified teacher but she has not worked since Mario was born. Mario’s father is a physician in Turrialba. Mario was born in Turrialba and all his extended family lives in Turrialba. No one in his family speaks English. Mario traveled to Canada for four weeks in April, 2004. Mario lives in a house in Turrialba. Mario was my student in 1997 when I taught English at the University preschool in Turrialba.
Abby was unique in the 5th grade class for a number of reasons. While she had grown up in Costa Rica and attended the Escuela Interamericana for as long or longer than anyone else, she was born in the United States. Not unimportantly, Abby is tall and fair with blond hair and blue eyes in a classroom full of olive-skinned, dark-haired children. Nevertheless, Abby does not try to capitalize on her stereotypically “American” looks but rather is a soft-spoken girl that rarely seeks the limelight. In fact her language use indicates that she would rather “fit in” than “stand out”. Abby’s mother is Costa Rican but her father is Anglo-American. Abby’s mother is a former Miss Costa Rica and a trained pre-school teacher but she has not worked since the first of her children was born. Abby’s father is a research scientist at CATIE specializing in Global Information Systems. Abby’s parents and 3 sisters all speak English though they speak Spanish at home. Abby lives in a large colonial style house near the football stadium in Turrialba. She travels to the United States every couple years to visit her grandparents and extended family in California.

**Selected participants - 6th Grade**

The three 6th grade children included in the analysis began attending the Escuela Interamericana at the same time and have been in the same class for all 7 years since they started. All were born in Turrialba and have lived in Turrialba all their lives. All have extended family that lives in Turrialba. All three are youngest children in their families and have older siblings that graduated from the Escuela Interamericana. These three students have the highest grade point average among the 6th grade students.

Gerardo is a very bright, creative boy with a scathing sense of humor. He reads a lot on his own and particularly likes the Goosebumps series. His father is a physician and his mother is
a college professor. Although his parents are divorced, they both live in Turrialba and he spends
about the same amount of time with each of them. The only people in his family that speak
English fluently are his brother and sister who graduated from the Escuela Interamericana. Both
his brother and his father were my students – his brother at the Escuela Interamericana and his
father in the adult English classes I taught at the University of Costa Rica in 1995 and 1996.
Gerardo has traveled to the United States on vacation although he has never lived in any English-
speaking country. Gerardo lives in Turrialba.

Marcia is a very bright girl who takes great care with her work and does not like to speak
or write unless she is very sure that she has it “right”. Her maternal grandfather is Chinese and
although she understands some Chinese she does not speak or write it. Marcia’s mother is an
optometrist and has a shop in Turrialba. She studied for a year in Iowa during college, but now
does not like to speak much English. Marcia’s father is a very successful veterinarian. All her
extended family lives in Turrialba. Marcia has traveled to China and the United States but she
has never lived in any English speaking country. She lives in a house in Turrialba.

Raymundo is a very bright boy with a critical and incisive mind. However he is not
inclined to work very hard in class (perhaps because he has never had to). He speaks and writes
English with a native-like accent and understands subtle nuances of the language. His parents are
divorced and he lives with his mother, who is a university professor, in Turrialba. He visits his
father who works in international business in San Jose on the weekends. Both Raymundo’s
parents speak, read and write English as do his 3 older sisters. His grandfather emigrated from
Yugoslavia in 1948 and speaks several languages. Raymundo’s sister lives in the United States
and he has visited her on vacation.
Perhaps it bears mentioning here that personal networks are very tightly woven in Turrialba and in spite of my being a foreigner, I have multiple personal or professional ties to nearly all the children outside the school setting. For example, Marisa’s father was my veterinarian and Lorenzo’s mother was my dentist for 10 years. Lorenzo’s younger sister is my daughter’s best friend and Marcia’s father is a colleague of my husband. I cannot even begin to encompass the complexity of the ties among the children themselves. But I have tried where possible and where it seems appropriate to mention the ties I know about.
CHAPTER 3
HETEROGLOSSIA AND THE EFFECTS OF GLOBALIZATION ON LANGUAGE USE

Chapter Summary:

This chapter focuses on specific examples of classroom language as indicators of larger social and political influences and patterns. This chapter offers a historical overview of the influence of the United States as an economic power in Costa Rica and a brief analysis of the impact globalization and linguistic imperialism has had on the “national psyche” and on English language use in this country. Then, within this sociopolitical context, I trace specific linguistic evidence in the children’s speech data. I have focused on discussions about American businesses, shows and products (e.g. Going to Disneyland or McDonald's and all that implies socially) and examples of heteroglossia as demonstrated by the entextualization of English song lyrics or advertising jingles in speech.

Historical Context and Ramifications of English in Costa Rica

The children at the Escuela Interamericana are learning how to be bilingual in a society that is changing rapidly and subject to the economic, political and cultural pressure brought to bear by the increasing dependence of Costa Rica on the United States and the local manifestation of the effects of globalization. Any study of code choice or English language use in Costa Rica must be firmly rooted in a framework which considers the social, political and historical context since linguistic practices help to construct, reinforce, challenge and refute social paradigms and
structures. This is particularly true in developing countries, as Heller and Martin-Jones (2001) posit, language use and language policy in any given setting in contemporary societies are shaped by colonialism in the 19th and 20th centuries and “new global forms of cultural, economic and social domination” (p. 2) Trade and conquest have precipitated language contact and the concomitant language shift, creolization and language death throughout human history (Nettle & Romaine 2000).

However in the last century, increased globalization has accelerated the process of human migration across political and geographic borders and caused social groups with vastly differing languages and cultures to come into direct and mediated contact with each other at rates and scopes never seen before. Furthermore, international commerce fueled by ease of travel and improved communications and media, have made it possible for people to stay in their own countries, villages and communities and be in contact with different cultures and languages. In these language contact situations or linguistic borderlands, heteroglossia and language shift occur where traces of what had been two or more linguistic codes begin to mix. How and when they mix, however, is conditioned first by social factors (Thomason & Kaufman 1988). The rise of Britain and America as colonial and economic powers at this critical juncture of global change has had enormous impact on the presence of English and English language use across the globe. And in order to understand how these changes play out in developing societies, one must take a critical eye to the issues of dominance and resistance in ESOL classrooms.

---

4 The economic and linguistic balance has tended to be asymmetrical. The influence of the media and tourism has tended to be from industrialized countries or regions toward developing countries or regions while, for the most part human migration has tended to be from developing countries toward industrialized countries or regions (Nettle & Romaine 2000).
Resistance and Dominance in the ESOL Classroom

In his study examining student attitudes toward ESOL teaching methods in Sri Lanka, Canagaraja (1993) deals specifically with the idea of student resistance to their L2 and argues that “attitudes, needs and desires of Marceloity communities and students are only partially free from the structures of domination in the larger social system.” (603) The students in his study were not necessarily responsive to methods that went against traditional styles, in part, because they were aware of the role the English plays in Sri Lankan society, and they feel some ambivalence toward the socio-economic power English represents. Therefore, Canagaraja suggests that formalist teaching would allow students to resist the cultural/ideological influence of the L2 and maintain a sense of identity while learning and using the L2.

In her study of attitudes toward English language instruction in Hungary, Duff (1995) also deals with the effect of L2 teaching styles that conflict with traditional methods. She looks at the discursive constitution of English classrooms and the socialization of students in school. The basis for her argument is that language teaching has social and political implications and that language itself is part of a socio-political context that cannot and should not be ignored. Like Canagaraja’s research, this study underscores the social implications of language classrooms and methodologies that challenge the students’ perception of what is appropriate.

Code-switching and Entextualization

In order to understand language use in specific language contact contexts, it might be useful to examine what texts can be entextualized - that is decontextualized as a distinguishably separate, mobile text from one context and recontextualized within a new context (for example when mono-lingual Spanish Costa Rican parents name their children with typically English
names like Michael or Jennifer) (Bauman and Briggs 1996). A brief discussion of
entextualization could be useful when discussing code-switching phenomena and what kinds of
texts can be code-switched. Traditional research on the subject of what texts can be code-
switched and how tends to focus on the decontextualization and recontextualization of isolated
lexical items or grammatical structures in code-switching practice, but with little attention paid to
the social or pragmatic “meaning” of the texts themselves in their original contexts and how that
meaning does or does not transfer to their new contexts. Shoaps (2002) argues that,

Both text and context emerge in discourse concurrently. As text is “created”
framed, or set apart by performance and poetic features, - so too is context. Thus
entextualization can best be defined as the apparent removal…of a stretch of
discourse as a coherent semiotic form (qua “text”) from its context and its
logically consequent or temporally subsequent (re)contextualization – the
(re)creation of a text in context. (47)

This has important implications for the analysis of code-switching because it can help make clear
not just when individuals in language contact situations code-switch (as identified by the
apparent change of code), but what they do semantically and pragmatically when they switch.
This framework of analyzing code-switching reveals the layered nature of meaning inherent in
each instance of code-switched text. For example, the phrase, ”mmm tasty” from the commercial
for a popular fast food restaurant has very different meaning when entextualized by a fourth-
grader in Athens, Georgia than it does when it is entextualized, lifted out and recontextualized by
a fourth-grader at the Escuela Interamericana in Turrialba, Costa Rica, and that has largely to do
with contextual and historical resonance the phrase carries with it. It is also important to note in
the context of code-switching that entextualized text is not translated from one language to
another, but lifted from one context to another in its original language.
Evidence of English and English Language Education in Costa Rica

The politics of English language teaching and students’ use of and attitudes toward English is not only relevant in Asia and Europe where British colonialism left its mark, but in the Americas as well. In recent years, English has become more and more important throughout the Americas, in spite of the fact that Spanish is among the three most commonly-spoken languages in the world after Mandarin Chinese and English (Nettle & Romaine 2000). Throughout Central and South America, English language schools for children and adults have sprung up like mushrooms, seemingly overnight. English and an “English Education” are considered essential to the elite, even in Costa Rica where the split between the have’s and the have not’s is not so marked as in many of Costa Rica’s neighboring countries. It is popularly understood that fluency in English is one of the best ways to ensure economic solvency in a tenuous labor market where unemployment has steadily risen in the last decade (Costa Rican Ministry of Work 2002).

Demand for English education has fueled a boom in private schools that offer English; there are no fewer than 28 private bilingual elementary and high schools in the capital city of San Jose alone, and in the city of Turrialba, in the mountains of the Cartago province, there are 4 private bilingual schools (and this is a city with a population of less than 100,000 with few Americans or native speakers of English). Command of the English language is equated with power as evidenced by the fact that six of the last 10 Costa Rican presidents were not only fluent in English, but educated in English speaking countries.

Although Spanish is the national language of Costa Rica, and the country shares no border with English speaking states, there is evidence of American influence and English language contact everywhere. The US Embassy compound covers 2 square city blocks serving
the more than 30,000 American expatriate retirees\(^5\) who live in Costa Rica. Whole industries have been developed to cater to this influential group. Real Estate agencies announcing “English spoken here” abound and the many McDonald’s and Burger King fast food restaurants that dot the metropolitan area are full to bursting at lunch time despite their relatively high cost.

Furthermore, evidence of the English/American incursion is present nearly everywhere: not just in the more cosmopolitan capital city of San Jose, but in the outlying areas and the provinces as well. It is not uncommon to find a hand-lettered cardboard sign proclaiming “Fresh Fruit” at roadside stands outside the city. But English is not just used to accommodate or attract tourists; English is present in the discourse of native Costa Ricans. Many popular radio stations play English playlists and Cable TV airs MTV and VH1 as well as HBO, Showtime and the Warner Channel. My students would listen to Alanis Morisset and Matchbox 20 mixed with Belinda y Chayanne and watch American sitcoms and dramas in English with Spanish subtitles. The students reference English songs, television shows and video games as part of their regular discourse.

And the English influence extends beyond the level of commerce and popular culture, and has impacted cultural practices as fundamental as naming and the realm of personal identity as well. When I arrived in Costa Rica in 1993, I was shocked by the number of Costa Ricans who where christened with Anglo names, even when the name chosen by their parents had a perfectly “legitimate” Spanish “equivalent”. There are literally hundreds of Costa Rican Michael’s, William’s, and Henry’s whose parents decided against naming them Miguel, Guillermo and Enrique in favor of the English name. In the mountains above Turrialba, my Costa Rican neighbors Alexander and Sandra had three sons named Kenneth, Christopher and

\(^5\) Exact figures are difficult to obtain as the US Department of State relies on US tax and census data to determine expatriate populations. Local news agencies estimate the number as being much higher.
Kevin; ironically none of them speaks English. However this phenomenon has not occurred without resistance. In Turrialba, a priest is rumored to have changed the names of countless babies at the hour of baptism, christening them with traditionally Spanish names when their parents had chosen Anglo names for them.

The push toward English has reached the level of policy and in the mid 1990’s the Costa Rican Department of Education declared that every child attending public schools K-11 (there is no 12th) would be required to receive English. At the same time, English was added to the set of core subjects (Math, Science, Spanish and Social Studies) included on the state-administered high school graduation exit exam that all Costa Rican students have to pass to receive a diploma. But the reach of English has not extended into Costa Rica overnight; several historical and economic factors have influenced its spread and strengthened its foothold, particularly in the context of the Escuela Interamericana and Turrialba.

**Costa Rica: Echoes of the Banana Republic**

While Costa Rica was never a formal colony of the United States, its economic solvency has, for more than a century, depended heavily on American aid, international investment, tourism and now remittances from Costa Ricans living and working in the United States. The “beginning” of the complex relationship between Costa Rica and the United States might be traced back to the Battle of Rivas in 1856, where a small group of Costa Rican farmers, armed only with machetes, rifles and torches, turned back the mercenary army led by William Walker, a Tennessee-born American fortune-hunter who, under the philosophy of Manifest Destiny, sought to conquer Costa Rica in order to annex it to the United States.
Almost no American has ever even heard of William Walker and his failed attempts to extend U.S. territory into Mexico and Central America, but every Costa Rican schoolchild knows who he was, and more importantly, who Juan Santa María was. Juan Santa María was a drummer-boy in the hastily assembled Costa Rican militia sent to turn back Walker’s forces. He became a national hero when he volunteered to undertake the suicide mission of burning out the “mesón de guerra”, William Walker’s headquarters. Today, a huge statue immortalizing the hero of this pacifist country, now stands at the entrance to Juan Santa María International Airport in San José. American tourists exiting the airport are welcomed (and perhaps warned) by the imposing bronze figure brandishing his torch as a reminder of the boy who repelled the rapacious Americans and sent them packing. This image creates a powerful David and Goliath metaphor and accurately reflects the ambivalence many Costa Ricans feel towards Americans, and by extension English.

While the United States is respected and admired in Costa Rica, there is nevertheless, a kind of deep-seated cultural animosity toward America. Therefore it is not ironic that although Costa Rica has had no standing army since 1949 and they are proud of their pacifist stance, the anniversary of the Batalla de Rivas is a national holiday and every year, school children across the country reenact the battle. Dressed in peasant garb and carrying sticks, they repel “the American, William Walker” by burning down paper and cardboard representations of his stronghold. This image of Costa Ricans defending their sovereignty in the face of U.S. imperialism is cultivated and recreated in the Costa Rican psyche through these actos cívicos (civic acts) in spite of -and perhaps because of- Costa Ricans’ embracing of the ever-increasing influence the U.S. has in Costa Rican society.

---

6 This ambivalence toward Americans and English is not exclusive to Costa Ricans but is seen in many countries with an extended political and economic involvement with the United States, such as Puerto Rico and Vietnam.
In spite of the symbolic significance of William Walker on the Costa Rican sense of identity with relation to the United States, the actions of another American have had far more far-reaching influence on Costa Rica and the region in general: railroad tycoon, Marcelo Cooper Keith. Widely known as the “Uncrowned King of Central America”, Keith founded Boston’s United Fruit Company one of the most powerful economic and political forces in Central America for more than 50 years. Keith’s influence in Costa Rica began in 1871, when the Costa Rican government contracted Keith to build a railroad from the city of Limon on the Atlantic coast to San José. In exchange for building the railroad and helping reduce Costa Rican debt in England, Keith received a 99-year concession and huge tracts of land in the Atlantic zone. This contract marked the beginning of capitalist investments in Central America that would lead to U.S. imperialist control over Costa Rica and the region. After thousands of Italian and Chinese laborers died of malaria and yellow fever, Keith brought in Afrocaribbean slaves from Jamaica to finish the construction. Descendants of these Jamaican workers still populate the Atlantic province of Limon and speak an English-based creole called Patois. The railroad, which represented one of the major engineering feats of the age (along with the Panama Canal), was completed in 1890 and with it, Keith opened shipping routes from Costa Rica to New Orleans and Boston. Keith sold his interest in the United Fruit Company in 1899, but continued building 800 miles of railroads throughout Central America that would have a profound impact on the economic development of the region.

The United Fruit Company (UFCo.) continued to have a tremendous impact on the social and economic fabric of Central American society until the early 1970’s. The company had a monopoly on banana production in the region predicated on the fact that 60-90% of the regions’ exports were sold to the U.S. This coupled with the fact that by the early 30’s bananas had
overcome coffee as Costa Rica’s leading export, made Costa Rica’s economy almost completely dependent on the United States. The United Fruit Company’s activities in Costa Rica had equally powerful social impacts. UFCo. promoted absolute dependence on the company and repressed dissent and strikes of the local workers with sometimes brutal force.

It owned huge tracts of land, including whole towns. There are still towns in the Atlantic zone whose names are not names at all, but farm numbers from when they were part of the United Fruit company holdings. Costa Rican peasants who had been subsistence farmers sold their land to Mamá Yunay (Mommy United), as the United Fruit Company was known in the region, and then worked on company plantations and bought all their supplies and necessities at the company store and their children attended the company schools. However, this dependence paved the way for disaster when the company pulled out of the Atlantic region (and later the southern Pacific region) because the land was depleted; it left the people with no arable land, no jobs and no other identifiable source of income creating an economic depression marked by high levels of unemployment and social unrest in the Limon Province and the Osa Peninsula that persists to this day. While the United Fruit Company and the railroads boosted economic growth in the region, there is little argument that those who benefited most lived far north of the border and its demise left a bitter aftertaste on the tongues of Costa Ricans, furthering this sense of ambivalence toward the United States.

The activities of the United Fruit Company laid the groundwork for the controversial trade agreement CAFTA (the Central American Free Trade Agreement) which would open the road to even more asymmetrical capitalist investment that undermines Costa Rican government protections and efforts by labor organizations to promote fair working conditions. Nevertheless, the Central American states are feeling a lot of pressure to sign or lose needed aid. Even without
the signing of CAFTA, Latin America and the United States are becoming increasingly interdependent on many levels. In 2005, economics analysts published startling evidence that remittances (money sent to home countries by people living and working abroad – in this case in the United States) of several Latin American countries (including Costa Rica) have climbed in national economic importance and now account for the second largest generator of foreign exchange in Mexico (surpassing oil exports) (Federal Reserve Bank of Houston, 2005). This stunning news underscores the economic interdependence between the United States and its neighbors to the south.

But this interdependence goes beyond economics and has far-reaching social and cultural implications for both Americans and Costa Ricans. Approximately 30,000 American citizens live in Costa Rica and more than 600,000 American tourists visit Costa Rica annually (US Department of State, 2006). Most of the Americans living in Costa Rica are retirees who know that they can have a much higher standard of living than they could in the U.S. on the same pension. However, the flow of immigration is not one-way; fixed inflation and ever-rising unemployment rates have forced more and more Costa Ricans to look north for economic opportunity. But the profile of the average American in Costa Rica is very different from that of the average Costa Rican in the United States. Costa Ricans who go to the United States are predominantly young single men seeking the opportunity to work and send money back to Costa Rica. Although it is difficult to cite exact numbers because Census data do not accurately reflect the number of undocumented workers in the United States, approximately 26,000 tourist visas are granted to Costa Ricans every year and many of those receiving them risk deportation and imprisonment to come to the United States every year to work, separated from their spouses and children, because they see it as the only way to support their families. Even though most stay for
a short period of time (several months to a year) these separations have a dramatic psychological impact on these families and the society in general. And a constant recurring theme both among those who go and those who stay is the need for English.

Ironically, those Costa Ricans who can speak and read English have a better chance of finding employment in Costa Rica, while working and middle-class Costa Ricans who do not speak English are more likely to find themselves unemployed and therefore consider traveling to the United States to find jobs – and learn English. So, while English used to be the exclusive realm of the wealthy elite (those who could pay for private education), people of all economic classes have begun to view English as an economic necessity. One of my students’ mother, a bus driver, lost her job in June of 2004 and left for the United States in January 2005 to “work for a year” so that she could pay her children’s tuition at the Escuela Interamericana, the bilingual school in Turrialba where I gathered my data.

The Town, the Neighborhood and the Networks

To fully understand the nature of English language use in by the students at the Escuela Interamericana, it is important to understand the context of the town in which it is situated and the history that resonates in that context. The town of Turrialba lies about halfway between San José and Limon straddling United Fruit Company mogul Marcelo Keith’s now defunct railroad track, that for nearly a century was the main artery ensuring trade and providing work to the whole area. In the early 90’s President Jose Maria Figueres decided to stop funding the railroad and now only short stretches are still maintained for privately organized excursions. The closing of the railroad was the final blow to many of the towns in the Limon Province and the mountains between San José and the coast. Because of its location on the railroad line, Turrialba was a
pivotal city in the history of Costa Rica; it represented the physical point demarcating racial segregation in the country – Costa Rica’s Mason-Dixon Line. Until 1949, after the Costa Rican revolution when President Pepe Figueres (Jose Maria Figueres’ father) abolished it, there was a strictly enforced law prohibiting people of Afrocaribbean descent from passing Turrialba and crossing into the Central Valley. Since these descendents of Jamaican slaves speak a variation of English, this creates another source of ambivalence for Hispanic Costa Ricans toward English.

Turrialba, a close-knit community of approximately 100,000, was a pivotal stop on the railroad line nestled in the central mountain range of Costa Rica between the high central valley, where the capital city of San José can be found, and the Atlantic Coast. For the last 100 years or so, the economy of Turrialba has been driven by agriculture, mostly coffee and sugarcane, and the railroad ensured that these commodities reached national and international markets. But in recent years these activities have been overtaken in economic importance by industry and ecotourism. Turrialba’s Rawlings baseball factory manufactures the baseballs used by the US major leagues and a nearby Conair factory produces small appliances for export.\footnote{Due to trade agreements, all of the products manufactured in most foreign-owned factories are shipped out of the country, so the workers cannot even buy what they make.}

Also, as is true for Costa Rica in general, ecotourism has become key to Turrialba’s economy. Recent studies report that tourism has overtaken coffee and bananas as the most important source of GNP in Costa Rica. This is largely due to the global interest in ecology and the preservation of biodiversity. Costa Rica (which was ignored by the Spaniards because it didn’t have the wealth of minerals) has in the last 15 years attracted a great deal of international attention for its variety of ecosystems and biodiversity. Turrialba has become the vacation destination for world-class kayakers and rafters because of its proximity to the Reventazon and Pacuare Rivers that boast class 4 and 5 rapids and arguably some of the most biologically diverse
and beautiful tropical scenery in the world. Turrialba is also the closest city to the Guayabo National Monument, the largest excavated Precolumbian archaeological site preserved by the National Parks Service and the National Museum.

As a result of the growth in tourism, the area has developed the concomitant cadre of tour companies, souvenir stores and small hotels catering to tourists. Ironically, in an effort to meet rising demand for electric power, the Costa Rican national power company ICE completed construction of a hydroelectric plant damming the Reventazon River in 2002 in spite of heated protests and published ecological studies indicating that the area flooded by the dam would include several unique microecosystems that provided habitats for an unknown number of plants and animal species.

CATIE and the Price of AID

Another important institution in the area is CATIE (the Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education Center), as much for the approximately 400 local people it employs, as for the international attention it attracts due to its research, education and outreach activities in the region. CATIE was founded in 1948 at the initiative of US Vice President Henry Wallace, whose name still adorns the Center’s main building, under an agreement between Costa Rica and the United States government. The land for CATIE (then known as IICA) was donated by the Costa Rican government and the construction of the facilities was financed by the U.S. government. The purpose of the institution was to research best agricultural practices in the cultivation of bananas and coffee (largely to the benefit of U.S. business interests). Nevertheless, for over 50 years the Center has been at the forefront of tropical agricultural research and teaching in Latin
America and has benefited from funding by international development agencies such as USAID (United States), GTZ (Germany) and Danida (Denmark).

The financial and political influence of the United States and Europe can be seen reflected in the fabric of the institution, but the social dichotomy this influence provokes is perhaps most marked in the stratification of the institution’s employees and reflects the same social power structure as was evident in the institutional organization of the United Fruit Company; the support staff – secretaries, security guards, groundskeepers etc. – are exclusively Costa Ricans that live in the surrounding area, while the vast majority of scientists, administrators and high-level technicians working at CATIE through the years have been Americans and Europeans who arrive at CATIE with short-term contracts (2 to 4 years) and live on the CATIE compound with their families.

In recent years English has become the lingua franca of science the world over, and agriculture is no exception. All “serious” papers are published in English and international funding agencies that finance CATIE’s activities (including those from Denmark, Germany and Finland) require semester reports to be translated into English. This phenomenon has impacted CATIE tremendously. So while Spanish is the most commonly spoken language at the Center, English language skills are understandably coveted. Still, staff attitudes toward English are ambivalent. The issue of English came to a head in 1995, when the then Director, Ruben Guevarra, officially declared CATIE a bilingual institution and set the goal of requiring all the Center’s employees to know English before the year 2004. This ambitious aim sent ripples of resentment and fear through the Costa Rican staff because it represented a real risk to their job security and an upset to the existing social structure. The decision challenged the uneasy truce between the Costa Rican employees and the foreign scientists, and shifted the use of English
further along the continuum from a practical to a political choice. These two attitudes are reflected in the code-switching patterns evident among the institution’s professional and support staff.

Code-switching has always been present at CATIE, particularly where jargon and scientific language is concerned, however, it is often difficult to determine if the instances are code-switching or borrowings. For example, both nouns and verbs such as check, monitor and pesticide, have been wholesale borrowed into the institution’s Spanish lexicon with morphological and phonological changes to create new words like: chequear, monitorear, and las pesticidas. These words and others like them have been fully assimilated into the common CATIE lexicon. Tag-switching, intersentential and intrasentential switching are all common. Perhaps the most common and easily identified examples are tag-switching. Some more frequently inserted tag-switched are: pues, bueno or entonces. They are used predominantly as fillers, or introductions to speech or a change of topic. The following are examples of how these tags are used.

Bueno, I suppose we should get started now.
[Well]

Which are better? Pues, these had better results in the trials.
[Well]

Interestingly, these kinds of tags appear to be used as frequently by native English speakers as they are by native Spanish speakers. Another interesting tag-switch example is the use of the clarifying yes? inserted where monolingual English speakers would use isn’t it? or didn’t you? Examples such as, “You are going with me, yes?” or, “The report got in on time, yes?” are common. What is interesting about this code-switching is that neither English nor Spanish monolinguals would use this form. A native Spanish speaker would not say ¿sí? but ¿no? as a
tag so the first example above would be “Vas conmigo, ¿no?” and a monolingual speaker of English would use neither yes? nor no? as a tag but a variety of the negative tag questions as indicated above.

**Escuela Interamericana: School Between the Americas**

The CATIE bilingual school, the *Escuela Interamericana*, was founded to serve the “high-level” employees’ families living on the institutional compound *not* the children of the local support staff. This was not a product of open segregation, however, economic and social constraints constructed barriers which prevented most locals from being able to (or thinking they could) attend. And therefore, for the first 45 years, the school’s student body was composed primarily of non-Costa Ricans – both native and non-native speakers of Spanish – and because the students’ parents were there on limited contracts, the institution saw a high level of student turnover. However, beginning with USAID’s exiting Costa Rica in 1993 and withdrawing its support of CATIE, the institution has experienced a slow though steady decline in the amount of foreign funding it receives and as a result, the number of non-Costa Ricans living and working on its vast campus has also declined. This change in CATIE’s demographics has precipitated a dramatic shift in the school’s composition. For the first time since the school’s inception, to avoid having to close its doors due to lack of students, the school has begun actively marketing to local families. As a result, the current makeup of the student body is about 80% Turrialbans, and 20% children of students at CATIE’s graduate school. In spite of this recent opening to the general Turrialban community, CATIE continues to be seen by locals as an exclusive club, whose access is limited to the elite (now local as well as foreign).
This perception is due to another real limiting factor: the cost of tuition. CATIE’s *Escuela Interamericana* is by far the most expensive private elementary school in the area, costing 63,000 colones per month in 2003 (about $140), plus fees, books and uniforms, in an area where the average monthly family income is approximately 200,000 colones (about $450). So only the very wealthy can afford to send their children to the school. Also, although all Costa Rican public schools are mandated to offer instruction in basic English from k-11 and there are 3 other private schools that offer “bilingual education” in the area, the *Escuela Interamericana* is the only institution that offers fully half of its instruction in English (math and science as well as English) taught by qualified teachers who are native speakers of English.

In a questionnaire given by the school at enrollment, the most common reason parents cited as to why they send their children to the *Escuela Interamericana* is that they want them to become proficient in English\(^8\). Having said that, and understandably given the history, there is still a great deal of resistance to English and confusion about what the process of learning English might mean to their children. Most parents do not speak any English and so cannot help their children with their homework. Moreover, sometimes parents express concern over not being able to understand their children as they become more proficient in English. Others express some conflicting feelings about their children *tirandose para arriba* - becoming “stuck up” - as they learn English and “forgetting” who they are and where they came from. And this is not surprising given the visible separation between the city of Turrialba, where “regular” Turrialbans live, and the CATIE campus.

---

\(^8\) It is perhaps interesting to note that the *Escuela Interamericana* (Interamerican School) which is widely perceived as offering the best English education in the area alludes to the relationship between the Americas in its name while the only other school to offer English taught by native speakers is named the *Escuela Jorge Debravo* after a famous Turrialban poet.
What English gets Entextualized into Student Talk

The students at the Escuela Interamericana are exposed to English through class texts, teacher talk, television and popular music, but as described above, much of the English that they hear is imbedded in the context of commercial interest and surrounded by general cultural ambivalence toward the language. So how do texts with greater cultural resonance become entextualized and recontextualized into the students’ speech and become part of the classroom context at this particular school?

There is evidence in the students’ discourse of their exposure to American popular culture and to their attitudes about it. One of the main sources of this exposure is television. Turrialba has had access to cable television for about the last 10 years. In 2003-2004, Amnet Cable Company offered 40 channels in their basic cable package including the 5 national channels (which Costa Ricans remark that they watch less and less) plus 39 channels from the US including Warner, Disney, Sony, TNT, TBS, Turner Classic Movies, HBO and Showtime. Many of these channels offer reruns of syndicated programs like Walker Texas Ranger and Bay Watch dubbed in Spanish, but most first run movies and current series are telecast in English with Spanish subtitles. In spite of the cost (basic cable cost about $20 per month) only two children in my 4th, 5th and 6th grade classes did not have cable and they were the children of CATIE graduate students.

In the following excerpt, Marcia, Jesus Maria and Gerardo in 6th grade are preparing their Weekend Review questions. Marcia asks Jesus Maria and Gerardo if they had watched channel 27 (the Warner Channel) over the weekend. Jesus Maria says that he had, and that he watched the show 24 (on Fox Channel). Gerardo answers that he does not watch Warner Channel because it’s “una cochinada [crap]”. Jesus Maria then backpeddles from his statement of affirmation that
he watches Warner Channel by asserting that 24 at 9 o’clock was better. Marcia then tries to reintegrate herself into the group by stating that she has seen 24 as well.

Later after the game has started, in line 1 Marcia asks her group’s question about who hadn’t watched channel 27. Silvio, who is on the other team guesses excitedly that Marcia had watched “Joey”, she evades the tactic by asserting that they show the program on another channel. When the other team guesses incorrectly that it was Jesus Maria, Gerardo was the only one on the team who had not watched channel 27, the discussion disolves into what programs the students watch and like. Lines 19-23 are comprised of Jesus Maria and Gerardo confirming that 24 on Fox is the best and Marcia discussing with Veronica (her comments are not heard on the tape) which characters on the OC she likes and dislikes.
It is clear from the interaction that the students are not only talking about what they watched over the weekends but voicing their likes and dislikes in order to construct social bonds. Warner Channel is popular among the girls but generally not watched by the boys because it carries romantic dramas like the OC and light comedies like Joey. Fox Channel on the other hand was more popular among the boys because its series included more “manly” shows like 24 and Angel. Even though they are talking in Spanish about the shows, it is important to note that all these shows were telecast in English with Spanish subtitles; therefore, in watching them, they are being exposed to English language (as spoken on American television) as well as American pop culture and these have become part of their repertoire.

This repertoire is used and drawn upon to attach meaning to unknown vocabulary and unclear concepts in English. In Excerpt 3, the fourth graders were doing a vocabulary exercise where they had to find groups of rhyming words. Marcia and Susana were working together and they came up with “cog” as a word that rhymed with “dog” and “fog”, however they are unsure if this is actually a word in English so they ask me. In line 2, I draw them a picture and tell them
that a cog is a circular piece in a watch. In lines 3 and 4, the girls apply what they know from arcade games with iconic American cartoon characters in American fast food chains to understand the vocabulary word.

Transcription Excerpt 3-3
Tape 4-12.B:345
1 Marcia: Cog? Teacher, cog exists?
2 Paula: Cog? Yes. May I write on here? Actually, I’m gonna use your pencil. A cog- where is it- a cog is like in a circle-in a watch. Have you ever seen in a – machine and it has two of them that = go together-
3 Marcia: Ah like in Bugs Bunny – in Bugs Bunny you have the tiempo you have to incorp this and they valer 5 colones (pronounced with Spanish phonetics). [cost 5 colones]
4 Susana: Ah in Kentucky, of Multiplaza they have one for the little ones to play to move it and move it and move it.

KFC is commonly called “Kentucky” in Costa Rica and this particular restaurant is at the Multiplaza Mall (replete with such stores as GAP and Express). The KFC at Multiplaza has an arcade with games for small children that have large, colorful, exposed cogs. The fact that the children would reference this to ground the meaning of “cog” is particularly interesting because cogs exist within “Costa Rican” background knowledge, but the children are using the background knowledge they have from “American” contexts to understand English vocabulary.

In the previous case, the students use their knowledge of American culture to ground what they are learning about English. But there are many cases where they recontextualize an entextualization to make a point. In the following short transcript, Soledad and Marcia begin singing the Queen song “We are the Champions” at the end of the Weekend Review after they had won the weekly contest. This is significant because the song fragment is recontextualized and given new meaning in this context.
Nevertheless, sometimes the entextualization process can be traced back several steps. In the following excerpt, I had set up the video camera in the 5th grade to film the Weekend Review and had focused the camera on one group to start with. In line 1 Lidia says it isn’t fair that the camera is only fixed on another group (she wanted to be filmed). I respond that she should not worry as I am going to move the camera so that I can film all the groups. As soon as I say don’t worry, Alvaro latches on and sings “Don’t worry use Huggies” to the tune of the Bobby McFerron song “Don’t Worry be Happy” which starts a chorus of the song by other group members.

The most interesting aspect of this passage is that while Alvaro is singing the tune of the Bobby McFerron song “Don’t Worry be Happy”, he is singing the string of text that had been entextualized, adapted and recontextualized into a Huggies diaper commercial popular on the television at that time. While I am aware of the layered entextualization, it is likely that he and his classmates are not. Nevertheless, Alvaro’s lifting of the diaper jingle and singing it to Lidia casts her concern about not being taped in relief against the worry one might feel about a leaky diaper which may explain Lidia’s exasperated response in line 5.

The students frequently insert entextualized pieces of songs or jingles into their speech and change them according to the situation. Sometimes as in the previous passage this is
triggered by the words said in a previous turn, sometimes it is triggered by the rhythm or sound of the words, or the concept being discussed. In the following excerpt, Carlo has said a bad word and is concerned that it is on the tape. In line 1 Rajit suggests that they rewind the tape to see if Carlo “said that thing”. The sound and rhythm of the phrase triggers Rajit’s next turn when he begins to sing “Said that thing, yeah. Wanna, wanna shake that thing,” to the tune of a popular reggaetón song.

Transcription Excerpt 3-6
Tape 5-8:320
1  Rajit: We have to rewind it to see if Carlo said that thing
2  Carlo: Ah, come on!
3  Rajit: (singing to the tune of the reggaetón song “Shake that Thing”) Said that thing, yeah wanna, wanna shake that thing.
4  Carlo: I said a bad word. Can I turn it off?

Reggaetón is a cross between Latin dance music, Jamaican reggae and hip hop that originated in Panama and developed in the Caribbean and has become immensely popular in Costa Rica in the last 10 years. Almost all reggaetón is sung in Spanish, however, because of the influence of hip hop and Jamaican reggae the lyrics often mix English words or phrases. In this case the rhythm of the song sounds almost taunting, which is particularly fitting considering Rajit’s reaction to Carlo’s obvious discomfort about having just been recorded saying a bad word on his teacher’s tape-recorder.

In the following passage, Abby and Lidia in 5th grade are answering discussion questions about an excerpt in their readers from a novel called Cheating. They have been procrastinating and I have already asked them twice to get to work. In line 1, Abby says “We need to write, tra la la la la la” which triggers Lidia’s launching in to a rendition of Billy Joel’s song “Uptown Girls”. Abby joins in but they do not get past the first line because they don’t know the rest of the lyrics.
Abby: We need to write, tra la la la la la
Lidia: (singing to the tune of Billy Joel’s “Uptown Girls”) Up town girls you’ve been livin’ in a
Abby: you’ve been livin’ in a (garbled words/laughter)

What is curious about this case of entextualization is that the trigger – Abby’s tra la la la la is not sung but merely said to the beat of the phrase “you’ve been livin’ in a” in the song, but that is enough to start it off.

At times the entextualized text does not even comprise words, but still references a concept that the speaker wishes to recontextualize. In the following passage, the 4th graders are reading a story called “If you Say so, Claude” by Joan Lowry Nixon which is about a frontier couple who are trying to find the perfect place to homestead. The story is set in the desert of the American southwest. It should be noted that Costa Rica is a tropical country that gets more than 2 meters of rain per year in many areas so for most of these children, their only exposure to deserts has been through the movies and on the Discovery Channel. In Excerpt 8 Marcia is trying to keep the group on task discussing the setting of the story, but Diana, in a seemingly off-task and distracting action begins humming. What is interesting is that she is humming the theme song from the Clint Eastwood western, The Good the Bad and the Ugly. When Marcia tries to get back on task in line 2 and discuss the setting of the story, Diana responds as if she hasn’t heard and doesn’t understand – but she is just playing. This is evidenced by the fact that she repeats “what” six times. That she is not confused by the question is made clear by the fact that she has been singing a song from a classic movie set in the desert.

Diana: (humming the theme from The Good the Bad and the Ugly) Do do do do do, da da da- do do do do do, da da da
Marcia: They were in Texas desert
What is most interesting to me about this excerpt is that Diana chooses the theme song from an iconically American western to reference the desert, rather than something out of the plethora of Mexican movies which are often shown on the Costa Rican national stations. Although María José laughingly tells Diana to stop, later in the tape, the whole group begins humming the song and laughing. Without having to discuss its reference, Diana’s trope was successful and the entextualized text was recognized and taken up by everyone in her group.

The following excerpt shows how entextualized text is sometimes taken up and played with consciously to fit new circumstances, while still remaining recognizable and maintaining resonances from previous contexts. In the following passage, the fourth graders and I were going over their vocabulary lists from the readings. When I ask the class in line 1 if anyone remembers what the word “steep” means, Marcia hits upon a musical mnemonic device to help her remember the meaning of the word. When we had first talked about the word steep, I had said that the stairs in the main building were steep to give the students a familiar reference point. So referring back to that reference, Marcia begins singing the tune of Billy Joel’s “In the Middle of the Night” but changes it to “in the middle of the stairs”. Then she modifies it changing middle to the adjective “high” and then finally to the noun “top” and sings the newly (re)contextualized song to help her remember the word meaning.

Transcription Excerpt 3-9
Tape 4-12.A:151
1 Paula: Okay, does anybody remember what steep is?
2 Marcia: Teacher like this, (singing to the tune of Billy Joel’s “In the middle of the night”) In the middle of the =
2 Diana: =House?
3 Marcia: no, no, Teacher, In the middle of the stairs
4 Paula: Yeah!
4 Marcia: (singing to the tune of Billy Joel’s “In the middle of the night”)
Marcia’s conscious and creative recontextualization of the song with the intention of referencing the meaning of a vocabulary word is wholly her own. She did it spontaneously, just as Diana began singing the theme to a movie set in the desert when they were reading and talking about a story set in the desert.

**Conclusions**

It is interesting that in the English tasks, only English jingles or songs came out. It would be spurious to conclude that the children have no access to Spanish texts that would fit equally well in these moments of discourse because of the children’s background. Rather it must be concluded that these English texts are triggered in these cases in spite of “Spanish” background knowledge that could be drawn upon.

There is no evidence of resistance or ambivalence toward the popular culture because of their association with the United States or English in the children’s discourse. If anything, knowledge of and a taste for “all things American” is displayed as something to be admired. All overt entextualized references on the tapes to American pop culture was positively framed, with the exception of Gerardo’s emphatically stated dislike for the Warner Channel in Excerpt 1 which may be more of an issue of gender construction and Gerardo’s attempt to align with the “guys” and not the “girls” who watch sappy programs like the *OC*. In that respect it is interesting
that many of the songs recontextualized are by artists like Billy Joel that in the United States would not necessarily be considered in vogue by adolescents.

It is interesting that in order for the recontextualization of entextualized texts to work – that is for the other students to understand the reference and make sense of the meaning in the new context - the texts have to be familiar to the other participants. It is clear from the fact that the other children frequently join in (as in the case of most of the songs) that these English texts from popular culture are well-known enough to form part of the children’s linguistic and social resources. These entextualizations are clear evidence of the conceptual connections the students are making between what they know about English through popular culture and what they are learning in class. This should be an indicator that teachers should carefully examine the context of what might at first glance look like distracting or off task discourse to determine if it is not really a creative recontextualization of a piece of background knowledge the students can use to anchor their understanding of the present context.
CHAPTER 4

INDIVIDUAL AGENCY AND ROLE CONSTRUCTION IN INTERACTION

Chapter Summary

This data analysis chapter delves into how the students at an elite bilingual school in Costa Rica use language choice as a tool of individual agency to construct their own identities: that is to say, how different children use English and Spanish to construct roles in interaction. I have identified three participant roles: mediator, model student and compañero and examine how the students go about “doing being” those roles – co-constructing them in interaction. I analyze participant constellations (who’s talking to whom, what they are talking about and how). I have paid particular attention to topic as well as pragmatic function of L1 and L2 use (i.e. exclamations, commentary, asides etc.), borrowing from the theoretical frameworks for code-switching analysis pioneered by Fishman (1972) and Gumperz (1981), and Goffman’s (1981) formulation of roles within participant frameworks. I have also focused on language in sequence, i.e. which language is used in the turn before or after, insofar as that affects identity negotiation. I have also used the conversation analysis techniques to analyze code-switching developed by Peter Auer (2001).

Context: On the Way to School

Each morning driving down the windy narrow roads to school, with the jagged sentinel of the Turrialba Volcano guarding my back, I drive through the city of Turrialba to get to the lush valley floor. Turrialba, situated on the Atlantic slope of Costa Rica, is a closely populated jumble
of brightly painted houses and businesses built seemingly one on top of the other. No attention seems to have been paid to building codes or architectural plans; jagged awnings jut out at forehead height and room additions called palomares (dovecots) perch precariously atop rusty tin roofs. The city is a chaotic mosaic of color and sound and movement. The pungent smell of rotting garbage and bus exhaust mingles with the heady scent of ripe fruit and ever-present flowers. The contrasts are striking where a bright pink newly-painted storefront might butt up against a wooden shack that appears to be still standing only because it is held up by the buildings pressed up tightly next to it on either side.

On the main thoroughfares downtown, people walk and stop to chat in front of shops with Latin dance music blaring (all on different stations). Bright red taxis swerve to pass ancient busses, and 25-year-old flatbed trucks with canvas and plastic covers held up by wooden slats rumble by filled to overflowing with coffee or sugarcane or occasionally cattle. But then, as if a line has been drawn by an invisible hand, the city stops and the well-manicured lawns and experimental farms of CATIE (the Center for Tropical Agricultural Research and Education) begin. The visual assault of color is still present but now created by the brilliant riot of pinks, reds and corals of wild impatiens and bougainvillea juxtaposed against the bold, waxy greens of cane and coffee. Threads of cottony clouds are strung like Christmas garlands on the surrounding mountains, and white flocks of herons fly in arrow formation following the course of the Reventazon River in search of breakfast before the sun climbs too high over the mountain range and the heat and humidity of the valley’s bowl become oppressive.

The entrance to CATIE is marked by a white gatehouse with a red, tiled roof and a simple post across the road barring indiscriminatant entry. Like everyone else in town, I am aware that even if I didn’t know the particular guard on duty, my white face and light eyes would buy my
admittance to the compound with little or no questioning while any local (my husband included on several occasions) would be questioned, asked to surrender his or her identification and even turned back. The roads through the compound are just as narrow as the roads in town, but they are well paved and smoothly graded and wind through a tranquilly landscaped “neighborhood” of identical whitewashed stucco and clapboard houses separated by sloping lawns and precisely landscaped gardens. The only sounds come from the birds roosting in the bamboo stands that line the lagoon and the side of the road and the distant rush of water from the Reventazon River that crashes along the valley floor. The contrast between the city and the campus is striking.

The gravel of the small, sloped parking area outside the school crunches under my car tires and I park under an enormous ficus tree literally covered with orchids and other epiphytic plants. My ’83 Honda looks small and out of place between the late model 4-Runners and Land Rovers that the children’s parents drive. The bell rings (just a regular old-fashioned school bell with a cord to pull the clapper) and the children rush to line up outside their classrooms. The long string of classrooms is organized in an “L” shape with 1st and 2nd grades on one wing and 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th on the other. The classroom doors open to the outdoors and a covered walkway runs alongside the classrooms connecting them all. A large open-air, covered pavilion serves as both a gym and as an auditorium for school assemblies, presentations, and meetings. The grounds around the school are as lush as the rest of the compound and giant old trees shade the playgrounds.

Children from my first class meet me at my car, “Let me help you teacher”, “May I open the door?” The children dressed in starched blue and gray uniforms (all Costa Rican students are required to wear uniforms) are lined up outside the door in ragged formation carrying heavy backpacks. The class-sizes are small – only 9-15 students – and in spite of the uniforms, the
classroom atmosphere is relaxed and informal. Fluorescent lights and a fan hang from the ceiling but neither is used very often because of the natural light and cross ventilation provided by the screens which run the length of the room (there are no glass windows). The children drop their bags on the spotlessly waxed, red cement floor and settle into their shiny, varnished wooden desks and chairs lined up in three neat rows. But Monday mornings are when we do the Weekend Review, and so the children fidget anxiously, waiting to be numbered off and divided into groups.

During the year that I was teaching at the *Escuela Interamericana* and teaching English language arts, reading and writing to 4th, 5th and 6th graders, the Weekend Review was the weekly opportunity for every child to tell the rest of the class what he or she had done over the weekend. Each child narrated to his teammates what he had done and composed questions to stump the children on the other teams. The groups changed every week and therefore the interaction among children was always dynamic, and the individual roles each of them constructed within interactions changed across groupings and emerged in the children’s code choices.

“Investment” and the Role of Social Context in SLA Research

The sociocultural theoretical framework assumes that language is socially constructed in a complex, interactive, context-specific process where what and how people learn and how they understand what they learn is determined by that context and in turn helps to construct that context. Unlike the Universal Grammar and cognitive approaches to second language acquisition which hope to find the common denominators among all learners and determine the overarching processes that go on within the brains of all individuals, the sociocultural approach views each
individual, and therefore his or her learning process, as unique and in no small part influenced by his or her surroundings (as indicated in Chapter 3, this context can extend to the scale of global capitalism and the associated sponsorship entailed in local language practices). From this perspective, language is culturally and contextually specific, and thus, language acquisition (whether first, second or otherwise) is a dynamic process of interactive, dialogic communication among members of a speech community, where that community constructs language meaning and the social identity of each individual member is not static but fluid and constantly being constructed and (re)constructed through collaborative processes.

However, much traditional SLA research has neglected to look at issues of identity and how they might affect language learning or use and how language use contributes to the construction of identity or the forging of group membership. While language use is not the only factor that plays a part in identity construction or group membership (other factors include ethnicity, gender, age, economic status, class etc.), the relationship between language and identity is reflexive, not causal. That is to say, language use and meaning are shaped by who is speaking and their ascribed identity within a speech community, but at the same time, language use is also a key factor in shaping the social identity of the speaker. Thus, identity and language use cannot be divested from one another. Concomitantly, each member of a speech community plays an agentive role in his or her own identity construction process and that is played out in his or her code choices, and by means of collaborative interaction with the other members of his or her community.

The idea of agency has been troubled even within the sociocultural perspective toward linguistic analysis, in part because agency has been tangled with the concept of motivation. It is often assumed that motivation plays a large part in the language acquisition process, and that if
an individual does not or “cannot” progress, it must be due, in part, to a lack of motivation. Therefore, an unsuccessful learner is often blamed for his or her lack of progress or “unwillingness” to speak in the L2; i.e. she does not speak because she is not motivated (and lack of motivation is a character flaw). However, if the issue of individual agency cannot be divorced from the context surrounding it, perhaps then, motivation is as much an effect of the socio-political context in which an individual learner finds herself, as it is a question of personality and individual desire.

Pierce (1995) expands the notion of motivation to encompass the effect that social context may have on a student’s desire to learn. She argues that instead of talking about motivation, we should discuss learner “investment”, where investment comprehends the influence of external factors on a learner’s willingness to risk interaction and any subsequent use of the L2. Pierce (1995) introduces the idea of investment in her attempt to construct a theory of social identity when she argues that language is “constitutive of and constituted by a language learner’s social identity” (13) and that identity is complex, even contradictory and in flux. She identifies learner “investment” as “cultural capital” and asserts that learners may feel ambivalence toward learning language in a given context, but if they choose to “invest” in a second language, only if they feel that by doing so they will be able to, “acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources which in turn will increase the value of their cultural capital.” (17) Therefore, many L2 learners will not risk learning if they feel that it is not worth the investment of energy, prestige or identity.

McKay and Wong (1996) take up Pierce’s concept of learner investment combined with the idea of agency and they apply them to the examination of language learner strategies. They agree that language learners’ lives are integral to their learning process, but they suggest that
agency and identity are the goals rather than the investment in the L2 itself. They suggest that learners are extremely complex social beings and that they “conduct delicate social negotiations to fashion viable identities” (603). As a consequence, if the learner wishes to “take on” the identity that the L2 represents for them they will invest in it, but only as long as this identity is viable within their social sphere. However, these identities are often contradictory and resist being “positioned”. As a result, the strategies that work for one student will not necessarily work for another, or even for the same student at a different place and time. At the same time, what constitutes cultural capital for one individual might not for another, depending on their goals of social acceptance and interaction. Though it may be counterintuitive for middle-class white teachers who speak Standard American English, becoming a speaker of Standard American English may not be a goal to which all individuals aspire – for reasons of identity.

Ibrahim (1999) argues that learning an L2 is a challenge to an individual’s identity because it can stretch the boundaries of who he perceives himself to be and how those around him perceive him. This conclusion helps to explain why some of the Black Africans in Ibrahim’s study who had immigrated to Canada chose to adopt a marginalized linguistic variety of English as their own; they identified with the speech community that uses it. Kinginger (2000) puts forth the idea that language can only be learned through practice within the appropriate social context. She stresses that language learning, like all learning, involves issues of face and that to maintain face language learners must balance involvement and independence within the framework of power which for her is manifested in the distance between the social statuses of the participants in a hierarchical structure. She concludes that interaction with peers may do much to breakdown social power structures common to classrooms and thereby facilitate the learning of language pragmatics and encouraging students to “claim the right to speak” (Pierce, 1995) within and
outside the class. This latter aspect is of pivotal importance because language is not bound by the walls of the classroom but woven into the fabric of its socio-historical context.

**Agency within the Frame**

The social-historical context represents the blueprint of meaning in language use, which we read and build from as we learn to frame our experience. As Goffman argues (1974), “definitions of a situation are built up in accordance with principles of organization which govern events – at least social ones – and our subjective involvement in them; these principles are referred to as frames.” (p. 10-11) Moreover, frames provide background understanding for events that incorporate the will, aim and controlling effort of an individual (Goffman, 1974) – that is to say, her agency. Scollon and Scollon (1983) assert that from infancy we begin learning how to frame our experience through language. We divide it and categorize it, question it and create it so that we can interact as full participants in our culture, society and families. The frames we learn and construct are the warp and weft of the tapestry which comprises each society’s values and judgments about what is “right and wrong”, “polite and impolite”. These frames become what Andrews (2001) refers to as the “social paste” or “social covenant” that establishes the web of connections which form our social networks or communities. As Andrews claims: frames are a context of use.

Contextual frames remain relatively consistent in any given space and time (which is to say they change very slowly); however, the layered contexts of use that are present when one or more cultures overlap can cause confusion and sometimes conflict within and among individuals and groups. And this conflict of frames is no more poignantly felt than it is in language contact situations. In these linguistic borderlands, where two languages and cultures rub against one
another, what may be considered two distinct languages in monolingual settings (e.g. Spanish and English), form an amalgam which is a unique and whole mosaic comprised of a blended mixture of bits of each. The members of the bilingual community interact within this new framework where the two languages and their use become resources for meaning negotiation in the multiple contexts present – contexts which monolinguals familiar with only one of the “two” contributing languages can not fully understand because they only see part of the picture. Nevertheless, the language use patterns in language contact situations are not random, nor are they the same wherever the same contributing languages are present.

“Doing being a bilingual student” Escuela Interamericana style

When one talks about code-switching or code-choice, there is often the misconception that every time a person says anything, he or she makes a conscious choice about which “language” or register he or she will use. While there is a certain amount of consciousness involved, much of the “choice” is guided by the limits of the contextual frame within which the speaker is interacting. For example, the way individual speakers in the Escuela Interamericana speak with each other is bounded by their own and others’ patterns of language use in the local and more layered context of the school within the historical and social context of the surrounding area, town and region. In a constantly flowing dance of interaction, the students try on, shed and integrate identities or parts of identities in the form of roles established through patterned behavior. These roles are not concrete or static, but fluid and mutable and yet identifiable within the classroom context. For the purposes of this study, and to focus the analysis in this particular local context, I have categorized three roles the students “try on” as: 1) model student; 2) compañero and 3) mediator.
To define these terms I have isolated certain stereotypical characteristics that these titles connote. This does not mean that they are the only or even the most common connotation of these terms in contemporary American society and schools, however, I have tried to tease out what these categories mean in this Costa Rican school to these children. While the roles are separate, any given child might “try on” any or all of them at different times depending on the participant constellation, the topic and the speaker’s purpose. Nevertheless, while any child can try “doing being” any of the roles, because the process of constructing any of these roles is an interactive process, success requires not only the attempt on the part of the speaker to “do being” the role, but also the successful taking up of that attempt by the other interlocutors in the participant constellation.

At times a speaker might try to do being a particular role, but their topics are not taken up by the other speakers, they are not responded to, even after repeated attempts or they are actively mocked for trying. For example, if a speaker who is known by his peers to be an average student “tries on” the role of model student his attempt might backfire into his being made fun of for “putting on airs” or in his being ignored altogether. This indicates that agency is not the only factor necessary to achieve an identity. Because of the intersubjective nature of meaning and identity construction, the identity ascribed to an individual by the group can often be a powerful deterrent to that person’s attempts at trying on a new role.

*Doing being a “model student”* can be loosely identified as the role “played” by individuals when they: are on task, talking only about the current assignment, and in the case of this class, because it is an English language class, talking exclusively or almost exclusively in Standard English (SE). The model student is aligned with the teacher and accommodates his or her behavior and speech to what the teacher models and to what he or she perceives the teacher’s
wishes to be. Physically, the model student tends to bend over his or her own work or may often position his or her body toward the teacher rather than in toward the group so that he or she has the teacher in sight line. She or he reconstructs the traditional roles of student and teacher in the classroom. For this reason, the model student may call the other students to task and use code-switching as a functional means to underscore a point regarding the assignment or to emphasize meaning. For example, she might code-switch to Spanish even though the previous turns have all been in English, and even if her switch is unnecessary for reasons of understanding in order to emphasize the importance of what she is saying - to set it apart.

*Doing being a “mediator”* can be identified as the role “played” by an individual speaker when he: tries to resolve misunderstandings between classmates caused by language miscues or unequal competence in the L1 and L2; explains another student’s behavior or attitude to the teacher; attempts to persuade students to attend to the task; interpret unclear language or instructions for students or teachers. The mediator often code-switches back and forth fluidly between English and Spanish and repeats the same content in both languages or translating what someone else has said in order to make sure that everyone understands what is going on. Like his or her language moves back and forth between the two codes, physically, the mediator’s body tends to move back and forth between the different participants. That is, he or she will shift or “pivot” (Goffman, 1982) to face each of the participants in turn.

*Doing being a “compañero” (buddy or classmate)* can be identified as the role played by individuals when they: are talking off task in Spanish (or English) discussing topics external to the classroom or the assignment; using vernacular language in either L1 or L2; code-switch to make a commentary or exclamation when the commentary is not used as a means to explain or to scaffold. A compañero will also employ code-switching to accommodate to the other
interlocutors either in topic or language choice. This is particularly evident when a speaker code-switches in response to another speaker’s use of language in the previous turn. For example, speaker 1 is speaking in English but speaker 2 asks him a question in Spanish. A compañero would respond in Spanish in his next turn. I use the term compañero rather than buddy because it comes closer to encompassing the more comprehensive meaning of buddy/friend/classmate in this context. Physically the compañero will lean in close and often touch, slap or get into the space of the participant with which they are attempting to be a compañero.

Within the study participants and the conversations analyzed, no individual person can be identified as exemplifying any single role; their roles change depending on variables such as whom they are talking to and what they are talking about. Having said that, some students have the tendency to do one role more than others. This is due, in part, to their ascribed identities within the group. Additionally, the roles they do try “being” depend greatly on their personalities, e.g. a shy child is rarely seen trying on the role of compañero. The participants’ identities are fluid and emergent, however, there is evidence of patterns of language use which they employ to construct particular roles. Therefore, rather than focusing on the roles as iconic, in this analysis I analyze the patterns of language use of individual speakers and the varied and layered roles they undertake to construct within their interactions in the classroom.

Analyzing doing being a model student

Doing being a model student is not just a question of agency. In order to construct this role, there has to be complicity among all the participants. That is to say, the co-construction process requires that the other interlocutors be willing to “play along” in the construction of the
role for the other interlocutor, and their willingness to do so depends a great deal on how they perceive that person. For example, if someone is perceived as a “class clown” or not a serious student, any attempts he or she might make to do being a model student might be rejected by the other students.

In the following passage (Transcription Excerpt 10), Marcia, Jesus Maria and Raymundo Salas (he is known in school as “Salas” because there are two Raymundo’s) are working together in a group. Marcia is one of the most successful students in the class while Jesus Maria and Raymundo Salas are among the least successful (there was some question whether Salas would pass several of his classes). Jesus Maria, is a very bright boy, but a classic underachiever. He is known as a class clown and brags that he wants to be an automechanic and truck driver like his mother and grandfather. He and Salas are close friends and are counted among the school’s leading athletes. In this excerpt, the 6th graders were working in groups to find examples of figurative language in a story by Gary Salas called, “La Bamba”. They were instructed to write the examples in their books and then describe them with words or drawings.

Transcription Excerpt 4-1
Tape 6-15.B: 85
1 Jesus Maria: This one teacher, “he asked himself-
2 Paula: “Why did I raise my hand, he asked himself, but in his heart he knew the answer, he yearned for the limelight, he wanted applause as loud as a thunderstorm- and to hear his friends”=
3 Jesus Maria: okay
4 Marcia: =Is that a simile - or a metaphor
5 Paula: AS loud AS a thunderstorm, that is a simile
6 Jesus Maria: is a sssi…a simile, yeah
7 Paula: Yes, okay, so that you can write down in your book.
8 Jesus Maria: Teacher I have one dr/o/wing, Marcia one page please
9 Marcia: Dr/o/wing?
10 Jesus Maria: Yo quiero hacer el dr/o/wing [I want to do the drawing.]
11 Salas: No, Marcia
12 Jesus Maria: Salas, shut up.
13 Salas: eh!
14 Marcia: **Está muy arriba**  
[It's really high up]

15 Salas: Marcia, only Marcia

16 Jesus Maria: Shut up

17 Salas: because she is perfect.  
*(Pause of 25 seconds while Marcia draws a picture of Manuel)*

18 Marcia: **Parece playito pero no me importa.**  
[He looks like a fag but I don’t care]

19 Jesus Maria: Like Raymundo Salas.

20 Salas: Hmm.

In the excerpt Jesus Maria starts out trying to do being a *model student*. He speaks almost exclusively in English and is on task. In line 1, Jesus Maria has found an example of a simile (the first identified by his group) and calls Paula over to ask if he is correct. When Paula reads the passage, Jesus Maria says “okay” right after she reads the simile, effectively indicating that he knows what the simile is. Then Jesus Maria overlaps Paula when she is confirming that it is a simile in line 6 interjecting “is a sssii” and completes the word “simile” after Paula does. He has identified an example of figurative language which was a very difficult concept for the 6\(^{th}\) graders to learn and is following the assignment as a *model student*. What is curious is what happens immediately after that.

In line 8 Jesus Maria suggests that he has a drawing for the simile and asks Marcia for a piece of paper but Marcia shoots him down. Marcia is used to being looked up to as one of the academic leaders in the class and does not like being shown up by the class clown. So when Jesus Maria pronounces drawing, like “drowing” (rhymes with growing) she repeats the word mimicking him and thereby underscoring Jesus Maria’s nonstandard pronunciation. At this point Jesus Maria code-switches to Spanish to emphasie that he wants to do the drawing. That this code-switch is for emphasis and not an attempt to clarify is made apparent by the fact that he does not translate “drowing” nor does he change his pronunciation. Marcia ignores him and begins drawing but she does not have to respond because Salas affirms her reprobation of Jesus
Maria’s attempt at doing being a *model student* in line 9. Jesus Maria responds with “shut up” in lines 12 and 14 but Salas hammers in the last nail of the coffin of Jesus Maria’s attempt to do being a *model student* and so reaffirms Marcia’s role as *model student*, by responding in line 11 “Marcia, only Marcia” and then on his next turn, in line 13 by way of explanation, “because she is perfect”.

After Marcia has made the drawing, she comments in Spanish that the figure looks “like a fag” and Jesus Maria taking out some of his frustration from having been shot down, chimes in with “Like Raymundo Salas” in line 19. Interestingly, he uses Salas’s full name, not the nickname he is commonly called, like a parent or teacher might when they are angry, and he uses the English comparative “like” in spite of the fact that Marcia used the Spanish “parece” in the preceding turn. Both these factors underscore the fact that Jesus Maria believes he is still worthy of being considered a *model student* and he resents that his classmates do not help him co-construct that role.

The following passage, again with Marcia and Jesus Maria, illustrates another example of this type of interaction. The 6th graders were combining Latin and Greek prefixes and roots like electro, hydro, sub, marine, bio etc. to form words in English. Paula is walking around the room answering questions and verifying for the students if different root/prefix combinations are appropriate or not. Marcia, Silvio and Jesus Maria are working together to make their list. Among the three of them, Marcia is considered by her peers to be the best student, while Jesus Maria is considered to be a class clown and one of the “worst students”. These are roles that they actively cultivate and continuously construct. Jesus Maria is frequently given attention for “misbehaving” but not for being a “model student”. Therefore, when Jesus Maria tries to do the assignment and offers possible words, he is ignored. Ironically, Marcia offers suggestions to
Paula, and in three separate turns (lines 3, 8 and 11), Jesus Maria tries to call Marcia’s attention and repeatedly offers “hydroelectric” as an option. Nevertheless, his suggestion is not taken up by Paula until Marcia suggests it in line 16.

Transcription Excerpt 4-2
Tape 6-13.A: 78
1 Marcia: Electric current?
2 Paula: Yeah, but those are two separate words
3 Jesus Maria: Hydroelectric?
4 Marcia: Ah
5 Paula: That works, but…
6 Jesus Maria: How do I- How –
7 Paula: I’ll be right there-
8 Jesus Maria: Hydroelectric, Marcia. Hyd-
9 Marcia: Marine cycle
10 Paula: Also two separate words, but that works
11 Jesus Maria: Marcia, hydroelectric
12 Marcia: bio-ele, bioelectric works?
13 Paula: Bioelectric,
14 Silvio: **Electricidad de la vida**
[electricity of life]
15 Jesus Maria: Teacher, ah no, what is-
16 Marcia: -hydroelectric?
17 Paula: Absolutely.
18 Marcia: I don’t have it.
19 Jesus Maria: **Yo ya la tengo, Marcia!**
[I already have it, Marcia!]
20 Marcia: Where?
21 Jesus Maria: **Aquí véala.**
[Here, look at it.]
22 Marcia: *(laughs)*

Notice that when Marcia offers “hydroelectric” as a prefix-root combination, she does so with rising intonation, questioning it’s validity. However, when Paula confirms that it is a word she responds, “I don’t have it” in line 18 after checking her list. Although she says nothing directly, it could be inferred that she is still doubting how Jesus Maria could have the word if she does not. In the next turn Jesus Maria responds “I already have it, Marcia”. Jesus Maria’s code-switching to Spanish and his use of the explicit pronoun emphasize his frustration and
underscore the fact that he has the word while she does not. This is only made further emphatic when Marcia responds in English in line 20, “where?” and Jesus Maria responds, “Here, look at it”.

Marcia’s role of model student is played out by her constantly speaking only in English, addressing the teacher and ignoring the “bad student”. The irony is that the “bad student” had a correct answer that she did not have. Paula’s role in the co-construction of these roles is not irrelevant and cannot be overlooked. Jesus Maria does not initially address Paula, but tries to give his suggestion to his teammate, Marcia. However, when he does call for Paula, in line 15, she does not immediately answer him. Furthermore, she actively encourages Marcia’s ignoring Jesus Maria and her looking only to the teacher for answers by readily and continuously answering Marcia’s queries and by not insisting that the team work together to come up with answers.

So as can be seen in the above examples, the kinds of discourse that are available to some students are to a degree dependent on the expectations of the other interlocutors in the participant constellation. This can be seen in the following example of Abby in 5th grade. Although she is one of the best English speakers in the class, she most often speaks Spanish when speaking with the other girls, to accommodate and draw closer to them. But with the boys, who are very competitive, she has a tendency to speak in English all the time and use Spanish only as a means to underscore meaning or make side-long comments. Abby often tries on the role of model student, and when she is with the girls, her efforts are well-received as she is respected as a native speaker of English and a generally good student. However, her attempts to do being a model student are not readily accepted by the boys, especially Lorenzo, when she tries to indicate to them what they need to do. In the following passage, three 5th graders, Abby, Lorenzo and
Rajit are working together on a Weekend Review team and it is time for them to ask another team (the CALFs) a question. In line 1 Lorenzo asks me (Paula) how many questions each of them has to ask. Because I am helping another student, I do not answer immediately so Abby steps in as model student to answer his question. Lorenzo is a very competitive boy who has the one of the highest grade-point averages in the school. He thinks of himself as a good student and is constantly comparing his grades to those of the other students. In spite of the fact that Abby’s English is native-like, she is not a high achiever (in terms of grades) and so is not considered by Lorenzo as “worthy” of status as a model student and this is evidenced by his response to her when she tries to give him the answer to the question he posed to me.

Transcript Excerpt 4-3
Tape 5-2.B:62
1 Lorenzo: Okay, Teacher but how many-?
2 Abby: We each have 3
3 Lorenzo: Okay but
4 Abby: Esperen, vean, vean los números que le tocan a Ud.
[Wait, look you guys, look at the numbers that you have to do.]
5 Lorenzo: What, what?
6 Abby: Abajo! Lorenzo!
[Below!]
7 Lorenzo: Okay. Alright! Who played computer on Sunday?
8 Paula: Who played computer on Sunday?

Notice that at first Abby answers Lorenzo in English and Lorenzo does not take it up, he responds in Line 3 with “Okay, but…” indicating that her response is inadequate. Abby then code-switches to Spanish to get Lorenzo’s attention and further explain to him which questions he needed to ask the other team in the game. Her switch to Spanish is unnecessary for reasons of understanding, as Lorenzo is a very competent English speaker, however, Abby uses the code-switch to Spanish to underscore that she knows the answer and will show him. Nevertheless, after she explains in Spanish and indicates which questions he has to ask, he still does not take up her attempt to be the model student and responds to her in Line 5, in English, as if he doesn’t
understand her Spanish. She responds emphatically in Spanish in line 6 and finally, begrudgingly, he responds, in Line 7, “Okay, Alright!” and then asks the other team the question Abby had indicated to him.

As can be seen in Excerpts 10 and 11 this behavior of resisting or even mocking the speech of other students when they try on the role of *model student* is particularly marked when the target is not one of the best students. Interestingly, it doesn’t matter if the one doing the mocking is a “good student” or not. For example, none of the students in 4th grade would mock Marcia for doing being a model student but when María José tries it, Antonio mocks her in Spanish in response. Manuela is an average student but she tries extremely hard and applies herself diligently. Manuela is Jesus Maria’s younger sister and some of the attitudes held by her classmates about José Afredo affect how Manuela is perceived, particularly by the boys.

Manuela does not share her brother’s attitudes about education and admits that she wants to do well because of the enormous sacrifice that her mother has made for her and her brother to go to school. When she works she is very careful about how neat her papers are and making sure that everything is exactly as the teacher said it should be. In the following passage, Manuela, Roberto, Antonio and Susana are discussing where to write down the questions they have to compose for the Weekend Review. I had given them instructions that they should write all their questions on one portfolio sheet rather than doing it in their separate notebooks so that they could take out the single sheet of paper from the portfolio and hand it in to me after the exercise.

Transcription Excerpt 4-4
Tape 4-6.B:33
1 Antonio: I will write on my notebook.
2 Roberto: No, one piece of paper.
3 Antonio: One big for both?
4 Roberto: Yes, one big for both!
5 Antonio: No Maria.
6 Roberto: No, the other.
Manuela: It’s okay. One in the portfolio.

Roberto: No, one for all, because these pages are very big.

Susana: No, Maria. We are four, we divide one in two

Manuela: Sí ella dice con una entonces con una.
[If she says do it with one then it’s one]

Antonio: Ai, María se cabrió otra vez.
[Geez, Maria got ticked off again.]

In lines 1-4 Roberto and Antonio are arguing about where to write their questions and Manuela is quietly taking out a sheet from her portfolio to use, just as the teacher had said to. In line 5 Antonio sees what she is doing and tells her no, that she is doing it wrong. Manuela simply states “It’s okay, one from the portfolio”. But in line 8 Roberto disagrees with her saying that the portfolio sheets are too big. Finally when Susana chimes in, on line 9 with “we are four, we divide it in two,” Manuela who has been trying to take out one sheet from the portfolio as instructed, gets angry and snaps in Spanish on line 10 “If she says do it with one, then its one!”

Manuela’s irritated response in line 10 comes only after she has been trying to do what the teacher had asked them to do and the other members of her group have been arguing amongst themselves about what to do and then questioning her. Nevertheless, rather than recognizing that she is right, and doing as she has suggested, Antonio who has the highest grade point average in the class and is, therefore, seen as the “best student” teases her by commenting to the others in Spanish “Geez, Manuela got ticked off again” directing the attention away from what she has said to how she has said it, thereby implying that Manuela is overly sensitive, not that she is paying attention. Manuela is not allowed by the group to be the model student because they do not perceive her that way, especially when her doing being a model student would mean her being “better” than Antonio who has “proven” by his grades that he is the best student.

A similar dynamic exists among Rajit, Lorenzo and Carlo except that all three boys are among the most successful students in the class and their competitiveness leads them to
constantly try to outdo one another. Therefore, when any of them attempts to share his knowledge with one of the others and tries to do being the model student, the others deny the offered suggestion, or simply ignores it. In the following excerpt, Rajit, Carlo and Lorenzo are working together as a team to complete a grammar lesson - write 20 sentences using adverbs and adverbial phrases of time.

Transcription Excerpt 4-5
Tape 5-14.B:74
1  Rajit:   Eh Voy yo, voy yo emm-Today, tomorrow, yesterday...in a minute=
           [It’s my turn, it’s my turn]
2  Carlo:  In a minute--I’ll be back in 15 minutes.
3  Rajit:  Noooo
4  Carlo:  Porque no?
           [Why not?]
5  Rajit:  In a minute, I’ll be
6  Lorenzo:  -I’ll be back in 15 minutes
7  Rajit:  No
8  Lorenzo:  Yes
9  Rajit:  In a minute I will be the best Capoeira -- ha
10 Carlo:  In a minute, I will be the best Capoeirista. Ya, pongámolo
           [Capoeirist. Come on, let’s put that!]
11 Rajit:  Ya NO pongámolo. In a minute I will go watch TV.
           [No, let’s not put that]
12 Carlo:  Okay. (writing) In...a...minute..I will go..watch..to watch..television

It is Rajit’s turn and he is going through the adverbs of time they have already used (today, tomorrow, yesterday) and trying to come up with another one. When he hits upon “in a minute” in line 2 Carlo latches on and quickly suggests, “I’ll be back in 15 minutes” as a possible sentence. But Rajit emphatically rejects Carlo’s offering. When Carlo responds defensively in Spanish “Why not?” Rajit ignores him, not because Carlo’s suggestion is wrong or because he doesn’t understand him, but because he doesn’t want to do as Carlo says and thereby let Carlo be
the expert. This is made more clear when Lorenzo takes up Carlo’s offered sentence and puts it forth again but again Rajit rejects it. When Carlo finishes another of Rajit’s sentences for him in line 10 and comments, “come on let’s put that,” Rajit gets really irritated and snaps back at him.

The code-switching patterns in this passage are very interesting as they indicate the struggle for who will get to voice his authority through the writing of the list and thereby be the model student. Rajit begins by taking a stand in Spanish by repeating, “It’s my turn, it’s my turn” indicating that he wants the opportunity to show his ability and he will not give that up. Carlo code-switches to Spanish when he is challenging Rajit’s decision in line 4 and then when he is insisting that they write the sentence that he has completed for Rajit in line 10. Rajit code-switches to Spanish in line 11 in response to Carlo’s use of Spanish and to effectively squash his suggestion. He merely repeats exactly what Carlo had said and inserts the negation “NO”. He then gives his own complete answer and Carlo acquiesces but has the last word by changing Rajit’s TV to television as he writes the sentence on the list. This exchange also demonstrates that the use of code-switching to Spanish is an effective tool the children use to make metacommentaries on the task at hand.⁹

Just as sometimes an interlocutor’s attempts to do being a particular role are not successful because the other interlocutors do not accept the attempt, sometimes the other participants try to construct a role for a particular student that they do not want. In the following passage, ⁴th graders María José, Marcia, Diana, Benita and Yesenia are all working in the same group doing a reading comprehension activity. Diana and Benita were among the ⁴th grade students that struggle most with English, while Marcia and Yesenia excelled. The class often looked to Marcia as a model student and that perception led them to frequently ask for her help
and guidance. In Excerpt 4 María José is explaining to Diana what they have to include in their questions but she is not certain about their instructions.

Transcription Excerpt 4-6
Tape 4-16.A:245
1 María José: We have to put all these things.
2 Diana: What, all?
3 María José: yeah! THESE. Marcia we have to put all that things?
4 Marcia: I don’t know.
5 María José: MARCIA! It says here-
6 Marcia: WHAT?!
7 María José: Nothing.
8 Diana: What?
9 María José: Nothing (giggling)
10 Diana: Marcia, where, I don’t know
11 Manuela: Don’t ask Marcia, I-I am ask and the people don’t say to me
12 Marcia: UH! I have to see Diana and Benita, I – I can’t go with you, you can do – Benita, see here.

In line 3, María José asks Marcia to affirm that she is correct in what she has told Diana. Marcia is busy though and in line 4 tersely answers “I don’t know”. María José tries again in line 5 stressing Marcia’s name and Marcia responds angrily, “WHAT?!” At that point María José backs off giggling, but then when Diana tries to ask Marcia, she snipes in line 11 that Diana shouldn’t ask Marcia because she (María José) had and Marcia didn’t answer. Marcia then gets really frustrated and responds that she has to help both Benita and Diana she can’t help María José as well and besides, María José can do it herself. Marcia is doing being the model student by helping Benita and Diana, but there is a limit to what she is willing to do. She knows that María José can do it on her own and so is not even willing to answer her question about what they are doing.

9 This will be discussed more thoroughly in Chapter 5.
Sometimes when the other members of the group defer to a particular student as a model student they do not wish to take on that role, however, in some cases they abuse that deference. In Excerpt 5 which occurs a few minutes after Excerpt 1 in the same group, Jesus Maria tries to make concessions to Marcia and agrees that he will write for all of them while Marcia and Salas draw but Marcia laughs at him. He switches to Spanish but still has to ask her twice what color she wants him to use to write in her book and when she finally answers him, it’s to admonish him that he better not write messy.

Marcia’s admonishment and the fact that she does it in Spanish are not so much indicators that she does not believe that he can do the assignment well, but putting him in his place as “not as good as” her. It is important that this passage happened not long after Jesus Maria was praised by me for having found the first simile for the group. Marcia’s discourse is an attempt to reestablish the “normal” pecking order and to leave no doubt of who is the model student.

Analyzing doing being a mediator

Code-switching can be used as a means to attack the other interlocutor and attempt to do being a model student, but it can also be conciliatory and an attempt at doing being a mediator.
In the following excerpt, Abby attacks Lorenzo in Spanish when he gives the wrong answer but then when he snaps back at her, that she didn’t give the right answer either, she speaks in English to smooth the conflict over. In the following excerpt, Lorenzo, Abby and Rajit are working on a Weekend Review team and it’s toward the end of the game. Lorenzo has just answered “Ana” to the team MALA’s question and the answer is wrong. Abby immediately comments “I didn’t say Ana” indicating that she wasn’t to blame for the wrong answer, but Lorenzo responds that she had wanted to say Lourdes which was also wrong. Abby then switches to English and makes the comforting observation that regardless of the outcome of the next question, they will win. In so doing she changes the focal point of the discussion from who is to blame for the missed question to the fact that the team is going to win.

Transcription Excerpt 4-8
Tape 5-2.B:350
1 Lorenzo: Ana.
2 All MALA: NOOOOOO.
3 Abby: Yo no dije que Ana!
   [I didn’t say Ana!]
4 Rajit: No, no me duele la jupa!
   [No, no my head hurts!]
5 Lorenzo: No pero, usted me dijo que no. Usted-usted dijo que Lourdes.
   [No, but you told me no. You –you said Lourdes].
6 Abby: Okay, But if they, but if they get the point we win. And if we get the point we win too.

By switching to English when Lorenzo points out that she was also wrong, she does being a mediator by metaphorically pulling away from the conflict and turning Lorenzo’ attention to the fact that they are winning. Mediation is often about resolving conflict through changing the focus of the discourse, clarifying what is unclear and making sure that no one feels left out or embarrassed.
In the following passage, Marcelo, Antonio and Marcia in 4th grade are working together on a team and they are asking the other teams their questions about what they did over the weekend. In this excerpt, Marcelo asks his team’s question “Who knitted?” In the Weekend Review, the goal is to create questions about the team members’ weekend activities for which there is only one answer. That is if everyone on the team went to the pool, “Who went to the pool?” would not be a good question because there would be no way for the other team to get the answer wrong. Now, when Marcia was writing her team’s questions, she said that she had knit over the weekend and she asked Marcelo if he knew how to knit just to be sure. He had said no, that he didn’t know how.

Transcription Excerpt 4-9
Tape 4-15.A:279
1 Marcelo: Who knitted?
2 Diana: Que cosa? [What?]
3 Antonio: Who knitted?
4 Diana: Ay, mamá-Marcia. [Oh geez-]
5 Marcia: Yes.
6 Marcelo: No! mi papá me enseñó a coser. [No, my dad taught me how to sew.]
7 Marcia: Marcelo, you said that it was a broma. [joke]
8 Marcelo: Sí, pero no, no es broma. [Yeah, but it’s not. It’s not a joke]
9 Marcia: Aye, Marcelo [Aw, Marcelo.]
10 Antonio: Marcelo said - Now he said that he knit.
11 Paula: Did you knit this weekend?
12 Marcia: No, coser no es tejer. [No, sewing is not knitting.]
13 Antonio: Lo mismo, Marcia [It’s the same thing, Marcia]
14 Marcia: No. Uh, uh.
15 Marcelo: No.
16 Paula: Can you knit?
When Diana’s team guesses that Marcia knit (which is the correct answer giving them the point), Marcelo says no, that his father had taught him how to knit. This immediately causes a conflict within his team. Marcia gets cross not because of the points, as even if it were true that Marcelo had knit the other team would still get a point, but because Marcelo’s statement means that she had written a question for which there were two possible answers and this means that she who is so careful about being a *model student* did the assignment wrong. For Antonio, since no points are at stake, the most important thing is keeping the peace. Marcelo’s father makes backpacks and is teaching Marcelo how to sew. In line 12 Marcia tries to tell him that sewing and knitting are not the same. Antonio does being a *mediator* and tries to smooth things over between Marcelo and Marcia by interjecting that sewing and knitting are the same. Unfortunately, Marcia is adament about the distinction between the two. Marcelo is equally adament that his father can do both.

Perhaps most important to understanding Antonio’ role here, one must know that when this discourse was taped Marcelo’s father had just been released from prison, where he had been incarcerated for 8 of Marcelo’s 10 years. In spite of that fact, Marcelo believed absolutely in his father’s innocence and would defend him absolutely to the point of saying obviously ridiculous things. Antonio understands and knows that when it comes to his father, Marcelo is not rational.
So finally in line 21 Antonio says in Spanish, “It’s the same. You put in the needle and then back and forth back and forth,” effectively implying that in this case the distinction is not that great, thereby saving face for both Marcia, who can’t deny the truth of the description, and for Marcelo who does not have to admit that his father cannot knit.

Doing being a mediator does not always involve saving face or resolving conflict, however. Most of the time doing being a mediator consists of making sure that everyone at the table is on the same metaphoric page. In the following passage, Marcia, Marcelo and Antonio are working together on their Weekend Review questions. Marcia is writing and trying to find out if Marcelo gets the newspaper so they can use that as a question. Marcia asks Marcelo three times in English if he gets the newspaper. He answers her in English. But after the third time, before he can answer, Antonio does being the mediator by translating “newspaper” the word that he has guaged is causing the problem.

Transcription Excerpt 4-10
Tape 4-15.A:101
1  Marcia: Please put your name to your paper. You finished -ah one question, Marcelo come here. You get the newspaper?
2  Marcelo: Ah?
3  Marcia: You get the newspaper?
4  Marcelo: What?
5  Marcia: You get the newspaper?
6  Antonio: Periódico.
   [Newspaper.]
7  Marcelo: Periódico?
   [Newspaper?]  
8  Antonio: Sí.
   [Yes.]
9  Marcelo: Ah! No.
10 Antonio: Ponga periódico.
   [Put newspaper.]  

When Marcelo understands, Antonio tells Marcia in Spanish to “put newspaper” in the questions. Curiously he does not code-switch back to English when he tells Marcia. This could be because
the previous few turns have been in Spanish or because he is mediating for Marcelo and switching back for Marcia’s understanding is not necessary since she understands Spanish as well.

In the following passage, the 4th graders are doing an exercise trying to find rhyming words. This is particularly difficult for some of the students and they continue to make errors like rhyming “find” with “side”. Paula has explained that they have to find “word families” looking for words whose last two syllables rhyme, but she has not given them a practical strategy to do so and as a result, much of the students’ efforts are hit and miss. To facilitate the process for her groupmates, Marcia has devised a method to find rhyming words. When Manuela asks her how to do it, Marcia does being the mediator by explaining the task step by step in a way that the students can better understand.

Transcription Excerpt 4-11
Tape 4-12.B:316
1 Manuela: **Como es que se hace?**
[How do you do it?]
2 Marcia: **Hay que hacerlo para que se vea como el mio.**
[You have to do it so it looks like mine.]
3 Marcia: *(reading the letters in English)* A B C D E F G H I J– haga-
[Give a paper to Susana too.]

Notice that Marcia code-switches to Spanish to explain the task and then actually does the task reciting the letters’ names in English. This way she is making sure that the other students understand what it is to do but she is also effectively separating the metacommentary about the task from the task itself.
Analyzing doing being a compañero

If doing being a mediator is about accommodating for other interlocutors to smooth over conflict and ensure understanding of the academic concepts, doing being a compañero is about accommodating linguistically with the goal of forging and reinforcing social bonds. In the following excerpt, Diana’s team has asked, “who didn’t buy something?” Antonio suggests Yesenia, Marcia agrees and Marcelo finally states with rising intonation, Yesenia? Antonio says the name they have agreed upon and they win the question. Then in line 11 Marcelo implies that he had suggested the winning name and tries to garner praise from Antonio. Rather than correcting him and saying that in fact he, Antonio had made the suggestion, he constructs the role of compañero by responding in Spanish and tells him to “give him five”.

Transcription Excerpt 4-12
Tape 4-15.B:256
1 Diana: Who didn’t buy something?
2 Benita: Eh!... who didn’t buy something?
(overlapping whispering voices)
3 Antonio: I think Yesenia.
4 Marcia: mm-Yesenia
5 Marcelo: Yesenia?
6 Marcia: Yesenia
7 Antonio: Ya digo? .. Yesenia. [Should I say it?]
8 Diana: What?
9 Antonio: Yesenia.
10 Diana: Yes.
11 Marcelo: Mahe, yo le dije, vio. [Dude, I told you. Did you see?]
12 Antonio: Chóquela Mahe. [Give me five, Marcelo.]

It is significant that Antonio responds in the same language that Marcelo used, because that emphasizes his desire to accommodate Marcelo and do being a compañero. Most of the time, off task talk is a trigger to switch to Spanish.
In the following passage, Excerpt 11, Susana is discussing with her group what she did over the weekend so that they can make questions. In the middle of her telling, she begins to talk about the wake she attended at Marcelo’s grandmother’s house. Marcelo’s uncle had been shot and killed by police the week before and the wake had been over the weekend. As Susana begins to narrate what had happened at the wake, the focus of her discourse changes from one of recounting what she had done, to describing the details of a rather gruesome event that was of especially great interest to the class because Marcelo was their classmate. The shift in focus from an academic goal to an off-task goal is marked by her code-switch from English to Spanish.

Transcription Excerpt 4-13
Tape 4-6:A:112
1 Susana: I went to the vela at Marcelo’s grandmother’s. Wow, she was crying so much. Wow, it was terrible. She went to the coffin and started hitting it and saying, ‘if you hadn’t gotten drunk yesterday, you wouldn’t have died.’ My mom got scared.

2 Antonio: ¿Y como está el señor? ¿Con un hueco aquí?
[And how is the man? With a hole here?]

3 Susana: Antonio! Antonio! Shhhh.

It isn’t until Antonio begins to ask about the physical condition of the body that Susana realizes that what they are talking about could be painful for Marcelo, who was not in their group but sitting nearby and she shushes Antonio. This kind of talk about local gossip is typical of the kind of discourse seen when the participants are doing being compañeros as it helps to construct and reconstruct bonds of shared experience and frames what kinds of events are important to the group.
Gossip is not the only topic of currency when a participant does being a compañero, however, games and sports appear with equal frequency. In the following excerpt, Marcia has made a question for the weekend review about a video game that she had played over the weekend. Antonio who is also in her group, code-switches to Spanish to ask her to tell the rest of the group about it, thereby signaling his desire to slip into off-task chat. This first code-switch does not trigger a switch for Marcia who is more comfortable in the model student role but she does describe it to them in English. But at Antonio’ next turn he persists in Spanish. It is clear that he has understood everything that Marcia has said in English, but because this is an off-task interaction and Antonio uses Spanish almost exclusively when he is talking with his friends about off task subjects, in line 5 he asks for clarification in Spanish. In the following turn Marcia begins in English but switches almost immediately to Spanish to finish her description. In this excerpt, her role of compañera is more salient than her role of model student.

Transcription Excerpt 4-14
Tape 4-14.A:304
1 Antonio: Cuéntenos.
   [Tell us about it.]
2 Marcia: You have the lamp like this and like this and you are here and you are forming and you go with the people to explorar and you go
3 Marcelo: Boom!
4 Marcia: And you go - Ah, yes, and you put here are the rest and here you mandar a person in a hole to go and see and sometimes you go and then you do waaa and waaa and
5 Antonio: Trae armas y bombas?
   [Does it have weapons and bombs?]
6 Marcia: No, it’s not with ametralledoras como ahora, es en tiempos viejos - es con espadas - pero es buenisimo.
   [No it’s not with machine guns like now. It’s in olden times – it’s with swords, but it’s really cool.]

Throughout the first part of her narration, Marcia was using a lot of gestures to describe the action of the video characters. Notice that Marcia inserts the verbs explorar and mandar into her
otherwise English narration. These isolated code-switched words can be attributed more to her having those words more accessible at that moment and not to her choice to speak in Spanish.

As well as being used to talk off-task, code-switching is often used to make metacommentaries about what is being said. In the following passage, Rajit has asked a question during the Weekend Review about the videogame called Celda. When I ask him what Celda is, he goes into an extensive description of the game in English. While describing the game, Rajit speaks only in English even though it is technically off-task. This is probably because he was specifically addressing me in answer to a direct question. Lorenzo asks him a question in line 3 also in English and Rajit answers him in English, but in line 5 Lorenzo code-switches to Spanish to make the comment, “How cool!”

Transcription Excerpt 4-15
Tape 5-2.B:220

1 Paula: What’s Celda?
   [Cell]

2 Rajit: It’s a game that um, I have a guy that, it’s a guy called Link and he saves, um, uh, a place called Jiru, Like he, uh, it’s like there’s different celdas [cells], I have fights like you start with- with little and you pass and you go through a couple of times and you get big.

3 Lorenzo: And you play and you kill, you kill like?

4 Rajit: And you kill boys and you kill like samples and you kill the bad guys

5 Lorenzo: Ah! Qué bueno! [How cool!]

It is significant that the code-switch does not happen until after the description is done and that the code-switching site is the change from description to commentary. This kind of “tag-switching” is particularly common and very easily identified. Some more frequently inserted tag-switches are those such as: pues, bueno or entonces. They are used predominately as fillers, or as introductions to speech or as commentary as seen above. Another interesting tag-
switch example is the use of the clarifying “yes?” inserted where monolingual English speakers would use *isn’t it?* or *didn’t you?* Examples such as: “You are going, yes?” are common.

In the following example, Marcelo is working with Marcia and Antonio on the Weekend Review and it is his turn to ask the other team a question. He begins in line 1 with a tag code-switch similar to that described above. Marcelo has great difficulty in English and in class in general and being grouped with Marcia and Antonio was always productive for him because they were not only good students, but patient friends and supportive tutors for him. In the excerpt, Marcia and Antonio are doing being *compañeros* as they encourage Marcelo to read the question for the other team. Notice that both Marcia and Antonio use English to encourage him to go ahead and say the question in spite of his fears and the fact that the other students do not readily understand his pronunciation when he does speak.

Transcription Excerpt 4-16
Tape 4-15.B:224
1  Marcelo: I, I go, **verdad?**
    [right?]  
2  Marcia: You read it.  
3  Marcelo: I don’t-I-  
4  Antonio: You do good, just read it, read it. *(laughs encouragingly)*  
5  Marcia: Marcelo.  
6  Marcelo: Who do crazy things?  
7  Team: Huh?  
9  Team: crazy?  
10 Marcelo: Uh huh.

Sometimes it is not necessary to code-switch to Spanish to be a *compañero*. Sometimes the other students model in English and at the same time encourage using English.

In this case it was more powerful for Antonio and Marcia *not* to code-switch to Spanish to do being a *compañero* and encourage Marcelo through their modeling.
Conclusions:

As demonstrated, participant constellation was one of the most important factors affecting what role the students tried to “be”. What roles different participants choose to take on, or are allowed to take on, depends a great deal on who they are talking to. The most marked divisions are according to gender and academic success. Nevertheless, the boys are consistently more competitive and tend to try to either be model students, or compañeros. They do not tend to try on the role of mediator. Also, boys tend not to try doing being compañeros when talking to girls and some girls are conspicuously more talkative when they are in groups with other girls (even successful students) but not when they are with boys.

Ironically, being the model student often has little to do with a particular student’s performance in class at that moment. That is to say, if a student has consistently been perceived as a model student, they will continue to construct that role or it will be constructed for them regardless of whether they are performing well in the current academic exercise or not. The reverse is also true: even if a student is answering all the questions well and doing so in English, they might not be seen as a model student if they have not been perceived that way before in that group. Concomitant to that point is the conclusion that although students may try doing being a particular role, they may not be successful in their attempt. Whether or not they are successful depends a great deal on how the group perceives them.
CHAPTER 5

NEW PORTRAITS OF COMPETENCE: USES OF L1/L2 RESOURCES
AND PEER SCAFFOLDING IN THE CLASSROOM

Chapter Summary

The teaching of English as a foreign language in the classroom presents a significant challenge from a practical as well as a theoretical point of view, given that schools are critical sites for socialization, and attitudes about bilingualism especially among monolingual teachers can be ambivalent and misguided. This chapter looks at how individuals use various resources available to them in their L2 learning process. It examines how students draw on their L1 skills to support cognitive, phonetic and grammatical development in their L2. It also looks at scaffolding and negotiation as a means by which individuals rely on their peers and benefit from their peers’ knowledge and skills. Several L1/L2 code-switching strategies are identified including: 1) Code-switching to translate; 2) Extension of L1 semantics into L2 as a resource; 3) Code-switching to talk about talk; 4) Code-switching for spelling in L2; and 5) L1 + L2 linguistic play. Some attention is paid to how monolingual teachers recognize and value (or devalue) the potential inherent in bilingualism.

Disconnects and Blindspots: When Monolingual Teachers Teach Bilingual Children

The Escuela Interamericana prides itself in being the best bilingual educational institution in the Turrialba area. This self-assessment is based almost solely upon the fact that it offers quality core instruction in both English and Spanish taught by native speakers of each of
these languages. However the title “bilingual” is misleading and somewhat erroneous because while the children receive instruction in two languages, the majority of the teachers are monolinguals and so they approach instruction and their bilingual students from the perspective of monolingual speakers. This is particularly problematic when their being monolingual prevents them from recognizing many of the strategies used by bilinguals as positive.

The year I was teaching at the school and conducting this study, the faculty consisted of 6 core teachers, 3 “special” teachers and the school director. Of those, only 2 were bilingual: the first cycle science and math teacher and I. The other English teachers spoke very limited Spanish that did not extend much past the basics of “Buenos días”, “Como está” and “Buen provecho”. The Spanish-speaking teachers would often lament that English was too hard to learn in spite of the fact that many of them had worked at this “bilingual” school for years. This communication gap was problematic for more than practical reasons.

In addition to the fact that none of us could just teach our subjects and stay out of everyone else’s way, because we were all teaching the same children and needed to work together, there were frequent and sometimes ugly altercations between staff members founded almost entirely on linguistic or cultural miscues. The lunchroom was a source of tension much of the time because the Spanish-speakers resented the English-speakers speaking only in English (they understandably felt excluded), but the English-speakers often expressed frustration at being prevented from taking advantage of the one opportunity many of them had in the day to talk with other adults; if they limited themselves to Spanish, they couldn’t express themselves and it was too much like work or class, but if they spoke in English, they offended the Spanish-speaking faculty. Christy and I, the two bilingual teachers, often found ourselves in the middle of the table, interpreting for both “sides” and smoothing ruffled feathers.
This conflict among faculty would not have been particularly important had it not impacted the teachers’ attitudes about bilingualism and consequently, how they dealt with the children in the classroom. It was not uncommon to hear the Spanish-speaking teachers making comments about how English was distracting or openly stating that they were worried that a particular student couldn’t learn what he needed in order to pass the exit exams because he was having to focus too much energy on English. Frequently, the English teachers would complain that the students spoke in Spanish too much in class. Both the English and Spanish monolingual teachers generally thought that only Spanish should be spoken in Spanish class and only English in English class and often felt insecure when the children spoke in their “other” language because they could not understand what the children were saying and they were certain that the students were “talking about them” or saying inappropriate things.

The crux of the issue lies in the fact that the students had a different repertoire and set of resources from which to draw and use in their learning and socialization process than the teachers had and many of the teachers found that fact threatening, or at best did not understand it. Unfortunately, this disconnect between the students and the teachers meant that teachers did not recognize the strategies bilingual children use or the resources the children have to draw on which I have documented in the previous chapters. Therefore, the teachers try to repress the behaviors they do not understand, often reprimanding the children for code-switching and telling them to not speak Spanish in English class or vice versa. This behavior is counterproductive at best and potentially destructive at worst because it means that while the students are being encouraged to become bilingual they are being forced to not use the skills and competencies that that bilingualism offers them in order to achieve. It is like having a giant box of crayons and
being told you can only use the blues, greens and oranges to draw some pictures and reds and yellows and purples to draw others.

**Code-switching: L1 Interference or Creative Use of Resources?**

The competence of bilinguals can be evaluated on two levels: at the level of repertoire (semantic, syntactical, phonological, morphological and pragmatic); and at the level of metadiscursive strategies the bilingual employs in interaction and in learning (Mondada & Gajo 2001). Although the bilingual’s repertoire consists of two codes, the combination is greater than the sum of its parts. While there is no dearth of literature proclaiming the dangers of bilingualism, there is ample and persuasive evidence that bilingualism can have positive social and cognitive effects (Grosjean 1982, Romaine 1995, Zentella 1997). Bilinguals have been found to have more mental flexibility, and higher verbal and non-verbal intelligence than monolinguals (Peal & Lambert, 1962). Bialystock (1987) concludes that bilinguals have higher metacognitive awareness than monolinguals and are conscious at a younger age of the arbitrary quality of categorization and naming.

Nevertheless, verbal communication between native and non-native speakers is often marked by discourse characteristics not seen when native speakers talk. Communicative strategies such as circumlocution, pauses, rising intonation, corrections and clarification requests are frequently employed in negotiated interaction, and code-switching and language transfer are common (Heller, 1988). Code-switching is marked by the use of two or more languages (or codes) in the same utterance, interaction or even word. This is a common occurrence in many situations of native bilingualism. (Coupland and Jaworski, 1997). Code-switching can have real
pragmatic triggers and is often used by the interlocutors to construct their identities and roles in the interaction or in a group (Auer, 1999, for analysis, see Chapter 4). However, rather than being seen as a resource, code-switching is often misinterpreted (by monolinguals and ironically often by other bilinguals), as a deficiency to be got over or a sullying of both languages.

Furthermore, because most research on second language acquisition has been conducted from the viewpoint of monolinguals, the focus has tended to be on “problems” of language acquisition such as language transfer. Language transfer is most noticeable in what we call “learners’ foreign accent”, that is, pronunciation in the L2 which has traces of phonology from the L1 (Mitchell & Myles, 1998). However, very little has been done to discuss how bilinguals utilize these “transfers” of resources to clarify, scaffold or create within a bilingual setting.

**Peer Scaffolding in the ESL Classroom:**

While observing children in the classroom and on the playground, I was surprised by how often “more capable peers” scaffolded for other students whose language was not as well developed. On further examination, it became clear that an intricate pattern of negotiation was taking place and that the strategies used by the students appeared to be similar to many of those used by ESL teachers in the classroom (recasts, corrections etc., modified input etc.). The advanced students would modify their speech patterns often eliminating some grammatical morphemes and simplifying complex grammatical structures. Also, both peers would repeat and reinforce the structures and lexical items assimilated through this collaborative interaction. That is to say, it appeared that the children developed complex scaffolding patterns while they played.

Vygotskian theory is derived from cognitive psychology and argues that language learners “appropriate” or assimilate new language when their Zone of Proximal Development
(ZPD) is activated. The metaphor of “scaffolding” has been applied to first language acquisition research in order to study the role of peer interaction in activating the ZPD and the language “appropriation” that comes in the wake of that activation. Scaffolding interactions have traditionally been understood to reflect an expert-novice relationship, i.e. teacher-student or parent-child. However, recent studies suggest that effective scaffolding can take place in dyads with one more capable peer who recruits, simplifies, maintains, marks, controls and demonstrates language (Donato, 1994; Machado de Almeida Mattos, 2000; Gerrero, 2000) in order to activate the ZPD of the less fluent peer and encourage his/her appropriation of new language.

The bulk of the peer scaffolding research applied to second language acquisition, to date, has focused on older students in a non-native setting and almost always in the classroom. However, little has been done to study scaffolding among younger children. Machado de Almeida Mattos (2000) and Donato (1994) both studied task-oriented verbal interaction among university students and found that learners are capable of providing guided support to their peers during collaborative L2 scaffolded interactions, supporting the Vygotskian theory that individual knowledge is socially and dialogically derived. While Guerrero (2000) focused on written rather than verbal tasks, her conclusions were similar to those of Donato and Almeida Mattos in that the scaffolded interaction between university student dyads prompted the more passive writer to assume greater responsibility for his/her own writing and to advance.

Ervin Tripp (1986) is one of the few researchers to explore the role of scaffolding in child L2 acquisition. Her intriguing study lays the Vygotskian framework over a context of play as a vehicle for child development and learning. While different games require the players to have varying levels of language development in order to interact effectively, Ervin-Tripp posits that play, in general, is the ideal context for child L2 language acquisition, because it has the three
essential factors of *redundancy, simple models to copy*, and *cooperative attitudes* expressed in the motivation to work together in collaborative interaction (i.e. work toward common goals, turn taking)(1986). Group work in class often (though not always) has these three factors and when the bilingual children in these classes are working in groups and allowed to use the plentiful resources at their disposal, one can see them interact collaboratively, utilizing bilingual strategies to co-construct meaning.

**Strategies Utilizing L1 and L2 Resources as Illustrated in the Data**

The strategies bilingual children employ to scaffold for one another and to negotiate meaning in interaction are varied and complex. In the following data analyses I have divided the types of strategies into 5 categories which are by no means comprehensive but are representative of the major strategies found in the data taken at the *Escuela Interamericana*. These strategies are: 1) Code-switching to translate; 2) Extension of L1 semantics into L2 as a resource; 3) Code-switching to talk about talk; 4) Code-switching for Spelling in L2; and 5) L1 + L2 linguistic play.

Code-switching to translate is a resource in a bilingual classroom when the students use their semantic resources in their L1 to scaffold meaning for their peers. This usually means when one student tells another student the L1 “equivalent” for an unfamiliar word in the L2 to promote understanding of the larger text and to allow the other student to continue with the task. This does not entail a complete interpretation of a whole text.

The extension of L1 semantics into the L2 is more complex cognitive activity than “simple” translation, which occurs when a student extends what they know about the lexical field of a word in the L1 into the L2. Most often lexical extension goes unnoticed, because when it is
successful, the extension “works” in the L2. However, this lexical extension can present what might be seen by monolingual speakers of the L2 as “errors”. This occurs when the lexical field of the L1 does not exactly overlay on the lexical field of the L2. These appear similar to the developmental syntactical extensions a child might make in their L1 when he “knows” that when you have more than one “hand” you have “hands”, and concludes that more than one “foot” must be “foots”.

When I refer to code-switching to talk about talk in this context, I mean when the participants code-switch to the L1 in order to comment on the L2 activity or exercise in a metapragmatic way. The L1 interaction is used to talk about the task but not specifically about the meaning of the words or the content of the task. These commentaries are then separated off from the task by both language and function.

Code-switching for spelling is when the participants use their knowledge of L1 phonetics to scaffold for spelling in the L2. L1 speakers of Spanish find this strategy particularly useful in helping them with English spelling because Spanish is much more phonetically regular than English. These strategies are regularly employed.

Linguistic Play refers to instances when the participants notice and play with words or phrases that have meaning when said in the L1 or the L2 with little or no phonetic modification. For example the phrase, “Eso sí que es” when said aloud in Spanish is phonetically identical to the spelling of the word “socks” in English: that is “S-O-C-K-S”. This opens the door for word play, bilingual puns and jokes that require an understanding of both codes in order to be received.
**Code-switching to Translate**

In the following dialogue, the 4th graders are trying to think up a name for their Weekend Review team. Marcelo is working with Marcia and Antonio and he is having trouble understanding the name they have chosen for their team, Wolf Empire. Antonio scaffolds for him by parsing the words and translating them individually:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tape 4-15.B:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Marcelo:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Marcelo:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Antonio:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Marcelo:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Marcia:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Paula:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This kind of translation was not uncommon in the classes where one child would ask what is, “X” and another would simply provide the Spanish translation for the word, in a one to one correspondence. However, the vast majority of negotiations were much more complex – even when they appeared to be just translations. In the following passage, from the same tape, Marcia is checking Marcelo’s questions. He has spelled “castle” like “cassel” and she corrects him, saying the English word but pronouncing the “t” so that he will know to spell the word with a “t”. Then to emphasize that the word has a “t”, even though the “t” is not pronounced in the English word, she translates the word to the Spanish “castillo” where the “t” is clearly pronounced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tape 4-15.B:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Marcia:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Marcelo:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Marcia:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is important to note, that Marcia translates here not for reasons of semantic understanding but as an orthographic strategy. Marcelo knows the word “castle” and what it means in English; he simply does not know how to spell it. Marcia is utilizing the knowledge she knows she and Marcelo share about the Spanish translation of the word, “castillo”, to give him a means to remember the English spelling (for which there is no aural indicator in the English pronunciation).

Translation is also used for the functional reason of emphasizing meaning or intention. In the following excerpt, Marcia utilizes both her L1 and L2 resources to ensure that the other knows that she is sorry. Her code-switching has nothing to do with ensuring understanding of the words themselves. She does not need to say both “perdón” and “I’m sorry” to make sure that María José understands what she is saying, she does so because she feels bad that she accidentally poked her with a pencil and wants to make sure that María José knows that by using all the ways she knows how to say “I’m sorry”.

Transcription Excerpt 5-3
Tape 4-12.B:95
1  Marcia:   Sorry sorry, sorry, perdón, sorry, perdón, sorry
2  María José:  -s okay

The fact that Marcia wants to emphasize her intentions is underscored by both the code-switching and the repetition. In these cases, content understanding is not in question, but the individual code-switches repeating the same word in both languages to underscore the sincerity of her utterance.
Extension of L1 Semantics into L2 as a Resource

The data shows examples of instances when individuals code-switch to clarify meaning where false cognates cause confusion. In the following passage, the 5th graders were writing sentences using adverbs. Carlo, Lorenzo and Rajit were taking turns thinking up examples. In line 1 Carlo offers the adverbial phrase “in 30 minutes” to Lorenzo who then in line 2 takes up the suggestion but modifies it to “in half an hour” and then creates a lengthy sentence. At the next turn, Carlo protests that the sentence is “too large” then immediately corrects himself and says “too long”. This is a case of linguistic transfer where a word in the L2, in this case “large”, is similar in structure to a word in the L1, in this case “largo”, but the meaning is different. Rajit recognizes the mix up and so in line 4 code-switches to Spanish to clarify what Carlo had intended to say.

Transcription Excerpt 5-4
Tape 5-14.B:

1  Carlo:  In 30 minutes
2  Lorenzo:  Shh, in half an hour I will read on my English exam that - is - that I got 100 points.
3  Carlo:  No, too large-too long. I--
4  Rajit:  Está muy largo. I read [It’s really long]
5  Carlo:  I -- I read half and hour. Sí?
6  Lorenzo:  No

Carlo and Rajit are utilizing their combined resources to clarify meaning where the similarity of a false cognate can cause confusion.

In the following passage, the fourth graders were preparing poems for the Arbor Day school assembly. I had asked them to start by writing a list of everything we know about trees using lots of adjectives describing all the things that trees do or provide and how they make us feel. In this passage, they were working well brainstorming together in line 6, Marcia offers
“with shade” but her group-mates do not know what shade is. By way of further defining it she says “shadow”. At first glance this may seem a strange option, until one considers that the word for shade in Spanish is *sombra* and that another definition of *sombra* is shadow. Therefore Marcia is creatively extending what she knows about the Spanish word and applying it to English, the fact that her extension is inaccurate does not matter.

Most traditional SLA research would see both of the previous examples as errors, examples of interference from the L1, but I would suggest that they illustrate the creative use of combined resources. I would also put forth that this strategy happens far more frequently than is visible but it only becomes apparent when “errors” occur that call attention to the phenomenon.

**Code-switching to Talk about Talk**

Another common strategy that the participants use is to code-switch in order to give the definition of a word or concept and to negotiate meaning within an interaction. In the following passage, Antonio and Marcia in 4th grade are working with Benita to craft sentences using
adjectives that we have identified in the readings. They know that you can stack adjectives before the noun they modify and they are trying to do so using as many adjectives as will make sense before the noun, “monster”. Notice that in lines 3 and 5 Antonio tries to include the adjective, “terrified”, but in line 6 Marcia says, “No” and then code-switches to Spanish to define the word and begins to explain why she thinks it would not make sense in this sentence. Antonio immediately understands that “a bold hideous monster” would probably not also be “terrified” and so he concedes and they begin negotiating again. This time, in line 8, Marcia and Antonio begin saying the sentence as they have it so far in chorus “The bold, hideous-“, and when Marcia inserts “slithery”, Antonio finishes substituting the aforementioned “monster” with “snake”. When Benita questions the change, Antonio code-switches to Spanish and uses hand-motions to explain that snake is better because of the meaning of “slithery”.

Transcription Excerpt 5-6
Tape 4-12.A:232
1 Paula: Make some sentences with these too, okay? These are also adjectives. These are from Sir Fred.
2 Marcia: The bold- the bold, slithery=
3 Antonio: =the bold hideous and terrif-terrified monster
4 Benita: No, bold, hideous – hideous, the bold
5 Antonio: The bold hideous and terrified monster
6 Marcia: No, terrified es con mucho miedo, y como va a estar-
    [No, terrified is to be really scared, and how is it going to be-]
7 Antonio: Ah, sí.
    [Ah, yes.]
8 Marcia: The bold, hideous, slithery
9 Antonio: bold, hideous, - snake,
10 Benita: Snake?
11 Antonio: Porque para slithery (moving his hand back and forth)=
    [Because for]
12 Marcia: =snake=
13 Antonio: =goes up a steep hill.
14 Marcia: The bold, hideous, slithery snake, goes up a steep hill.
Finally Antonio finishes the sentence and Marcia repeats it back in its entirety. It is clear that Spanish code-switching is only used here to talk about what choices they have made in English and why. Spanish becomes the language of metadiscursive talk, separated from the English of the exercise.

In the following dialogue it is Lorenzo’s turn to craft a sentence but Carlo continuously interrupts him offering suggestions.

Transcription Excerpt 5-7
Tape 5-14.A:
1 Carlo: -No espérese, I, I, I jog- I jog very fast-
   [no, wait] I, I, I job – I jog very fast-
   -Carlo
2 Rajit: I uh, I dig?
3 Lorenzo: I, I, I jog very fast! Dígame, dígame. (laughter)
   [Tell me, tell me!]
4 Carlo: No pero esta puede ser I jog very fast. Fast is an adverb.
   [No, but this one could be “I jog very fast”]
5 Lorenzo: No pero
   [No but]
6 Rajit: Sí, sí, sí
   [Yes, yes, yes]
7 Lorenzo: Sí pero no! Mejor poner una más corta.
   [Yes, but no! It’s better to put a shorter one]
8 Carlo: I jog fast!
9 Lorenzo: I dig fast.
10 Rajit: I ate fast.
11 Lorenzo/Carlo: -fast.
12 Lorenzo: I ate fast.
13 Carlo: He jogged fast.
14 Lorenzo: No, ya!
   [No, enough!]

In line 1 Carlo offers “I jog very fast” in the next turn, Lorenzo rejects his suggestion and offers “I dig?” in line 3 with rising intonation. Carlo takes this up as implying that his suggestion of fast as an adverb is inaccurate and defends his alternative in line 6 by code-switching to Spanish to comment that the sentence could be “I jog very fast” and then in English comments “fast is an
adverb”. Lorenzo rejects the sentence again and although both Rajit and Carlo insist he code-switches to Spanish to say that they should put a shorter one, implying that the problem is not the meaning of the word but the length of the sentence. The length of the sentence is clearly not the issue, since “I jog very fast” is quite short already. Finally, after several short options using different verbs and “fast” as the adverb have been offered in lines 10-14, Carlo again offers, “jog” as the verb and Lorenzo, irritated, asserts in Spanish, “No, enough”, effectively ending the discussion.

The relationship among Rajit, Lorenzo and Carlo is intriguing and complex. They are very competitive and constantly try to one-up each other. Carlo spent 3 years in Miami and so has attended an American school, a fact which is both admired and resented by his peers. However, Lorenzo is one of the best students in class and does not abide admitting fault or being told that he is wrong. Knowing the relationship among these boys, I suspect, that the real issue in this interaction is not one of sentence length, or of whether fast is an adverb or not, but instead one of Lorenzo not knowing the word “jog” and being unwilling to ask Carlo or Rajit what it means and risk losing face. This analysis is born out by the fact that he uses the sentence structure and adverb that Carlo and Rajit have offered but gets irritated and code-switches to Spanish to say “enough!” when Carlo mentions “jog” as an option again. The differences in knowledge and ability is not always an advantage when working in a group because sometimes rivalry and competitiveness can get in the way of effective scaffolding and facesaving strategies compete with meaning negotiation.

The following excerpt is later in the same transcript as the previous excerpt. The undercurrent of Carlo’s larger active vocabulary butting against Lorenzo’s pride are well illustrated in the discussion they have about what verb to use in the sentences. In line 4 Carlo
code-switches to Spanish to comment on his frustration about the team’s continual use of the same verbs and his desire to have more variety and use other verbs such as jog (as in the previous excerpt or killed in this one. But Lorenzo continually goes back to the same set of basic verbs including: ran and walked.

Transcription Excerpt 5-8
Tape 5-14.A
1 Rajit: I walked downstairs.
2 Carlo: No, no, no, no - I killed, I killed, I killed in the – I killed very
3 Lorenzo: No, I walked, I walked-
4 Carlo: Sí pero todos, todos – ate, ran, walked, I, I, I [Yes, but all of them, all of them]
5 Lorenzo: Yes, because-
6 Carlo: He can he, can it be-
7 Lorenzo: He ran- he walked
8 Rajit: I walked-
9 Lorenzo: Downstairs. He walked downstairs.
10 Carlo: We played soccer outside.
11 Rajit: Ya tenemos outside. [We already have]
12 Carlo: Que importa? [Who cares?]
13 Lorenzo: We played soccer outside. Okay, número cinco. [number five]

Finally, in line 10, Carlo offers “we played soccer outside” using a different verb, play, but in a sentence that he knows will appeal to Lorenzo because they are avid soccer players (and Lorenzo is better than Carlo). When Rajit comments in Spanish that they have already used the adverb “outside”, Carlo says in Spanish “who cares”; repeating the adverb is less important than finding a sentence that they can all agree on. They have negotiated their needs using Spanish for metadiscursive talk and everyone has saved face.

This kind of metapragmatic discussion conducted in Spanish “surrounding” embedded English text which is almost exclusively lesson related is common. In Transcription 34, the 4th graders are discussing vocabulary words from their reading and creating original sentences based
on the meanings as they understood them from the context in the stories. Antonio and Marcia are trying to decide how to best write a sentence that describes the word “blazing”. Antonio knows that “blazing” is a synonym for “burning”, but he also knows that in the story, it is used metaphorically to describe the eyes of the ghost. Therefore, he has written a sentence that is metaphorical but describes the physical manifestation of the word. Marcia, however, does not agree and in line 3 suggests that they ask the teacher. Antonio thinks that her concern with the sentence is syntactical, so in line 5 Marcia explains that her concern is about semantics and further in line 7 she says she thinks that saying the “eyes are blazing” means they look “crazy or angry”. Notice to talk about what to say and how, both Marcia and Antonio code-switch to Spanish

Transcription Excerpt 5-9
Tape 4-12.A:50

1  Marcia:  Blazing, a nosotros nos falta blazing
[Blazing, we’re missing blazing]

2  Antonio:  No falta blazing, my eyes are blazing because the day is bright.
[We’re not missing blazing]

3  Marcia:  No porque eso- vamos a preguntarle a la Teacher
[No because this – let’s ask the teacher]

4  Antonio:  Yo no sé si es because of the bright or because the day is bright.
[I don’t know if it’s]

5  Marcia:  No porque ta– yo porque- ehhh my eyes are blazing because they are bravo
[No, because, ta – I because – ehh my eyes are blazing because they are angry]

6  Antonio:  No entonces no, entonces vaya, vaya
[No, then no, then go, go]

7  Marcia:  No, yo creo porque yo creo que no-que es de loco o de bravo, no sé
[No, I think because I think that no, that it’s from being crazy or angry, I don’t know]

8  Antonio:  Así que arden por la luz
[Like they burn from the light]

9  Marcia:  …levante la mano, levante la mano.
[raise your hand, raise your hand]
10 Antonio: Teacher, they don’t raise their hands, Teacher they don’t raise their hands.

11 Marcia: Teacher we could say, -

12 Antonio: **Cómo es?** My-my my eyes are blazing because the day is [How is it?] bright?

13 Paula: AHH *(falling intonation showing surprise)* Yeah. You could say that, because your eyes get hurt, they –they hurt, they feel like they’re really red and yeah, you could say that!

14 Marcia: We finished.

Antonio’ and Marcia’s lengthy negotiated talk is resolved in lines 11-14, when Antonio asks Paula if his interpretation is possible. Paula is surprised by the usage but grants that “blazing” could be used that way to describe the physical discomfort caused by bright light.

Curiously, Marcia does not press the subject and does not even ask if her interpretation is also possible. She merely acquiesces and says, that they are finished. This could be because they are still not aware of the multiple uses and meanings of words within a given language, in spite of the fact that they use multiple meanings in both their L1 and L2 constantly.

In the following passage, the participants code-switch for the metapragmatic purpose of indicating where a specific text is on the page. In Transcription Excerpt 5-10, Guillermo, Marcelo and Antonio are reading the story “Whatever you Say Claud” and answering reading comprehension questions. In this case, in lines 1 and 3 Guillermo discusses the questions and tries to work out the answers in English but when Marcelo asks him in English where he is reading, Guillermo code-switches to Spanish to answer.

**Transcription Excerpt 5-10**
**Tape 4-15.A:176**

1 Guillermo: Why did they leave? I don’t know..Because Claude thinks that that is the place that they want to live….*Reading under breath* Ah. Why did they leave? becau-they leave-.

2 Marcelo: Guillermo, Guillermo, Guillermo, where are? Tell me where.

3 Guillermo: **Veá** here,—**vea** they leave -**aquí dice,** [Look here—look they leave – it says here,]
I-- because -they eh because Claude say to Shirley this is a- is a
peaceful place we- we have been looking for...\textit{vea.} \\
[look]

4 Antonio: \textit{No its a, where, where, where?}
5 Guillermo: Look here.
6 Marcelo: \textit{Qué que?} \\
[that, what?]
7 Guillermo: \textit{Veà.} \textit{[Look]} Look here, “I hope not Claude, this land has the worst case of the uglies I have ever seen”

To show his group mates where to look, Guillermo uses both “Veà” in Spanish and “Look here” (the English equivalent) to show where he is reading. What is interesting is that he uses Spanish with Marcelo even in response to Marcelo when asks in English “where are? Tell me where” in line 2. However, Guillermo responds to Antonio’ query in English. This could be because Marcelo is perceived by his peers to be a much less competent English speaker, and student in general.

\textbf{Code-switching for Spelling in L2}

Although using L1 resources to talk about the L2 and set apart metalinguistic talk is common in the tapes, perhaps the most frequently used strategy is that of code-switching to employ L1 phonetic resources to scaffold for spelling in the L2. Transcription Excerpt 36 shows a typical example of this phenomenon. In this passage Antonio was going over Marcelo’s sentences for the Weekend Review, checking for spelling and grammar errors. Notice that he says the word in English as a reference, because Marcelo knows how it sounds in English and then spells it in Spanish to cognitively attach the letter sounds to the word sound.

Transcription Excerpt 5-11
Tape 4-15.B:
1 Antonio: sponge- you put \textbf{s-p-o-n-g-e} (saying the letters in Spanish).

Not only the less successful students benefit from peer scaffolding; it is not uncommon for the
more successful students to receive help from their “less-competent” peers. In the following passage, the 4th graders are preparing their Weekend Review questions and Antonio asks how to spell “gun”. María José responds to his question. And then Marcelo shows Antonio with physical actions what “gum” is to make the distinction. Then to clarify the spelling, Antonio pronounces the words with Spanish phonetics.

When the participants work together in groups, there is also evidence that the “more-competent” peers benefit from the knowledge of the “less-competent” peers. In the following excerpt, Marcelo, María José and Antonio are working together drafting their Weekend Review questions. Antonio asks the others how to spell the word “gun”. He is not sure if it is with an “m” or an “n” at the end.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription Excerpt 5-12</th>
<th>Tape 4-6.A:212</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Antonio: Gu- <strong>Pistola</strong> is gum o gun?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 María José: Gun. Gum is –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Marcelo: Like this Antonio <em>(smacking lips like he is chewing gum)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 María José: <strong>chicle</strong>…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Antonio: Gum o gun?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 María José: Gun.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Antonio: Okay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line 1 Antonio starts to ask how to spell “gun” then code-switches to Spanish to clarify which word he means. In the next turn, María José immediately responds, “gun”, but then continues to explain that “gum” (with an “m”) is **chicle** code-switching to translate to Spanish for clarification. Most interesting is Marcelo’s paralinguistic strategy - smacking his lips audibly to indicate gum chewing as a means to describe the word. Finally, in line 5, Antonio asks again “Gum o Gun?”. And María José answers simply, “gun”. It bears underscoring that this type of exchange (“less-competent peer” scaffolding for “more-competent peer”) is usually only
successful when the student who is perceived as the “more-competent” peer asks for help from the others. As seen in Chapter 4, if the advice comes unsolicited, it may be perceived as an attempt to do being a model student and, therefore, may be ignored, rebuffed or even mocked.

In another example of peer scaffolding using L1 resources to aid in L2 orthography, Antonio is writing his questions for the Weekend Review and he asks me, how to say “escaló” in English. After I translate for him, he is still unsure of the English spelling, particularly the vowel, and so to ensure that he has it right, he pronounces “climbed” as you would if you were reading in Spanish (it sounds like “cleemed” in English). When Marcia confirms that he has it right, he repeats the entire sentence with the English pronunciation.

Transcription Excerpt 5-13
Tape 4-12.A:248
1 Antonio: Teacher, how do you say este, eh escaló?
   [that is, uh climbed?]
2 Paula: Climbed
3 Marcia: Climbed
4 Antonio: Climbed?..climbed a steep-cleembed?
5 Marcia: Umhmm
6 Antonio: Climbed a steep hill

English spelling is extremely varied and arbitrary, especially where vowels are concerned and causes terrible problems for non-native speakers (as well as native speakers). However, the relatively regular phonetic/orthographic correspondence of Spanish makes this strategy particularly useful for Spanish-speakers who can read and write in Spanish, because they can utilize the resource of Spanish pronunciation to simplify and clarify the spelling of English words.

In line 3 of the following excerpt where the 4th graders are working on a vocabulary exercise, Antonio asks with rising intonation, “blistered hands, what?” and Marcia responds saying, “Hurt” twice, first using English pronunciation, then to clarify the vowel, using the
Spanish pronunciation of the English word (sounding something like “hoort” in English), so that Antonio can identify the vowel and spell the word correctly in English.

Transcription Excerpt 5-14
Tape 4-12.A:50
1 María José: Blistered hands?
2 Marcia: His blistered hands hurt.
3 Antonio: blistered hands que? [what?]
4 Marcia: Hurt. Jurt (pronouncing with Spanish phonetics)
5 Antonio: Jurt? (pronouncing with Spanish phonetics)
6 Marcia: Jurt. (pronouncing with Spanish phonetics)
7 Antonio: Jurt. (pronouncing with Spanish phonetics) Yo puse corazón. [I put heart]

Marcia and Antonio repeat the Spanish pronunciation back and forth through various turns and then in Spanish, Antonio comments, “Yo puse corazón” indicating that he had spelled the the word “heart” in English rather than the word “hurt”. This kind of scaffolded exchange illustrates a complex strategy utilizing both the L1 and L2 phonetic and orthographic resources to ensure that once the spoken words are translated to written text, they will be understood as they were intended and not confused by inaccurate orthography.

L1 + L2 Linguistic Play

The previous section shows how bilingual students are constantly pooling their L1 and L2 resources and comparing the two codes to enhance and ensure understanding. In this final section, I will discuss how the students pool their linguistic resources and play with the languages, creating puns and word plays. This is perhaps the most complex and difficult to tease out, because it deals with instances where the L1 and the L2 are deliberately overlaid and the codes are compared and contrasted to humorous result.

As an anecdotal example to explain this phenomenon, I will illustrate with a popular joke that was often repeated in school, especially among the 4th graders who were just becoming
aware of the subtleties of puns and language humor. Marcia first told me this joke but they would retell it and collectively reconstruct it frequently in the midst of uncontrolled laughter. In order to “get” the joke, you have to remember that the Spanish letter “z” is pronounced like an English [s].

One day a Zorro [fox] and a Burro [donkey] went to the United States to visit some friends. The Burro was really worried that he would make mistakes since he didn’t speak English but the Zorro told him, “Don’t worry just do what I do”. So Burro followed Zorro and tried to copy him exactly. Burro noticed that when Zorro bumped into someone in the street, he said “I’m Sorry”. So the next time he bumped into someone, Burro smiled and said, “I’m Burry”. (Joke retold here as remembered by researcher)

This joke is funny only to those who understand both English and Spanish and the intersection of the phonetics and semantics when these two codes are overlaid. To deconstruct the joke it is important to understand that culturally, zorros are thought to be clever and wily, while burros are thought to be stupid. When the joke is told, although everything is said in English, to make clear that the animals are Spanish-speaking, their names are pronounced with Spanish pronunciation so that Zorro sounds something like “sorrow”. The joke is funny because Burro thinks he is being clever like Zorro by saying, “I’m Burry,” but he has misread the clues and so looks “stupid”. This joke is especially funny to the students at the Escuela Interamericana because it exemplifies, albeit in a silly way, the kinds of “mistakes” English language learners make all the time when they are trying to use all their linguistic resources and make sense in interaction, while underscorcing the fear they have of making fools of themselves.

The following excerpt is an example of how the students notice the overlays of their L1 and L2 and play with the language. Gerardo and Silvio were working together to answer reading comprehension questions about the story they had read called, “La Bamba” by Gary Salas. The question had asked which characters were going to perform at the talent show and in line 1
Gerardo offers “Benny” as one of the characters. When Silvio repeats the name “Benny?” his rising intonation makes the word sound like he is saying, “Vení”, is the vos³ imperative form of the Spanish verb venir or “to come”. Gerardo immediately picks up on the trope and starts reiterating both the Spanish, vení and the English “Benny” repeatedly.

Transcription Excerpt 5-15
Tape 6-14.B:317

2 Silvio: Benny?
3 Gerardo: hmm? Benny, vení, vení, vení, Benny. [come, come, come]
4 Silvio: Vení, vení, vení (laughs). [come, come, come]

The fact that they are playing with the language is clear because of the repetition, the marking of the change in intonation and Silvio’s laughter and repetition.

Conclusions

From the data it becomes clear that the children employ complex strategies to negotiate meaning and interact in their L1 and L2 within the context of the classroom setting. Through these strategies, the students demonstrate collaborative peer scaffolding utilizing their L1 resources to ensure that they and their classmates understand the content and to facilitate understanding of grammar, semantics, and orthography in their L2. The L1 is also used frequently in metacognitive discourse commenting on the activity or meaning of texts in the L2. It is also important to underscore that the students who are perceived as being “more competent” are often receive scaffolding from “less competent” peers which would cause us to reevaluate how we measure competence.

---

³ Vos is frequently used throughout Central and South America as an alternative form of the 2nd person singular or “tú”.
Perhaps most importantly, it is clear from the data that the students use their L1 in the classroom as a resource to highlight, explain, and clarify points of question in the L2 and that they notice similarities and differences in between the L1 and L2 to such a high cognitive level that they can pun and play with languages. Educators could learn much from listening to how their students use language in general and code-switching in particular because it can offer a plethora of strategies for language learning which build on the rich combination of resources that the students already have. Rather than simply prohibiting L1 use in the L2 classroom, methodological strategies could be designed that actively draw upon the students’ L1 resources and cultural background knowledge to anchor learning in the L2 and encourage acquisition.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Layers of Influence on Code-switching

As I have shown in the previous chapters, there are several interwoven layers of context which influence code-switching behaviors among children at this bilingual school in Costa Rica. They include that of: 1) historical residue and globalized corporate sponsorship; 2) local participation frameworks; and 3) local ideologies about L1/L2 use. Below, I have outlined the conclusions and implications of this study regarding each of these layers.

1) English Crossing Global Borders: “Don’t Worry, buy Huggies”

There is extensive evidence that the students at the school have assimilated into their repertoires, English through commercials and other media. The fact that they frequently sing jingles from television advertisements or incorporate fragments from English songs into their discourse corroborates this. The students are also frequently conscious of what they are doing when they entextualize these texts, particularly when the texts are from commercials. What is not clear is how the students feel about the texts that they are recontextualizing or if they have given any thought to the fact that they are in English and what that means. This area is ripe for further inquiry. Furthermore considering the increasing economic dependence of Costa Rica on the United States, it would be interesting to examine more thoroughly the attitudes of Costa Ricans toward English and what implications that has for Costa Rican identity. Additionally, the students use background knowledge from experiences they associate with America or English to
ground English concepts or words. For example rather than using their knowledge of “cogs” in a typically Costa Rican context, they talk about the cogs they saw in the Kentucky Fried Chicken at the Multiplaza mall. What is clear from the taped data is that much of what these Costa Rican students have incorporated into their discourse are entextualized texts lifted from carefully-crafted scripts sponsored by multinational corporations and mediated by mass-communication. This has startling implications about English language use in Costa Rica and its role in identity construction because these entextualized texts are “not natural”, that is, not occurring within a community or through spontaneous interaction, but instead are written with the intent of selling products, ideas and indeed ideologies.

2) I’ll be your Friend - if You Let Me

One of the most interesting findings was that although students tried to “do being” different roles, their success or failure often did not depend so much on how well they enacted that role but on how their peers received their attempts. This indicates that individual agency is not the only factor necessary to achieve an identity. Because of the intersubjective nature of meaning and identity construction, the identity ascribed to an individual by the group can often be a powerful deterrent to that person’s attempts at trying on a new role.

3) Code-switching: Problem or Resource?

As noted in previous chapters, code-switching is often thought by monolinguals to represent linguistic “errors” that occur when the two codes come into conflict or when the speaker doesn’t have good control over his or her languages. Seen in this light, code-switching is a problem, something to be “got over,” and not the tremendously creative experimenting that is
so clearly evidenced in bilingual children’s speech, which draws from a dynamic storehouse of resources. The conclusion that code-switching in the classroom was preventing these children from learning would be spurious and unsupported by the evidence. In fact, the taped discourse made it clear that the students were using their L1 and L2 resources together and separately to accomplish a variety of goals. Moreover, this was true, not only of the “best” students, but also for the students whose English was not as strong. They code-switch to call attention to themselves or the topic, to scold, and to accommodate as well as to make a commentary about what is being said or to change topic.

Though language instructors often view peer interaction as counterproductive because it is tantamount to “the blind leading the blind” where language errors will be passed on from one learner to the other, this assumption has not been born out by the evidence presented in this dissertation. Moreover, when working together and allowed to talk in either language, the students tended to focus on the goals of the lesson and monitor each others’ speech while calling on shared resources in the L1 to help their peers to acquire vocabulary, phonetics, orthography and meaning in the L2. What is clear is that when the students are allowed to work together, their talk is not “wasted”. They use both the L1 and L2 to forge social bonds and to further academic ends. There was a great deal of evidence of metapragmatic talk about the L2 in the L1 which indicates that the students are very aware of the “form” of their L2 use and concerned about how to do it “correctly”. What is clear from previous research and from this study is that language learning is a dynamic, context and learner specific process which is dependent upon and not just aided by, social interaction. Therefore, methodologies should be designed that facilitate monolingual teachers’ teasing out the layered meanings of student discourse and their learning about the students’ L1 and culture in order to build on that knowledge.
Implications for US Schools

At the time of this study, which focuses on L1 and L2 language use in a English/Spanish bilingual school in Costa Rica, battles over “English-only” laws rage in U.S. statehouses, and U.S. boards of education in traditionally “white/European” regions are staggering under the recent and dramatic increase of Spanish-speakers and the impacts this increase has on their schools. U.S. Census data indicate that from 1990-2000 the population of Hispanics or Latinos increased by 300% in such areas as the Midwest and the Southeast making Latinos the fastest-growing, and soon to be largest, Marceloity group in the nation. In some areas, Spanish-speakers now outnumber the Caucasian and other Marceloity populations. This demographic shift has had, and will continue to have dramatic impacts on language use across the United States, as educators, policy makers and individuals grapple with issues of language and the relationship between language and identity among these newest Americans.

It is clear from the evidence that one of the main issues that must be addressed is the problem of language stigmatization both within and outside the Latino community. While bilingualism in itself and the problems posed by the contact of different cultures in the United States are not new, negative attitudes against Spanish and Spanish/English bilingualism are increasing. These stigmas cause conflicts of identity for Latinos because even if they do not speak Spanish, they are lumped into the “other” group by the dominant majority. Hence, even if they are monolingual Angophones, they “do not belong.” Further, because social identity is mediated through the use of language and other semiotic resources, if a person’s ethnic community shuns his or her variety of the language, as is the case for individuals who speak code-switched varieties like Pocho and Tex-Mex, then they will fell isolated and marginalized.

---

10 Note the case of the Kansas highschool student suspended from school for speaking Spanish in the hallway. (Reid 2005)
within their own ethnic group as well as by the Anglo, monolingual English majority. And instead of being able to move effortlessly between “dos worlds/two mundos”, they find themselves trapped on the borderland.

**Pedagogical Suggestions**

From my experience teaching at the *Escuela Interamericana* and the process of analyzing this data I have found several pedagogical strategies that could have great impact on student L2 learning/use in the classroom. First, I would suggest designing projects or activities that permit working in groups and allow non-native speakers to work with other non-native speakers as well as native-speakers. Working with native speakers allows the non-native speaker to become more familiar with a broader range of lexical and syntactic items in the L2 and to expand and anchor their background knowledge. However, other non-native speaking peers can scaffold for language and content based on shared knowledge in the L1 and cultural and experiential background. I would also encourage classroom practice that does not prohibit L1 use. While monolingual teachers are often concerned about allowing L1 use in case it gets “out of control”, as long as the activities are structured and progress can be monitored, off-task language use in the L1 should be no more bothersome than the off-task talk of monolinguals in English. In addition to taking advantage of the linguistic and cognitive resources it encompasses, allowing L1 language use in the classroom would also go a long way toward facilitating the construction of positive self-esteem for non-native speakers of English because it tacitly acknowledges the value inherent in that language and its accompanying culture.

Another strategy that is extremely beneficial in fostering positive self-esteem and identity construction is cross-aged tutoring. While at the *Escuela Interamericana*, I worked closely with
the first cycle teacher to develop big brother/big sister relationships between the older children and the younger children. Once a week, the children from 1st cycle met with their 2nd cycle padrinos/madrinas (godfathers/godmothers) to read and do English activities. What we found was that the older children gained as much as the younger children did, both in terms of their academic learning and self-esteem. We always planned the activity so that the older students had to prepare beforehand and so when they went in to help the younger students (for example to edit for 3rd person “s” in the present tense or write a story) they had to focus on the task themselves. Plus it allowed them to read out loud, books that were at their reading level to a non-critical (adoring) audience. In the sessions with the cross-age pairings there was always a great deal of L1/L2 code-switching utilizing the strategies enumerated in this dissertation, nevertheless, it was clear that this code-switching facilitated much of the English learning that was taking place.

The last strategy that I would encourage is free reading, discussions and writing in L2 English class. By encouraging the students to read what they like, providing them with authentic literature and other texts, and creating time and space in the curriculum, educators can create a space where students begin to make the language and the culture their own. By discussing and writing about what they read and how they react to it, they can begin to discover what it means to become a multicultural person and actively explore how they feel about it. This inquiry-based process could help the students to become more metacognitively aware of how they speak, what texts they incorporate in their speech and what that implies about their own identities and the contexts in which they live.
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## APPENDIX A

### CASSETTE CATALOGS

**Table 1: Cassette catalog – 4th Grade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tape #</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Tran</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>If you say so Claude</td>
<td>8/25/04</td>
<td>Susana, Soledad, Roberto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4-1    | This tape goes with the video. They talk almost exclusively in Spanish unless they are talking to me. All speak to me in English except Roberto.  
- There is a place about 2/3 of the way through that Guillermo talks about buying tic tacs in English.  
- | 11/15/04 | Guillermo, Roberto, Diana, Manuela |      |
| 4-2    | Yesenia doesn’t talk, Trees exercise Antonio, Marcia, and Marcelo help Yese. Yese doesn’t talk here (maybe because of the boys) she is painfully shy erases a response that was well-crafted. | 6/28/04 | Antonio, Marcia, Marcelo, Yesenia |
| 4-3    |                                               | 11/15/04 | Soledad, Guillermo, Roberto  |      |
| 4-4    |                                               | 11/15/04 | Manuela, Diana, Susana       |      |
| 4-5    | Lots of laughter and speech in Spanish. Talking about having mocos etc. When they are on task, they speak consistently in Spanish (except for when they are making commentaries | 10/4/04 | Marcelo, Soledad, Guillermo  |      |
| 4-5    |                                               | 10/11/04 | WR                            |      |
| 4-6A   | Discussion of how many papers to use. In English. Change to Spanish for a lengthy discussion of Marcelo’s uncle’s death. Discussion of spelling of “gun” using both English and Spanish phonetics, *Phonetic scaffolding* | 10/4/04 | Roberto, Antonio, Susana, Manuela | yes |
| 4-6B   | Discussing the Weekend review              | 10/11/04 | Yesenia, Marcia,              |      |
Benita asks Marcia for help but is very creative in her response to Marcia’s help.
300 Marcia talking about the dog. First in Spanish then in English with me.
309 Who went to a first communion
Marcia – Communion giving phonetic scaffolding
367 Asks forgiveness in Spanish of Guillermo
Buddy
378 comment on Chocolate with Dani

| 4-7.A | X | Girls talk in English most of the time. Always on task. About halfway, Yese and Marcia are talking in English, and continue to ask then Marcia switches to Spanish to ask the age of the birthday girl because Benita doesn’t get it or at least they think she doesn’t get it (Marcia’s switch happens just after Benita pronounces San Jose with Spanish phonetics might be trigger) | 10/4/04 | Benita, Marcia, Diana, Yesenia |
| 4-7.B | X | Long discussion in Spanish: about a computer program, buying land, repairs on the house, anger with the repairman. Finally changes to English when they are discussing the name for the team: Name in English/Spanish Naming process is very interesting: Super Rice, Super Beans, Super Gallo Pinto. Cockroaches in the desk, ants in the house. All the discussion about the weekend activities takes place in Spanish. “Who not How, who not how.” Brian tells how to spell then Antonio translates to Spanish. Headache | 10/11/04 | Antonio, Roberto, Diana, Susana, Manuela |

<p>| 4-8 | | 9/6/04 | WR |
| 4-8 | | 11/8/04 | Soledad, Manuela, Diana |
| 4-9 | X | Blank | 11/18/04 | Marcia, Benita, Yesenia, Susana |
| 4-10 | | 9/13/04 | WR |
| 4-10 | X | 11/8/04 | Antonio, Roberto, Guillermo |
| 4-11 | | 6/18/04 | Marcelo, Soledad, Roberto |
| 4-12 | X | Discussing adjectives from reading: The Boy and the Ghost Marcia – blistered hands hurt 50- (discussion about spelling using Spanish phonetics – Chapter 5) | 6/18/04 | Marcia, Antonio, Benita | yes |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-12.B</td>
<td>Rhyming words Discussion about 4-12.B.80 We are the Champions 95 Marcia: Sorry sorry, sorry, perdón, sorry, perdón, sorry María José: -s okay</td>
<td>9/13/06</td>
<td>Manuela, Marcia, Susana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6/18/04</td>
<td>Diana, Yesenia, Susana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/18</td>
<td>Guillermo, Manuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-15. B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11/15/04</td>
<td>Marcia, Antonio, Benita, Marcelo yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-15.A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8/25/04</td>
<td>Marcelo, Antonio, Guillermo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11/15/04</td>
<td>Soledad, Susana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Soledad and Susana talk in Spanish predominantly. 75 Interesting conversation 89 Buying something for Soledad 128 Yese talks, Soledad in Spanish</th>
<th>Yesenia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8/25/04 Marcia, Benita, Dani, Yese and Manuela yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A | 69 *ya empezemos a trabajar*  
Marcia and Manuela try to get Yese to talk by asking her opinion but she begins to cry.  
91 pet day  
160, 194 and 220 *singing the theme from the good the Bad and the Ugly*  
236 Marcia *we have to put all that things*  
I don’t know  
239 I am not asking Marcia anything  
MJ – no one answers me  
Benita see here  
Say to MJ I am saying to Diana  
They speak in English throughout! Even the ones that have a hard time with English and that are off task most of the time. What is up with that? Is it Marcia??? What role does she play in the mix?  
At the beginning Marcia and the rest of the group reprimands Benita and asks Paula to give her a dressing down for talking out of turn. |
Table 2: Cassette catalog – 5th Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tape #</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Tran</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11/15/05</td>
<td>Mario, Amparo, Marcela, Lourdes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1 on video</td>
<td>Don’t worry use Huggies 2.08 (intertextuality also indicates the influence of American advertising on the kids)</td>
<td>11/15/04</td>
<td>Lidia, Rajit, Abby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1 on video</td>
<td>Very difficult to understand.</td>
<td>11/29/04</td>
<td>Carlo, Marcela, Alvaro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2.A on video</td>
<td>Lorenzo talking in Spanish about … names. Not much actual talking because it is in the game. Abby talks to me and Rajit in English and starts with Lorenzo but then mediates for him in Spanish. Rajit speaks exclusively in Spanish to Lorenzo but in English to me and Abby. Lorenzo speaks to me in English but to everyone else in Spanish unless he has to do a sentence for the lesson. 145 Abby mediates for Mario’s group when Mario is playing with the cassette player. Lorenzo comments in Spanish 155 We guys to them guys Okay guys… 159 Lorenzo defends himself in Spanish 170 Andrea que tenemos ahora 171 Lorenzo and Rajit talking about other stuff in Spanish talking to Carlo – baiting him 225 Rajit narrating about Celda with Lorenzo commenting in Spanish in the background</td>
<td>11/15/04</td>
<td>Andrea, Lorenzo, Lidia, Silvia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2.B on video</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/04</td>
<td>Silvia, Alvaro, Lidia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-3.A on video</td>
<td>Toward end there is a part with Mario being creative.</td>
<td>11/15/04</td>
<td>Carlo, Marcela, Alvaro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-4.A X</td>
<td>Doesn’t start until 52 What’s a wake? Una vela 166 Interesting exchange between Carlo and Lorenzo in Spanish about lying Carlo starts in English and then when attacked by Lorenzo changes to Spanish</td>
<td>11/15/04</td>
<td>Carlo, Arturo, Andrea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-4.B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>208: Arturo talking with Ana about order. It’s Mac’s thing. Mario does not interact with the others. He only plays with the machine and taps on the table (making a lot of noise that is difficult to hear over) Ana and Arturo reprimand him continuously.</td>
<td>11/29/04</td>
<td>Mario, Alvaro, Arturo, Ana?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-5 A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>6/15/04</td>
<td>Abby, Lidia, Lourdes, Ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-5 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Word Lists</td>
<td>9/28/04</td>
<td>Marcela, Lidia, Ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Extensive dialogues with Carlo’s attempted scaffolding not taken up by Lorenzo</td>
<td>6/15/04</td>
<td>Rajit, Carlo, Lorenzo yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Word Lists</td>
<td>9/28/04</td>
<td>Carlo, Rajit, Lorenzo, Alvaro yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>6/15/04</td>
<td>Mario, Arturo, Carlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Word lists</td>
<td>9/28/04</td>
<td>Arturo ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/26/04</td>
<td>WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8.B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Comments Okay Carlo 005 Rajit – in English Que pereza Rajit speaks almost exclusively in English with me and with students. Carlo speaks English only with me and Brian but speaks exclusively in Spanish with the others unless he is doing the questions or his WR. For Chapter 3 agency “Shake that thing”</td>
<td>10/5/04</td>
<td>Amparo, Carlo, Silvia, Rajit Yes part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/6/04</td>
<td>WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9.B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/5/04</td>
<td>Marcela, Lorenzo, Andrea, Lidia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/13/04</td>
<td>WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10.B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/5/04</td>
<td>Alvaro, Arturo, Abby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Lots of good stuff</td>
<td>6/8/04</td>
<td>Rajit, Arturo, Alvaro, Lorenzo, Mario, Carlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>One of the first recordings. Lot’s of background noise. Answers to questions from book on story “Cheating” 037 Lidia has a question and Abby answers in Spanish, then in heavily accented English 069 Abby talks in Spanish again off topic 97 number 111 Lidia tells joke in English then in Spanish 136 Abby talks in English in sing-song voice</td>
<td>6/8/04</td>
<td>Lourdes, Abby Lidia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/8/04</td>
<td>5-13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amparo, Marcela, Silvia, Andrea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/04</td>
<td>5-14.A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Rajit, Carlo, Lorenzo, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/04</td>
<td>5-14.B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Carlo, Marcela, Abby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/04</td>
<td>5-15.B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Mario, Silvia, Lidia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/04</td>
<td>5-16.A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Lorenzo, Marcela, Lourdes, Mario, Andrea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/04</td>
<td>5-16.B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lourdes, Andrea, Alvaro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/04</td>
<td>5-17.A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Rajit, Carlo, Amparo, Silvia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/04</td>
<td>5-17.B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Arturo, Lorenzo, Amparo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Cassette catalog – 6th Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tape #</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Tran</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/5/04</td>
<td>Veronica, Silvio, Salas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11/15/04</td>
<td>Alejandro, Marcia, Radulavich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11/15/04</td>
<td>Mercedes, Jesus Maria, Gerardo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/19/04</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/26/04</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/26/04</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7.A</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/8/04</td>
<td>Silvio, Veronica, Alejandro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8.A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/11/04</td>
<td>Marcia, Gerardo, Ray R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8.B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11/8/04</td>
<td>Gerardo, Jose Alf., Marcia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9.A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/11/04</td>
<td>Veronica, Salas, Mercedes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9.B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11/8/04</td>
<td>Salas, Mercedes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/4/04</td>
<td>Gerardo, Salas, Jesus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>9/6/04</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/13/04</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/4/04</td>
<td>Ray R, Mercedes, Silvio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/4/04</td>
<td>Anselmo, Marcia, Veronica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/26/04</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-13 A</td>
<td>Compound words and Latin roots, prefixes and suffixes for science Electric Current Lovely passage where Jesus Maria tries to offer the suggestion of a word and is completely ignored through several turns of &quot;Hydroelectric&quot; Jesus Maria</td>
<td>6/11/04</td>
<td>Marcia, Silvio, Jesus Maria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-13 B</td>
<td>Talking about the Salas story. Ale is talking about the reference to Manuel’s waving his arms around like a symphony conductor and then when imitating it sings the William Tell overture. Jesus Maria, Marcia and Veronica talk about the “faroles” and then sing La Bamba</td>
<td>9/14/04</td>
<td>Silvio, Ale, Veronica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-14 A</td>
<td>Vocabulary using prefixes doing reading comprehension exercise</td>
<td>6/11/04</td>
<td>Mercedes, Jesus Maria, Veronica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-14 B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>9/14/04</td>
<td>Gerardo, Mercedes, Veronica, Silvio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 A</td>
<td>Using Latin and Greek roots to make whole words Gerardo talks a good bit offering</td>
<td>6/11/04</td>
<td>Salas, Ale, Gerardo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6-13 A**

**6-13 B**

**6-14 A**

**6-14 B**

**6-15 A**
possible words but there is little conversation other than that. Ale and Salas play with the recorder whispering things like “we are in English class.” This should be included in the methodology section where I discuss limitations of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Discussion at the beginning of the tape regarding the microcassette players and their cost. Awareness of the recorders. Exercise looking for figurative language in “La Bamba” Jesus Maria is good at it and wants to make a drawing. Marcia doesn’t understand him at first.</td>
<td>9/14/04</td>
<td>Salas, JM, Marcia</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to color codes:
- **Pink** = Chapter 3 Agency
- **Green** = Chapter 4 Globalization – Resistance and Creativity
- **Blue** = Chapter 5 Scaffolding and Use of L1 Resources in Acquisition
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE TAPE TRANSCRIPTION

Paula Mellom
Dissertation Data
4th Grade
November 15, 2004
Marcia, Antonio, Beatrice, Marcelo
4-15.B

Marcia: Can you listen please, two for each, two for each, write two
two questions.
Antonio: I will not write anything
Marcia: Two questions each that you did over the weekend.
(pause 1.5 minutes)
Antonio: Teacher how do you say “plátano”?
(pause 35 seconds)
Marcia: Please don’t put that one…don’t put,- don’t put they.
Marcelo: Voy a ponerlo con la letra peqêña. Así con
Marcia: Marcelo, write your questions
Marcia: Marcelo, write your questions
Antonio: I’m thinking, I’m thinking.
Marcia: Do like that, the other one. - Because you put go not went.
(pause 43 seconds)
Marcia: I am going to help Marcelo. What is one thing that you like so
Marcia: What is one thing that you like so much?
Marcelo: hmm?
Marcia: What was one thing that you like so much?
Marcelo: ¿Como se llama andar?
Antonio: ¡Qué buena la segunda!
Marcia: Please put your name to your paper. You finished. Ah one
question, Marcelo come here. You get the newspaper?
Antonio: Periódico.
Antonio: Periódico?
Marcia: Ah?
Marcelo: Ah! No.
Antonio: **Ponga periódico.**
Marcia: Marcelo, do you knit?
Marcelo: **Qué?**
Marcia: **Qué si usted teje?**
Marcelo: **Tejía. Yo tejía.**
Antonio: Teacher. Teacher Paula. **No puedo silvar.** *(whistles)*
Marcia: **Está ocupada.**
Antonio: Teacher, How do you say **tejer?**
Marcia: To knit.
Marcia: That is so good. She’s so good. Now you put question 2.
Marcelo, Marcelo. Can you lend me the paper, please. Marcelo,
please. I have to review the questions.
Antonio: sponge- you put s-p-o-n-g-e. And “with” with an H.
Marcia: Beatrice, I have to say you something- that this no, because it
sospechar this question. Please read it.
Antonio: The second is no good.
Marcia: Read my question.
Benita: I want to read one.
Antonio: **Lea. Lea la de Marcia.**
Marcelo: **¿Quién comió plátano con atún?**
Marcia: Marcelo put who.
Antonio: **¿Como son?**
Marcia: Put who. Put who. P-
Antonio: **Un momento Marcia. Inventar una pregunta más cada uno
para que sean 12 preguntas en total.** *(pause)*
Marcia: You play on the computer?
Antonio: Nooooooo. **El primero, el segundo y el tercero.**
Marcia: **No porque sí**
Teacher: Okay, is everybody ready?
Antonio: **No esta no.**
Marcia: Yes, teacher we made these extra ones
Marcelo: Okay.
Marcia: No, he is alone. And I do, I do – No cassel no, castle – **Castillo.**
Marcelo: The Castle?
Marcia: Yeah. **El Castillo.**
Marcia: Who played the, the, the, - put the name of the
Antonio: How do we know?
Marcia: I have Antonio, I have the -
Antonio: Marcia. **Se va a empezar el juego.**
Marcelo: **Que bien**
Antonio: **Déme, se va a empezar el juego.**
Marcia: A veces tiran bombas amarillas and some people
Antonio: **Cuéntenos**
Marcia: You have the lamp like this and like this and you are here and you are **formando** and you go with the people to **explorar** and you go

Marcelo: **Boom!**

Marcia: And you go -Ah, yes, and you put here are the rest and here you **mandar** a person in a hole to go and see and sometimes you go and then you do wha and wha and

Antonio: **Trace armas y bombas?**

Marcia: No, it’s not with **ametralladoras como ahora**, es en tiempos **viejos** - es con espadas - pero es buenísimo.

Paula: **Okay are we ready?**

Marcia: **Yes! (chorus of no’s)**

Paula: **What**

Antonio: **Wolf empire**

Benita: **What?**

Marcia: **Wolf empire**

Marcelo: **What is that?**

Antonio: **Wolf, like lobo and empire like imperio**

Marcelo: **Ah, okay**

Marcia: **Wolf empire**

Paula: **Wolf empire is that what you want?**

Marcelo: **No**

Antonio: **He said yes before and only now when you asked he said no.**

Paula: **Is wolf empire okay with you? Is wolf empire okay with you? Is wolf empire okay with you? Why? Marcelo you love wolves! Okay I tell you what. Let’s say wolf empire for now since the majority of your group likes it.** *(other groups do the questions)*

Benita: **Pongan atención, pongan atención. Nos van a preguntar ellos.**

Diana: **Who didn’t buy something?**

Benita: **Eh! who didn’t buy something?**

Antonio: **I think Yesenia.**

Marcia: **Yesenia**

Marcelo: **Yesenia?**

Marcia: **Yesenia**

Antonio: **Ya dió? Yesenia.**

Diana: **What?**

Antonio: **Yesenia.**

Diana: **Yes.**

Marcelo: **Mahe, yo le dije, vio.**

Antonio: **Chóquelo Marcelo.**

Marcia: **Who ate a hotdog at the fair?**

Antonio: **Un perro caliente. ¿Quién se comió un perrito?**Point for us teacher. No not them, to us.

Paula: **Oh, yeah. I’m sorry, I’m sorry.**

Antonio: **Who ate plátan and sugar? Plátan and sugar? Plátano y azucar?**
Marcia: Plantain!
Diana: Ah, Plantain!
Marcia: Teacher, en dulce? En dulce? in sugar?
Benita: Ay, que asco.
Paula: Yes.

(pause)
Antonio: Me duele la cabeza. No me di cuenta, mahe.
Marcia: (Talking to herself)
Susana: Marcia?
Marcia: Yes.
Antonio: Ay que bueno, mahe.
Marcelo: ¿Ay como era?
Antonio: Marcia.
Marcia: Ay Marcia!
Antonio: Alguien que no *** Márquelo de “la Luna”
Paula: Oh, sorry, sorry, sorry, sorry. Sorry, sorry, sorry, sorry, sorry.

(pause)
Antonio: Don’t forget – no me ponga a mi.
Marcelo: ¿Vamos a poner “anaconda”? Usted vio la película Anaconda?
Antonio: Mahe, póngale “anaconda” y luego se pone a la cámara. Sí?
Póngase a la cámara.

Marcia: I have to read.
Antonio: No, no. Esto no se ha terminado, Marcelo.
Marcia: Roberto
Diana: Ehhh
Marcia/
Antonio: Diana! ha ha!
Marcelo: Who, which one?
Marcia: Marcelo this, this.
Antonio: Vamos. Yo le tapo la -Tapémosle la cara de una vez.
Marcelo: Who- who played - a ball
Several: No entendimos nada
Antonio: Who played with a ball of esponge?
Marcia: a sponge
Several: No entendimos nada
Antonio: Who played with a ball of esponge?
Marcia: A sponge
Diana: a ¿Qué?
Marcia: a sp-
Antonio: Who played with a ball of esponge?
Marcia: No, with a ball made of sponge.
Several: Ahh
Marcia: Where is the paper?
Antonio: I don’t have. Marcia, veala acá...ahorita nos tocan Los lobos
Several: Who ****
Antonio: Espere, yo creo que los tres obviamente. (ha ha)
Marcia: I don’t know who Susana - I know who-
Marcelo: Susana *** Susana, Susana, Susana!
Marcia: I know – I was talking to Susana.
(overlapping talk indistinguishable)
Antonio: Ah, sí, sí Usted me lo había contado.
Marcia: What, that’s ours, Teacher. Teacher, Susana’s crying, screaming.
Paula: Okay, first warning, no screaming, that’s it.
Marcia: They don’t have the free one.
Antonio: They already lost the free bun.
Marcia: the one
Paula: You already lost the free one. Guys sit down.
Marcelo: Ha!
Several: Who ***
Marcelo: Ah, yo sé quien.
Antonio: Espere, espere. ¿Porque creen que ponen eso ahí?
Diana: Casi ganamos a los Wolf Empire.
Paula: Very close. Okay.
Antonio: Por uno
Paula: Okay. Wolf empire.
Susana: Who slept a somebody else’s house
Marcia: Susana
Benita: Susana!
Susana: No Yesenia!
Marcelo: Ah, papá!
Antonio: No se rían. Usted no me suplicó que se lo pongara.
Paula: Okay, Wolf Empire to ***
Marcia: -went to a party
Marcelo: Hah!
Marcia: quickly!
Marcelo: I, I go, verdad?
Marcia: You read it.
Marcelo: ****
Antonio: You do good, just read it, read it. Thank you. (ha ha)…
Marcia: Marcelo.
Marcelo: Who do crazy things?
Several: Huh?
Several: crazy
Marcelo: Mahe, porque me tapa?
Antonio: Porque se ven las caras
Marcelo: En serio?
Antonio: A Roberto nadie le -
(Overlapping broken speech)
Antonio: Cara de clavo
Marcia: I don’t want this Andrés. I think instead this is good.
Antonio: Sí está buena. A todo el mundo le da dos preguntas.
Marcelo: Qué ***-
Antonio: NO! -todavía no, todavía no, todavía no. Marcia, pongámos esta a Roberto
Marcelo: Pum!
Marcia: Marcelo!
Benita: I say María.
Marcelo: Vea esta. Ah, ah-Andrés, ya hago esta, vea.
Benita: Teacher I want *** but my grandmother said she won’t give me more money. Teacher the last.
Marcia: Yeah, so we ask them.
Paula: Okay, yeah.
Marcelo: Who knitted?
Unidentified: Que cosa?
Antonio: Who knitted?
Unidentified: Ay, mamá! Marcia.
Marcia/ Antonio: Yes.
Marcelo: No! mi papá me enseñó a coser.
Marcia: Marcelo, you said that it was a broma.
Marcelo: Sí pero no, no es broma.
Marcia: Aye, Marcelo
Antonio: Marcelo said - Now he said that he knit.
Paula: Did you knit this weekend?
Marcia: No, coser no, is tejer.
Antonio: Lo mismo Marcia
Marcia: No. Uh, uh.
Marcelo: No.
Paula: Can you knit?
Diana: Ah, no Marcelo, su papá cose.
Antonio: Hah!
Marcelo: Sí pero él también hace eso.
Paula: Very good-very good.
Antonio: Es lo mismo le mete la aguja y luego, para allá, para acá, para allá, para acá.
Several: ********
Paula: No, sweetheart. It was Marcia and they got her.
Marcia: Who went to a party? No, ya la dijimos?
Antonio: No. ¿Cuál fue la pregunta que le hicieron a ustedes? Roberto-No Soledad,
Paula: This is a close one, this is very close. Okay
(Microphone disconnected)
APPENDIX C

SECONDARY DATA FROM QUESTIONNAIRE

Fourth Grade –
All the participants turned 10-years-old during the year
*Ethnicity as defined by the student
Highlighted students chosen as focus for analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nationality/Ethnicity*</th>
<th>Years at CATIE school</th>
<th>Home Lang.</th>
<th>Time spent in English country</th>
<th>Family that speaks English</th>
<th>Other language spoken parents</th>
<th>Ethnicity or Nation. Parents</th>
<th>Parents’ Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antonio</td>
<td>Costa Rican Latino</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Father-L2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F - CR</td>
<td>F-Eng. M-Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benita</td>
<td>Costa Rican Latina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F – CR</td>
<td>M– Business F-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Costa Rican Lat/Bl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F-CR</td>
<td>M-Teach F-Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillermo</td>
<td>Costa Rican Latino</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F-CR</td>
<td>M-Banker F-Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>Costa Rican Latino</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F-CR</td>
<td>M-Business F-expolice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Costa Rican Lat/Bl</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>F/Aunts-L2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M-CR</td>
<td>M-Accoun F-Park Ranger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td>Costa Rican Latino</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F – CR</td>
<td>M/F-Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susana</td>
<td>Costa Rican Iran</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Visit to Disneyland</td>
<td>Absent Father L2</td>
<td>F-Arabic, Farsi</td>
<td>M/F-CR</td>
<td>M-Account F-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>Costa Rican Latina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F-CR Latino</td>
<td>M/F-Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yesenia</td>
<td>Mexican Latina</td>
<td>3 w/2 year break</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2 years in Idaho</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F-Mexican Latino</td>
<td>M-HW F-PhD Agronomy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fifth Grade
All the participants turned 11-years-old during the year

*Ethnicity as defined by the student

Highlighted students chosen as focus for analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nationality/Ethnicity*</th>
<th>Years at CATIE school</th>
<th>Home Lang.</th>
<th>Time spent in English speak. country</th>
<th>Family that speaks English</th>
<th>Other lang spoken by parents</th>
<th>Ethnicity or Nationality of Parents</th>
<th>Parents’ Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alvaro</td>
<td>Costa Rican Latino</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F - CR</td>
<td>F – Teacher M- HW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amparo</td>
<td>Costa Rican Latino</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F – CR</td>
<td>M– Teacher F-Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arturo</td>
<td>Mexican Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2 years in Idaho</td>
<td>F-L2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F-Mexican</td>
<td>M-biologist F-PhD student in Agronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby</td>
<td>Costa Rican/ USA White/ Latina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Birth-5 in CT Visits to CA.</td>
<td>F/3 Older sisters-L1 M-L2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M-CR F- USA/White</td>
<td>M- Teacher F-Geologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Costa Rican Latina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F-CR</td>
<td>M-F-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricky</td>
<td>Costa Rican/ USA Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Birth-10 in Miami</td>
<td>F/M-L2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M-CR F-Venezuelan</td>
<td>M-Business F-Airline Mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidia</td>
<td>Costa Rican Latina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Visit to Disneyland</td>
<td>Older Sister – L2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F – CR</td>
<td>M-HW F- Deceased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Costa Rican Black/ Latino</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Visits to USA</td>
<td>M/Aunts/ Older brother Oral En English L2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F-CR M-Black F-Latino</td>
<td>M-Dentist F- Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario</td>
<td>Costa Rican Latino</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Visit to Canada</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F-CR Latino</td>
<td>M- Teacher F-Doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Costa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F-CR</td>
<td>M/F-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rican</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajit</td>
<td>Costa Rican</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Visit to</td>
<td>F-Hindi,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latino/Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>F-Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M-CR F-Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia</td>
<td>Costa Rican</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Visit to</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M/F-CR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M-Account. F-?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sixth Grade

All the participants turned 12-years-old during the year

*Ethnicity as defined by the student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nationality/Ethnicity*</th>
<th>Years at CATIE school</th>
<th>Home Language</th>
<th>Time spent in English speak. country</th>
<th>Family that speaks English</th>
<th>Other Lang. spoken by parents</th>
<th>Ethnicity or Nation. of Parents</th>
<th>Parents’ Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anselmo</td>
<td>Rican Latino</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F - CR</td>
<td>F – Business M- HW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerardo</td>
<td>Rican Latino</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Visits to US Older Brother- L2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F – CR</td>
<td>M– Professor F-Doctor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Maria</td>
<td>Rican</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Younger sister L2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F – CR</td>
<td>M-Bus Driver GF-Mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercedes</td>
<td>Rican Latina</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M-L2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F-CR</td>
<td>M- Account Rawlings F-School Princ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymundo R</td>
<td>Rican Latino</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Visits to US M/Older Sister- L2</td>
<td>Grandfather Yugoslavian</td>
<td>M-CR F-CR/Yugoslavian</td>
<td>M-business F-?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymundo S</td>
<td>Rican Latino</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F-CR</td>
<td>M- F-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvio</td>
<td>Rican/USA Latino</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F-CR</td>
<td>M- Professor F-Agron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>Rican Latina</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M/F – CR</td>
<td>M-HW F-Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

CONSENT FORMS

Parent Consent Form

I __________________________ agree to allow my child _______________________ to take part in a research study titled Code “Code-switching behaviors in a Costa Rican bilingual elementary school classroom”, which is being conducted by Paula Mellom (506) 556-8502, under the direction of Betsy Rymes, University of Georgia Department of Language Education, (706) 542-4512. I do not have to allow my child to take part in this study; My child can stop taking part at any time without giving any reason, and without penalty. I can ask to have information related to my child returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed.

Reason for the research

The reason for the study is to analyze how and when students in a bilingual classroom use Spanish and how and when they use English with their classmates and their teachers and to understand what effect this language behavior has on their learning English and establishing identities as individuals and members of a group.

Benefits

I understand my child will not benefit directly from this research. However, his or her participation in this research may lead to information that could shed light on how children learn second languages in school environments and contribute to the development of strategies to facilitate that learning.

Procedures

The procedures of the study are as follows:

The participants will be sound recorded on microcassette recorders clipped to their belts and video-recorded as they interact during normal classroom activities during regularly scheduled English classes. Recordings will be made during 1 hour segments every two weeks from April - December.

Discomfort or stress

No discomfort or stress is anticipated from the study. To ensure that the participants feel completely at ease, they will not be asked to say or do anything that they do not wish to do, nor will they be asked to do anything other than what they are normally asked to do for class. They will also have the freedom to turn off the recorder at any time if they feel uncomfortable.
Risks

There are no risks expected from participation in the study.

Confidentiality

No information about my child, or provided by my child during the research, will be
shared with others without my and my child’s written permission, except if necessary to protect
his or her rights or welfare or if required by law.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified
with my child will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with my permission or as
required by law.

If information about my child is published, it will be written in a way that he or she
cannot be recognized. However, research records may be obtained by court order.

An exception to confidentiality involves information revealed concerning suicide,
homicide, or child abuse which must be reported as required by law or if the researchers are
required to provide information by a judge.

I will have the right to review all audiotapes and videotapes prior to their being used in
the study data. No one but the researcher and her dissertation committee will have access to the
tapes and they will be stored in a private locked cabinet in the researcher’s house.

Further questions:

The researcher will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the
course of the project, and can be reached by telephone at: (506) 556-8502 or at the email address
pjmellom@yahoo.com

Agreement and Consent form copy

My signature below indicates that the researchers have answered all of my questions to
my satisfaction and that I consent to have my child participate this study. I have been given a
copy of this form.

_____________________________________
Signature of Researcher. Date

_____________________________________
Signature of Participant Date

And

_____________________________________
Signature of Parent or Guardian Date

For questions or problems about your rights please call or write: Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D., Human Subjects Office,
University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone
(706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu
Marcelo Assent Form

Dear Participant,

You are invited to participate in my research project titled, “Code-switching behaviors in a Costa Rican bilingual elementary school classroom”. Through this project I am learning about how boys and girls learn a second language in school.

If you decide to be part of this, you will allow me to videotape and audio record you during regular English classes several times this year. Your participation in this project will not affect your grades in school. I will not use your name on any papers that I write about this project. However, because of your participation you may improve your ability to read, speak and write in English. I hope to learn something about how children learn second languages that will help other children in the future.

If you want to stop participating in this project, you are free to do so at any time. You can also choose to turn off the recorders at any time.

If you have any questions or concerns you can always ask me or call my teacher, Dr. Betsy Rymes at the following number: 706-542-4512.

Sincerely,

Paula J. Mellom
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Linguistics
University of Georgia
506-556-8502
pjmellom@yahoo.com

I understand the project described above. My questions have been answered and I agree to participate in this project. I have received a copy of this form.

_____________________________________
Signature of the Participant/Date

Please sign both copies, keep one and return one to the researcher.

For additional questions or problems about your rights as a research participant please call or write: Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D., Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, GA 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-mail Address: IRB@uga.edu