

Content integration in bilingual education: educational and interactional practices in the context of MEC-British Council partnership in Madrid Region¹

Diana Labajos Miguel & Luisa Martín Rojo (with the collaboration of Manuel López Muñoz)

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Abstract

This paper shows the results obtained while pursuing the R&D research project “School and multilingualism: a critical sociolinguistic study on educational linguistic programs set in the Madrid Region (HUM2007-64694/FILO)”. The aim of this project is to analyze two educational linguistic programs implemented in the Madrid region, in particular, the language immersion classes, called Bridging Classes, designed for newcomers, and the bilingual programs currently put into practice in public secondary schools. In this contribution we analyze a History and Geography lesson taught in English to a group of students who follow a bilingual program (Spanish-English) within a secondary state school in Madrid. The methodological framework of the teacher integrates language and contents. Data have been collected through classroom observation by a team of researchers who did a year-long ethnographic study. The analysis focuses on the relationship between the way in which classroom interaction is organized (activities, objectives, topics, participation framework, legitimate languages and participants) and the “teacher’s pedagogical focus”, that is, the teachers’ decisions about what will be learned, how and when (see Seedhouse 2004). The analysis of this lesson reveals a relative balance between content and language pedagogical focus and the way it can be achieved through classroom interaction.

Key words: ethnography, bilingual education, content and language integration, interactional analysis, code-switching.

1. This article is part of the results obtained for the research project “School and Multilingualism: a critical sociolinguistic study on educational linguistic programs set in the Madrid Region”, financed by the Research and Innovation Ministry (R+ D project, reference number: HUM2007-64694/FILO), and within the activities developed by the consolidated research group MIRCo (Multilingualism, social identities, inter-group relations and communication) from the UAM, Madrid Autonomous University (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid).

Resumen

Este artículo presenta los resultados obtenidos en la investigación I+D Escuela y multilingüismo: un estudio sociolingüístico crítico de los programas de educación lingüística de la Comunidad de Madrid (HUM2007-64694/FILO). El objetivo de este proyecto es conocer los programas de educación lingüística en esta comunidad (el programa de inmersión lingüística para recién llegados, las aulas de enlace, y las secciones lingüísticas, conocidos como programas bilingües, en educación secundaria). En esta comunicación se analiza una clase de ciencias sociales impartida en inglés a los alumnos de la sección lingüística (programa bilingüe inglés-español) de un instituto de secundaria público de Madrid. Los datos han sido obtenidos mediante observación en el aula, en una etnografía realizada por un equipo de investigadoras y que se prolongó a lo largo de un curso escolar. El análisis explora la relación que existe entre la forma en que se organiza la interacción en el aula (actividades, objetivos, tópicos, marco de participación, lenguas y participantes legitimados) y los objetivos educativos del profesor, esto es, los contenidos y objetivos que se fija, y cómo y cuándo abordarlos (véase Seedhouse 2004). El análisis de la clase revela un equilibrio entre los objetivos educativos de contenido y lengua, y muestra cómo este equilibrio se puede alcanzar a través de la interacción en el aula.

Palabras clave: etnografía, educación bilingüe, integración de lengua y contenidos, análisis interaccional, *code-switching*.

1. Introduction

In this paper we present the results obtained while pursuing the R&D research project, “School and multilingualism: a critical sociolinguistic study on educational linguistic programs set in the Madrid Region (HUM2007-64694/FILO)”. The aim of this project is to analyze two educational linguistic programs implemented in the Madrid region, in particular, the language immersion classes, called Bridging Classes, designed for newcomers, and the bilingual programs currently put into practice in secondary public schools. Two educational linguistic programmes implemented in the Madrid region are studied: 1) the Spanish immersion programme for newcomers, called Bridging Classes where Spanish is the only language of instruction and 2) the English-Spanish CLIL programmes currently being implemented in public secondary schools (particularly the programme run jointly by the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science and the British Council) where English, but also Spanish, are languages of instruction.

Our main goal is to explore how both programs are managed by the various “actors” involved: firstly, by the regional administration (such as funding, planning, teacher training and other resources); secondly, by the schools (school involvement, and how the programs stand in the school); thirdly, by the teachers (language teaching methodology, content and language integration, teachers’ aims and expectations). Finally, we study the students’ trajectories in order to know which programs, methods, practices and integration strategies are used to favour academic success and integrate students’ diversity.

This contrastive analysis is currently being conducted, and it is showing how, in spite of the fact that these linguistic programs are living under the one roof in schools, they approach linguistic capital in different ways. While in the bilingual program (CLIL), multilingualism and students’ linguistic capital are highly valued in the Spanish immersion programme for newcomers, Spanish monolingualism is generally imposed and students’ linguistic capital is only rarely valued

(Martín Rojo & Mijares 2007; Martín Rojo 2010). The rest of the school is apparently isolated from both programs, and from their linguistic and cultural diversity. This analysis also reveals a hierarchy of languages which explains what linguistic varieties can be used, and when, and which others should be avoided in classrooms. Only the linguistic varieties which are highly valued, as being “appropriate” “useful”, or as a language of instruction are allowed to be used during the lessons as a learning strategy and a tool for communication and for integration.

In this paper we will report on research in progress on the bilingual program, implemented by the Spanish Ministry of Education and the British Council, and managed by the Madrid Region’s administration. The analysis will focus on the History lessons taught to a group of students in their third year of ESO (educación secundaria Obligatoria – compulsory secondary education, CSE) who follow the bilingual program at Villababel High School, located in the south of Madrid. This school is a public school where regular, bilingual and bridging educational programs are implemented (see table 1, section 4). Firstly, we present the analytical framework applied in this research (section 2), and we outline the guiding research questions in the analysis (section 3). After presenting the research setting (section 4), we introduce the key features of this bilingual program (section 5), of the study group (section 6), and the History lesson (section 7). Finally, we analyse the interaction, focusing on the pedagogical focus of the interactions and the instances of code-switching (section 8). We conclude (section 9) by linking pedagogical focus, code-switching and the role of languages in the program.

2. The analytical framework

This paper approaches data from a Critical Sociolinguistic Ethnography perspective, one integrating an ethnographic, interactional and discursive perspective. This perspective explores the links between local discourse practices (such as interactional routines in classrooms) and wider, complex social processes, including the production of knowledge and ideologies. Sociolinguistics (Heller 1999/2006; Bailey 2002), critical discourse studies (Chouliarakis & Fairclough, 1999; van Dijk 2008; Wodak & Weiss 2002) and ethnography (Madison 2005) all share this critical stance. The analyses of data go beyond the fine-grained scrutiny of language practices in educational settings in multilingual contexts. Our aim is not just to reveal interactional patterns or to investigate the acquisition process that takes place in the classroom, but to explore how they are intertwined with wider social processes. In order to understand this approach, we need to bear in mind that a critical theoretical and methodological stance not only impacts on the aim of the research, but it also impacts on both the definition of what is actually under study and on how it is to be studied.

The corpus of this research responds, therefore, to this critical approach, seeking to examine how teaching and learning are partly discursive. Thus, the analysis focuses on the educational practices in classroom interactions, in particular, on how they are organized and regulated, on the participation framework and on the placement of students’ resources in the back stage or in the front stage of the class setting.

However, as Cicourel (2000; 2002) notices, we consider that ‘ecological validity’ cannot be achieved solely by close analysis of recordings of interactions; it also requires a broader ethnographic research enabling researchers to place a particular encounter in the context of texts, interactions and institutional practices. Thus, we consider that ‘bureaucratic settings trigger, guide and constrain communicative exchanges’ (Cicourel 2002: 4) and that “speech events frame and are framed by informal (often implicit or tacit) organisational policies and routine work practic-

es” (Cicourel 2002: 3). We are, then, involved in a “task-oriented ethnography” (Cicourel 2000: 115) which integrates the observation of organizational settings, interactions and language use, as well as ethnographic description of institutions’ layout, their working arrangements and daily social interactions (verbal, nonverbal and paralinguistic communications).

Following a task-oriented ethnography perspective, we have compiled three kinds of data: 1. The organisation of the interaction in the classroom, including the teaching materials employed (books, maps, photocopies, etc.) and the writing activities (blackboard exercises, use of notebooks); 2. The institutional documentation of the school and the bilingual program (School Projects, the British Council Guidelines for the integrated curriculum, the subjects’ syllabi, information on the composition of the student body, etc.); 3. Participants’ representations of the activities, the educational tasks and the bilingual program which emerge from two focus groups with the students, and two in depth interviews with the teacher. This teacher has been involved in the analysis and in the preparation of this paper, providing information for section 6.

Although in this paper our analysis is mainly focused on the organisation of the interaction in the classroom, in order to understand the processes taking place in the classroom we take into account the other two kinds of data.

3. Research questions and the focus of the analysis

The analysis tries to answer two research questions. The first question explores how the teachers’ pedagogical focus shapes the ways in which classroom interactions are organized (activities, objectives, topics, participation framework, legitimate languages and participants). We understand pedagogical focus (Seedhouse 2004) as teachers’ decisions about what is to be learned, how and when. For instance, if the pedagogical focus were to improve students’ competence in the language of the program that would be projected into the interactional order by relegating to the back stage area the students’ contributions in languages other than English. In turn, the pedagogical focus seems to be related to teachers’ views of the bilingual program, its goals and objectives and teachers’ expectations about students’ performance. Through the analysis of in-depth interviews and the teachers’ own contribution to the analysis of the data, we explore to what extent there is a connection between teachers’ expectations and the place the linguistic program holds among the other school programs, its prestige, and the image of its students.

The second research question we approach is whether the placement of languages (i.e. Spanish and English) in the interaction (front stage vs. back stage) gives us insight into how these languages are valued, and what role is attributed to them within the program and the educational processes. We study, then, code-switching instances within the sequencing of task activities, and also subordinate exchanges among peers. For the analysis of code-switching, our research applies an interactional approach, which sees the evocation of other languages as a contextualization cue (Gumperz 1982) retrieving the contextual presuppositions on which participants rely to make sense of what they see and hear in encounters. These cues “are used by participants in a global inference process to elucidate what the exchange is about, what the expected patterns of participation are, what the norms are, what the mutual rights and obligations are, and what the desired response is” (Gumperz 1982: 131). Nevertheless, the interpretation of this contextualization cue (code-switching) is not necessarily shared by all the participants in the class. We will study, then, the instances when participants (both the teacher and the students) resort to languages other than English (the language of the program).

In order to answer these questions, our analysis focuses on how activities are sequenced through the interactions, and to what extent they match the pedagogical focus stated by the teacher and by the program. The analysis reveals the kind of interaction sequences prevailing in these classes. We also study the instances of code-switching found in relation to the activities, and the linguistic norms built in the classes. This analysis reveals which languages are allowed in the front stage of the class, and which languages are off-stage.

Following a critical perspective, both research questions seem to be interrelated, and the analysis of local practices, in which languages play different roles, may give us insight into several social processes, such as the development of inclusive educational programs, and the legitimation of some languages. Therefore, we explore how classroom management is related to the program design, carried out by the Spanish Ministry of Education and the British Council. The analysis of code-switching will also show which languages are considered languages of instruction, and how this status is related to both the aims of the program and to the social valuation of languages as symbolic capital. Bourdieu explained just how schools perform this role, through processes that “convert” economic relations into symbolic capital (Bourdieu 1977: 195). By means of this “conversion”, the relations of dependence are presented as the consequence of inequalities of talent or educational ability. This is what happens with compensatory programmes and others justified by the existence of “different levels” or by a “lack of knowledge”. The concepts of “conversion” and “capital” immediately bring to mind others proposed by Bourdieu, namely those of “value” and “measure”. All these notions are fundamental to the present study, in which we show how some languages and types of knowledge (symbolic capital) are valued in Madrid schools.

4. The research setting: Villababel High School²

Villababel High School is located in the southeast of Madrid in a traditionally working class area. The area has experienced the arrival of several groups of migrants throughout the years: national immigrants, that is, people who originally lived in Spanish regions different from Madrid, like Andalucía, Castilla-La Mancha and Extremadura, and who settled in the 60s; and foreign immigrants, that is, those who have been coming in different waves since the early 90s, and who have settled in the area and are now an important proportion of the population in the neighbourhood.

Villababel School is a secondary public school considered a “priority public school”. In institutional terms the school follows “an educational quality improvement plan for schools in need of a specific effort by the Madrid region educational authorities and the schools themselves, given the socioeconomic and sociocultural characteristics of the school’s population” (López Rupérez 2006)³.

According to this special configuration of the school, the students defined as regular students (the ones who follow the usual secondary education program) are 65 % of the 780 students at Villababel High School while the other 35 % of the students follow special programs, that is, they are students in need or who follow curricular adaptations to the regular syllabus. These, such as

2. For this section we have used a formal interview held with the school headmistress, tape-recorded, and some informal conversations with Villababel teachers which took place during the first term of the 08/09 school year. The school data have been gathered by the members of the MIRCo research group.

3. Plan for the Improvement of Priority Public High Schools designed by the Madrid Region educational authorities.

the compensatory program or the bilingual program, differ from the official curriculum in some way or another and address the specific needs of the school's population.

Table 1 displays the different programs at Villababel School and the percentage of students who take each of them⁴

Program	Percentage of students
Bilingual program	18 %
Compensatory education program	8 %
Special needs students	2 %
Diversification program	5 %
Bridging class	2 %

As this table shows, besides the regular educational program, the school runs also other special programs. Of these, the program with the largest number of students is the bilingual program, analyzed in this paper and followed by 18 % of the students. These students benefit from a curricular adaptation to contents as they have incorporated some of the British National curriculum procedures and objectives. The compensatory education program, on the other hand, aims at helping students who have gaps in their knowledge and therefore cannot follow their age group lessons; Romani students can usually be found in this program's classrooms. A fact is worth noting: although the "bridging class" is not included in compensatory programs in the statistics, 2 %, the Spanish language program for foreign newcomers is considered part of the compensatory program in Villababel.

As well as the programs in table 1 the school's diversity is also reflected in the number of students who come from communities "at risk of exclusion", that is, students who come from marginalized or potentially marginalized ethnic or social groups: 9 students live in a nearby foster residence run by nuns (very near the high school), 17 students come from a shanty town on the outskirts of Madrid city (students living there are picked up and taken home by the council bus) and 3 students are from a Romani settlement on the outskirts of the city. According to the statistics provided by the school headmistress in November 2008, 230 of the 780 students are students with a migrant background, and so, they can be also considered as students at risk of exclusion. The number of these students has increased from 10 % in 2002 to 25 % in 2008. Some of these students have accessed the bilingual program; in fact, there are 8 students with a migrant background in the study group, 24 % of the class.

5. The MEC-BC bilingual model

This section is dedicated to the analysis of the educational model implemented by the MEC-British Council and the teaching philosophy, contents and methodologies which are part of the design of the program and structure the framework for the teaching-learning process in the subjects analyzed in this paper.

The Bilingual Schools Project is a Ministry of Education and British Council joint program aiming to "provide students from the age of three to sixteen with a bilingual, bi-cultural educa-

4. Data provided by the school headmistress.

tion through an integrated Spanish/English curriculum⁵⁵. That is, a program designed for students in compulsory education by which they learn curricular contents through two languages, English and Spanish. The program has been operating since 1996 in Spanish public schools and since 2005 in high schools. It started offering a Spanish/English Curriculum to 3-11 year old children in 69 Spanish infant and primary State schools, and later extended to 42 high schools.

Two main laws set the legislative framework for this program in compulsory secondary education: The national Royal Decree 717/2005 regulating the teachings of the MEC/British Council program in educational institutions, and the regional Decree 2819/2005, which created the linguistic sections in high schools following the MEC/British Council program.

5.1. Target population

The schools chosen for the implementation of the program were located in working class neighbourhoods, were very active in terms of extra-curricular activities, and started working on the so-called “bilingual and bi-cultural program”. The program was implemented by the partnership between the Ministry of Education and the British Council and has been in operation in secondary education since 2005. These schools have the same admission criteria as any other school: admission is open to anyone but students living in the area have priority of access to their public school, and some of the students the schools host come from bilingual primary schools. Students starting the bilingual program in secondary education are recommended to have a prior knowledge of English.

5.2. Curriculum

At the curricular level the goals of the program are mainly to teach content subjects in English. However, it is also important to address the development of the four skills, and in particular communicative skills, in Spanish students. The main focus though is to provide students with an English and Spanish curriculum. The program also focuses on the development of cross-curricular teaching and learning, fostering the linkage of content areas amongst the different subjects’ syllabi; in particular the curriculum design focuses on linguistic awareness in content subjects and the use of non-fiction texts in the areas of Science and Geography and History (G & H).

The curriculum is designed by British and Spanish teachers. In regard to what extent there are British or Spanish contents the Guidelines specify that “the philosophy of the Spanish education system concerning these subjects is maintained while the methodology draws heavily on the British National Curriculum⁶⁶”, that is, most of the contents are the ones established in the current national and regional legislation while the methodology is based on a “British approach”. The curriculum also follows the Council of Europe’s Guidelines and the European notion of learning as a lifelong process.

5. According to the Guidelines for the development of the integrated curriculum in secondary education. MEC/ British Council.

6. Guidelines for the development of the integrated curriculum in secondary education, p.1.

5.3. Teaching methodology

According to the Guidelines, the program relies heavily on a particular teaching methodology, “a new methodology for teaching and learning other curricular areas through English” and “a different approach from the traditional English as a foreign language classroom”. That is, the program’s pillars are content integration and the *cross-curricularization* of the different subjects. The emphasis is on learning contents through two languages (bilingual) not to teach English as a Second Language. The focus is also on active learning, the use of information resources, use of IT, and research. We must note here that these two teaching objectives are included in the LOE (latest education law in Spain) objectives for CSE (ESO). In regards to active learning, several types of activities are shown in the Guidelines of the program for Geography and History. Those are for instance, carrying out a research project, organizing a debate, webquests, concept mapping or history mapping.

As well as an active learning, research and inquiry focus and the use of resources and IT for learning, the MEC-BC Guidelines also include paying attention to the different learning styles. Learning styles are the different ways in which children and adults think and learn (Shirato 1992).

5.4. The bilingual program in Villababel⁷

The syllabus for the bilingual students in Villababel is designed by the school’s program coordinator and by some of the school’s teachers. It reflects a certain methodological and ideological stance in regards to the teaching of English. In particular, it specifies that “students will be always spoken to in English; a bilingual environment will be created”. By a bilingual environment, the school is understood to have posters and labels in English, to organise activities on the topic of other cultures, and to have a common lexicon for the different subjects. Other aims concerning English include to “use the language as a vehicular element in order to learn other subjects and to foster the involvement of as many teachers as possible in the program”. In relation to the teaching methodology, the school syllabus emphasizes the idea of a communicative approach to teaching and learning, the use of different groupings in the classroom with the aim of giving students the opportunity of speaking in English, and the use of authentic materials on other subjects in order to foster interdisciplinarity and cross-curricular support. The Guidelines focus on doing research, being autonomous, and being able to find information from different sources is also present in the school syllabus design.

6. The study group

Villababel has 143 students (18 % of its school population) enrolled in the bilingual program, which was in its 4th year in the 2008-9 school year. The study group is a bilingual 3rd year of *ESO* (Compulsory Secondary Education, CSE) class. At the beginning of the school year, the group consisted of 32 students and, at the time of writing, there were 33 as a new Romanian student had arrived to the school. This is not usually the case for bilingual groups, as there are usually less students per group. This group actually belongs to two former groups of students who were in different classrooms in the previous course, 2nd year of CSE and were put together in the third course because of the regional authority’s requirements for the number of students per class.

7. Data obtained from the Bilingual program syllabus 2008-2009.

The students are diverse in terms of ethnocultural origin, social class, academic success, primary education background, years of participation in the bilingual program and gender. Their ages range between 14 and 16 years old. Students with a migrant background are: 4 students from Romania, 2 students from Ecuador, 2 from Peru and one from Colombia. There is a Spanish girl born of a Spanish and Dominican family. There are 18 girls and 15 boys so it is balanced in terms of gender. Students have had different educational trajectories: some come from a bilingual school nearby and have had a bilingual education since the first course of primary education. Some have not had a bilingual education before and came to the bilingual program in the first course of CSE. Most of the time students work in their classroom; they sometimes go to the arts and crafts room or to the physics and chemistry laboratory. Their classroom is next to the other third year classrooms. They usually sit in rows. During the first term students sat in alphabetical order.

The bilingual subjects for the third year of CSE are the compulsory English Literacy (taught 5 hours a week), History and Geography (taught 3 hours a week) and Earth Sciences (taught 3 hours a week). Those subjects are mandatory in terms of the program's requirements. Optional subjects to be taught in English are Arts & Crafts and Technology. Individual teachers can decide whether they teach those or not. Those five subjects are taught in English, according to the integrated curriculum, but the rest are taught following the regular curriculum in Spanish. In terms of academic performance, in the first term, and according to the data provided by the school's headmistress, 50 % of the group failed at least 5 subjects. This paper focuses on the analysis of one of the compulsory subjects in the program—the History and Geography class—and in particular a lesson tape-recorded in October 2008.

7. The History lesson: context, aims and methodology

Manuel, a teacher we have observed since September 2008 and who has collaborated in this paper, participated in the design of the already mentioned Guidelines for the development of a History and Geography curriculum and has contributed to this section.

The lesson was taught during the first part of the course and the unit was designed to connect to students' previous knowledge on America before 1492. The lesson focused on Sir Francis Drake, a historical character who emulated Magellan's journey around the Earth. It also showed the antagonism between England and Spain at that time. The antagonism between England and Spain also served as an introduction to Philip II and the *Armada Invencible*. The lesson also touched on the "trade triangle", the way trade was organized up to the 19th Century, and what caused the slave trade. The figure of Drake as a pirate for the Spanish and as Sir for the British is essential to understanding the historical relativity of the characters and of their actions, depending on the viewpoint from which they are analyzed. Cross-curricular contents included the connections to Geography in world map revision and knowledge of the Earth's geography at that time. As Manuel puts it, Social Sciences teaching is an ideal area from which to analyze historical relativity and to "make our students' thinking more mature, more able to interpret and contrast facts".

According to Manuel the lesson was planned so that students could understand the same historical fact from completely different perspectives, as one of the activities consisted of matching the reasons of the different members of a ship's crew for sailing to America. This is related to the Social Sciences area's aim of encouraging students' empathy towards the feelings of people from different cultures.

Manuel decided to carry out these exercises because, in his opinion, the group's characteristics (the large number of students and their talkative and undisciplined attitude) made it impossible for the teacher to do more creative and free work. Consequently, he decided to do more guided lessons and activities during the first months of the year. The exercises chosen for the lesson come from a workbook designed for key stage 2 (Parsons, 2003) helping British students to revise for their exams. It is easy to use and it has easy instructions, which encourages students' active learning, the use of the information they are provided with, and the use of their existing knowledge.

8. Lesson interactional analysis

The central assumption of this paper is that classroom interaction is organized depending on the views held regarding the educational program and the educational tasks. Thus, the aim of the present analysis is not to reveal the class structure or the participation framework in these classes *per se*, but to determine what this organization means for particular participants. Following Seedhouse (2004), in this approach, the interactional analysis is oriented towards understanding a practical social accomplishment (see Seedhouse 2004: Chapter 1, for the differences between ethnomethodological Conversational Analysis (CA), and approaches developed by linguists, and among others, Sinclair and Coulthard 1975; 1992 in a Discourse Analysis tradition). While Seedhouse (2004) seeks to develop an Applied CA for the Language classroom, in this case, we propose to integrate the analytical tools developed by CA and by interactional sociolinguistics in a "critical" analysis. This analysis would reveal certain invariant underlying characteristics in classroom interactions, in conjunction with extreme flexibility and variability in other respects, depending on the educational programs and the relationships negotiated by participants.

8.1. Pedagogical focus in interaction: Language and content focus

According to Seedhouse (2004), the interactional patterns of language lessons relate to the pedagogical focus of the activity, thus activity, pedagogical focus and interactional structure are related. We need to observe the activity, the pedagogical focus of the interaction and the interactional organization of the educational exchange in order to understand the interactional organization of the lesson. It is precisely this interrelationship that we want to explore in the analysis.

As the bilingual program's pedagogical focus is both the content—in this particular lesson, the History of Spanish and British colonizers in America—and the language as the vehicle of the teaching and learning process, we explore here the relationship between language and content in the lesson. The questions are: how are content and language teaching integrated in the lesson, if integrated in any manner at all? What are the foci of the teacher's interventions? Is there any difference in the language and content interactional patterns present in the exchange? (7.1) and finally, what is the role of code-switching in the interaction? (7.2)

8.1.1. Language focused interactions in the bilingual classroom.

The way language is integrated in the lesson is analyzed in this subsection in relation to the lesson tasks and their correction. The following extract shows the interactional sequence related to the first exercise done after an initial introductory part of the lesson in which the teacher, with the

help of the students, revises the concepts and ideas learnt in former lessons. The first exercise consists of a text about Francis Drake in which some of the words of the text are missing. The content part of the sequence relates to the information students read about Drake, information which is part of the subject curriculum. The exercise resembles a fill-the-blanks ESL (English as a Second Language) task. The following extract then shows the link between the pedagogical sequence and the organization of the activity. (See transcript conventions in Annex 1.)

Extract 1

1. **Teacher:** (...) what I want to look at now 39 francis drake/ SIR francis drake let's begin with number one francis drake remember my question was /did english people sit and wait for / the world to be explored by spaniards
2. **Students:** no {several voices sound at the same time}
3. **Teacher:** or portuguese people/ no they didn't in fact look we have to use pacific silver and spain to complete the text of // francis drake
4. (1)
5. **Teacher:** let's write the words in the correct place / I think it would be nice if you use a blue pen or a red pen so you can see the words clearly // yeah and we will read it in a moment /so this is the answer to what-what did / some british people do/ easy is it not?
6. (14) {the students do the exercise}
7. **Teacher:** is really complicated
8. **Student:** no
9. **Teacher:** no?
10. (4)
11. **Teacher:** a bit (())
12. Student: es el ejercicio uno no?
Translation: is that exercise 1?
13. **Teacher:** only number one
14. **Teacher:** ok can-can we can we read it aloud and so / let me
15. (18)
16. **Teacher:**ok? right?
17. Student: empiezo
Translation: I begin
18. **Teacher:** You want to begin? ok perfect

As we can see in extract 1, the activity development follows a traditionally teacher-centered pattern: teacher introduces the task (lines 1 and 2), teacher explains the task (line 5), students do the exercise with some working individually and some working in pairs, and a student self-selects to correct the exercise (lines 14 to 18).

As mentioned above, the bilingual curriculum includes language awareness and the development of the four skills as curricular aims, which is very present in the teaching organization of the class. The skills involved in the activity analyzed are the following:

- Reading (text comprehension)
- Writing (fill in the words)
- Speaking (student who corrects the exercise)
- Listening (classmates)

The following extract shows the pedagogical focus of the teacher in the interactions, while correcting the exercise and the usage of English and Spanish.

Extract 2

1. **Student:** {starts reading}drake wasn't just an explorer
2. **Teacher:** pronounce drake drake
3. **Student:** drake wasn't just an explorer / he want to capture
4. **Teacher:** he he what?
5. **Student:** he wanted
6. **Teacher:** ah ok
7. **Student:** {repeats the sentence pronouncing "wanted"} he wanted to capture spanish ships carrying gold and silver
8. **Teacher:** very good carrying gold and silver it was the sentence
9. **Student:** across the pacific ocean from america home to spain the spanish thought that only they knew the way to pacific
10. **Teacher:** to the pacific
11. **Student:** to the pacific
12. **Student:** (()) {continues reading} they would be taken completely by surprise

We note an IRF/IRE pattern (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975) —that is, the typical interactional pattern in language classrooms, consisting of Initiation, Response and Feedback or Evaluation—in the extract: the student starts reading, says something (line 3: want), the teacher asks for reformulation implying that there is an error (line 4: he he what), student reformulates correctly (line 5: he wanted) and teacher evaluates (line 8: very good). It is clear that the teacher has a language-focus when correcting the student's pronunciation while reading the text (lines 1 to 8). The teacher's focus is on the production of a standard or "correct" linguistic form. The pattern, according to Seedhouse (2004), shows form-focused or accuracy-focused classroom activities (lines 1 to 8 and 9 to 11), in which the organization of interaction is strongly constrained, and students' contributions, acceptable in "natural" conversation, are not accepted by the teacher.

8.1.2. Content focused interactions in the bilingual classroom.

The following extracts show two moments in the lesson when content is being taught by means of teacher questions and students answers. In the following extract Manuel is explaining the concept of Modern Times to the students and writing the dates on the board.

Extract 3

1. **Teacher:** & what's the end? when do you think is the end of the modern period?
2. **David A.:** now
3. **Alex:** renaissance
4. **Teacher:** sorry?
5. David M. : mil ochocientos
Translacion: *eighteen hundreds*
6. Student: mil ochocientos
Translacion: *eighteen hundreds*
7. **Alex:** renaissance
8. **Teacher:** no renaissance is one important period in the be-very begin and then there's another period in art which is called baroque

This extract shows how, despite Alex producing a word, "renaissment" and the teacher reformulating it, as the focus is on content and not on language (form and accuracy), the teacher ac-

cepts the contribution as valid in terms of content and does not make the student reformulate the word again. The teacher pays no attention to the Spanish contributions.

In the following extract, the teacher and the students read a text about Christopher Columbus and America; the text says America was an “unknown new continent”.

Extract 4

1. **Student:** pero unknown del todo no era
Translation: but it wasn't completely unknown
2. **David A.:** yes
3. **Teacher:** yes it was [well u-unless you think that the Vikings reached there which is really possible]

This extract shows how the student uses an English-Spanish sentence where there is code-switching. As the pedagogical focus is the content, the teacher accepts the student's contribution as valid despite the use of code-switching, answering the student initiation. The next section deals with code-switching examples in more depth.

8.2. Code-switching

In this section, we study the instances of code-switching in relation to tasks and activities, and how some linguistic norms are built through the interaction. As analyzed in a previous study (Martín Rojo 2010), the analysis of the norms built shows which languages are allowed in the front stage space of the class, and which others are relegated to the back stage, in accordance with the critical perspective led by Heller and Martin-Jones (see Martin-Jones 2007, and Heller and Martin-Jones 2001). From this perspective, local practices like the discursive construction of what can be placed at the front stage of the lesson, and what is expelled to the back stage is related to a process of social “valuation” of languages. This placement is related to the valuation of languages in the program and to understanding the program's aim. In analyzing these code-switching instances—as a contextualization cue (Gumperz 1982: 131)—in a process of global inference to elucidate what the exchange is about, what the expected patterns of participation are, what the norms are, what the mutual rights and obligations are, and what the desired response is, it is revealed that the interpretation of this contextualization cue is not necessarily shared by all the participants in the class (Martín Rojo 2010).

8.2.1. Multilingual choices vs. a monolingual norm

In contrast to the increasing multilingual order, in the bilingual program, the fact is that in the classrooms we studied, a mainly monolingual norm is built up through interaction. We observed three interactional patterns to be present in building up this monolingual norm. The first, and often the most common pattern, is the explicit or implicit rejection or negative evaluation of the use of other languages. In this class, this norm remains frequently implicit.

The following extract illustrates this tendency. As we see, in line 4, a female student asks a procedural question in Spanish. The teacher, in line 6, translates the answer into English in the evaluation turn, and keeps the activity going.

Extract 5

1. **Teacher:** ok can-can we can we read it aloud and so / let me
2. (18)
3. **Teacher:** ok? right?
4. Female Student: *empiezo*
Translation: *I begin*
5. **Teacher:** You want to begin? ok perfect
6. **Female Student:** {she starts reading} drake wasn't just an explorer

This example shows how the teacher can be addressed in a language different from that of the language of instruction (line 4), but which, as the patrimonial and national language, is shared by all the participants. The teacher does not ask the student to reformulate her utterance in the language of instruction. By this inclusive pattern, Manuel re-establishes the norm, but at the same time he maintains the IRE cycle, using an interactional pattern focused on the content and the activity.

The second pattern is the teachers' lack of response (indifference), by means of which the students' languages are not integrated into the class but retain a position of non-focal side-play. As the following extract shows, these sequences in Spanish often occur in parallel conversations between peers.

Extract 6

1. **Gladys** {talking to a classmate}: (**que es** woollen clothes) °
Translation: what is woollen clothes
2. **Alex** {talking to Gladis}: (creo que lo que ha dicho de lana)
Translation: I think that what he said made out of wool

We can see how code-switching is a strategy of self-facilitation, in order to follow explanation sequences within the nucleus of the class (see, also, Unamuno 2008, for a similar analysis).

In some cases, this indifference is projected into the participation frame. Thus, students' answers in Spanish are ignored, and they are not placed at the front stage area. We can see this tendency in the following extract.

Extract 7

1. **Teacher:** & what's the end? When do you think is the end of the modern period?
2. **David A.:** now
3. **Alex:** renaissance
4. **Teacher:** sorry?
5. David M.: mil ochocientos
Translation: *eighteen hundreds*
6. Student: mil ochocientos
Translation: *eighteen hundreds*
7. **Alex:** renaissance
8. **Teacher:** no renaissance is one important period in the be-very begin and then there's another period in art which is called baroque

Only Alex, who provides the answer in English, gets the turn, while students who choose Spanish are not selected as next speakers.

The third pattern we detected was the teacher's exceptional suspension of the monolingual norm. In this case, the valuation of languages also contributes to explain these transgressions. Also, as in other bilingual programs (Lin 2008), the patrimonial language is introduced by the teacher himself in disciplining or in procedural sequences. In the lesson we study, it is apparent that the monolingual norm can be suspended by the teacher when so required for the purposes of the language program.

Extract 8

1. **Teacher:** what about modern times let me think what did you understand tell me that in Spanish // what did you understand by modern times?
2. **David A.:** now
3. Other students: now
4. **Teacher:** now ok that's the problem because this part of history we are studying is called Modern history

In accordance to the aim of the program, the teacher focuses both on the content and on the language. In this case, we find a content focus sequence. His pedagogical focus is to ensure the understanding of the subject, and as a consequence, the teacher requests an answer in Spanish. Students' reactions, in lines 2 and 3, show that this is not a general pattern in the class, but an exception.

9. Conclusions

The analysis of data focused on activities reveals how they are sequenced, showing a relative balance between content and language pedagogical focus. The aim of the program (teaching content and language) shapes the interactional organization of the lessons (sequences and participant framework) and the activities, classroom procedures and language choices. The two research questions guiding this analysis—how the teacher's pedagogical focus shapes the ways in which classroom interactions are organized and whether the placement of languages (i.e. Spanish and English) in the interaction (front stage vs. back stage) gives us insight of how these languages are valued—are then related.

From the analysis of code-switching, we can conclude that in the English-Spanish bilingual program, however, Spanish is omnipresent in the lessons taught in English, as it usually happens when the aim of such a program is to teach a language different from that of the community (see Lin 2008: 274, for similar examples). While English is the target of the program, Spanish is legitimate for explaining procedures, negotiating relationships and ensuring understanding; that is, it functions as a community language.

According to a critical perspective, the analysis of linguistic practices must therefore be framed within the correlating analysis of social order, structures, institutions, practices and situations, which is to say, within situational, socio-cultural and historical contexts. In this line, the analysis of the linguistic practices within the bilingual program can be seen in relation to the current socio-economic changes. New economies represent an ongoing evolution from industrialization to informationalization (Castells 1996/2000). This is evidenced by the transition from industrial-based to service-sector based economies. It is well-known that capital, production, management,

markets, the labour force, information and technology are all organized in this global era via flows which cut across national borders, and that this, in turn, requires a parallel modification in communicative practices at the local level. In this context, the English language has become an economic resource in channeling commercial exchanges across continents, and in the services-sector. In the future, we should examine the way English is taught as a way to train potential workers, and in this particular case, within the MEC-British Council program as a way to capitalize students in public schools in lower class neighborhoods. The potential linguistic and cultural colonizing effects of this program should be also examined, and whether their teachers are aware of them, or prevent them in any way by increasing students' awareness about cultural and historical differences.

10. Bibliography

- BAILEY, B. (2002). *Language, Race, and Negotiation of identity: A Study of Dominican Americans*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.
- BOURDIEU, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CASTELLS, M. (1996/2000). *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- CICOUREL, A. (2000). What counts as data for modelling medical diagnostic reasoning and bureaucratic information processing in the workplace. *Intellectica* 30: 115-149.
- CICOUREL, A. (2002). Organisation et communication en régime de surcharge cognitive. [Discourse and organizational practices in the workplace: Coping with 'normal' task interruptions and 'cognitive overload'.] *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales* 143 : 3-17.
- CHOULIARAKI, L. and FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity. Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- GUMPERZ, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HELLER, M. (2006) [1996]. *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*, 2nd edn. London: Longman / Continuum.
- HELLER, M. and MARTIN-JONES, M. (eds.) (2001). *Voices of Authority: Education and linguistic difference*. Westport, Conn.: Ablex Publishing.
- LIN, A. M. Y. (2008). Code-switching in the classroom: Research paradigms and approaches. In KENDALL A. KING & NANCY H. HORNBERGER. (eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*, vol. 9, 2nd edn., 273–86. New York: Springer Science.
- LÓPEZ RUPÉREZ, F. (2006). *Plan de Mejora de la Calidad de la Educación en Centros Públicos Prioritarios*. Comunidad de Madrid. [Internet document: http://www.educa.madrid.org/binary/831/CPP04_Des_PlanMejora.pdf. Last access: 01.03.10]
- MADISON, S. (2005). *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics, and Performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- MARTIN-JONES, M. (2007). Bilingualism, education, and the regulation of access to language resources. In M. HELLER, ed., *Bilingualism: a social approach*. New York: Palgrave. 161-182.
- MARTÍN ROJO, L. (2010). *Constructing inequality in Multilingual classrooms*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- MARTÍN ROJO, L. & MIJARES, L. (eds.) (2007). *Voces del aula. Etnografías de la escuela multilingüe* [Voices from the classroom. Ethnographies of the multilingual classroom]. Madrid: Centro de Recursos para la Atención a la Diversidad Cultural en la Educación (CREADE), Centro de Investigación y Documentación Educativa (CIDE).

- PARSONS, R. (2003). *KS2 History Workout: Book 2. England*: CGP Letts Educational.
- SEEDHOUSE, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: a conversational analysis perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- SHIRATO, L., ed. (1992). *What is good instruction now? : Library instruction for the 90s*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Published for Learning Resources and Technologies, Eastern Michigan University, by Pierian Press.
- SINCLAIR, J. and COULTHARD, M. (1975). *Toward an Analysis of Discourse: the English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SINCLAIR, J. and COULTHARD, M. (1992). Toward an analysis of discourse. In: M. Coulthard, ed., *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge. 1-34.
- UNAMUNO, V. (2008). Multilingual switch in peer classroom interaction. *Linguistics and Education* 19 (1): 1-19.
- VAN DIJK, T (2008). *Discourse and Power. Contributions to Critical Discourse Studies*. Houndsmills: Palgrave MacMillan.
- WODAK, R. and WEISS, G., eds. (2002). *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity*. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Annex 1. Transcription conventions

Transcription convention	Meaning
:	Turn
Arnaldo:	Student participant
Candela, Teacher:	Teacher participant
{ }	Comments made by the transcriber
&	Turn latched to previous turn
=	Maintaining of a participant's turn in an overlap
[]	Turn overlapping with similarly marked turn
-	Re-starts and self-interruptions without any pause
/	Short pause (0'5seconds)
//	Long pause (0'5 – 1'5 seconds)
(5)	Silence (lapse or interval) of 5 seconds. When it is particularly meaningful, the number of seconds is indicated in pauses longer than one second.
↑	Rising intonation
↓	Falling intonation
→	Intonation of suspension
RIGHT	Loud talking
(())	Non-understandable fragment
Pa1	Syntactical phonetic phenomena between words
()°	Low talking
Aa	Vowel lengthening
Ss	Consonant lengthening
?	Questions. Includes tag questions such as "right?", "eh?", "you know?"
!	Exclamations
Right	Direct voice
(risas)	Speech aspects: simultaneous laughter with the speech made
bold	Code-switching. Speakers names