Bilingual text production as task and resource: Social interaction in task oriented student groups

Jakob Cromdal[1]
Linköping University

1. Introduction and aims

In the past decades, research in multilingual educational settings has taken a social constructivist turn. In contrast to traditional studies, which mainly focus on teachers' methods of providing for students' learning of subject matter, the constructivist studies treat classrooms as arenas for collaborative learning. Accordingly, such studies highlight the need to examine social interaction as organized around pedagogic activities, stressing that learning is both accomplished and displayed through participation in collaborative construction of knowledge. As an effect of this, research focus has shifted from 'official' talk in teacher fronted activities to the discourse comprising students' work in task-oriented groups. Typically, such group activities involve the production of written text, which may constitute the very target for the groups work, or just serve to document aspects of the groups' progress.

Studies of bilingual text production frequently make the point that, in assembling a joint text, students are not merely involved in solving a mental or linguistic task, which may be facilitated by collaboration. Rather, the idea here is that such joint activities ineludibly involve students' management of social relations (e.g., Durán & Szymanski, 1995; Tuyay et al., 1995). It should be noted that while these studies provide important insights regarding the collaborative construction of knowledge in the peer group, we learn very little about the bilingual aspects of the students' conduct. Given that two languages are not just locally available but frequently used in bilingual task groups, we might inquire about the upshots of such bilingual practices as language choice and alternation (or code-switching) for the production of text, as well as for any other interactional projects students may be seen to pursue.

Against this background, the present paper attempts to highlight the bilingual nature of social interaction in task-focused groups taking place in school environments where more than one language is readily available for

[1] Financial support of the Swedish National Agency for Education (grant #U2001/1912/S) is gratefully acknowledged. I wish to thank Normann Jørgensen and the Køge team for making their data available for the present purposes. Thanks are also due to Jakob Steensig for discussing various analytical issues with me.

Nordlyd 31.5:746-761, © the author 2003
Proceedings of the 19th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics, vol. 31.5: Bilingualism, Edited by J. N. Jørgensen, Anne Dahl, and Peter Svenonius

the purpose of everyday social affairs. Specifically, the following analysis highlights three issues, central for our understanding of bilingual group work. These are:

*the linguistic organization of task-oriented actions, which will lead us to specify a socially
shared division of labor between the two languages
*the use of code-switching and related bilingual practices in the pursuit of various
interactional projects
*the notion of pedagogic tasks as interactional resources, exploited by the participants for a
range of practical purposes (clearly, this issue is not specific for bilingual groups)

To illustrate the relevance of these matters, samples of bilingual talk-in-interaction from two different settings will be fleshed out in some detail, combining the task-oriented as well as interpersonal aspects of students' actions, and treating the issue of language choice (and alternation) as an integral part of their social conduct.

2. Methods and materials

The present analysis draws on the following two sets of data:

2.1 Danish-Turkish interaction: The Køge-project

A collection of transcripts from the Køge project was provided by Turan (1999), entailing multiparty interactions in task-oriented activities among bilingual Turkish-Danish students at school. The present study specifically examines Conversation 801, which involves a group of 8th grade students engaged in the production of a cartoon strip. The group comprised three girls, Asiye, Esen and Selma, and one boy, Erol.

Prior to the recording, the group was informed that their task was to produce a cartoon strip using the following materials provided by the researchers: a sheet of plain cardboard, scissors, glue sticks, marker pens as well as a collection of teenage magazines as well as advertising and artistic postcards. The 45-minute audio recording was accomplished by supplying each of the participants with a microphone connected to a mixer board (see Turan, 1999 for details concerning data collection procedures).

The original transcripts used here were made in compliance with the CHAT conventions of CHILDES (MacWhinney, 1995). In addition, the present analysis draws on a conversation analytic transcript (e.g., Hutchby

& Wooffitt, 1998; see also Appendix) of the initial 15 minutes (approximately) provided by Steensig (2000b). For reasons of uniformity, the CHAT transcriptions have been converted to CA notations in the excerpts presented in the sections to follow. Naturally, this only means that the actual symbols have been changed, not the level of transcription detail.

2.2 Bilingual task groups in an English school in Sweden

The second set of data were recorded by the author in a 4th grade classroom in an English school in Sweden. An important feature of this setting is that all 'official' business is conducted in English. This simply means that all forms of interaction involving the staff was normatively conducted in English. Moreover, all pedagogic materials used in the classroom were in English. In other interactional settings, students were free to speak Swedish (see Cromdal, 2000b, for a detailed account of the field).

The recording used for the present purposes comprises 55 minutes of videotaped interaction between two girls, Ebba and Lara, seated at the classroom computer. The task for their session was to produce a written presentation of their work on the topic 'Victorian households of the rich'. Apart from the computer, the girls had the following materials at their disposal: a handwritten, preliminary sketch for their prospective text, a textbook on Victorian England and an encyclopedia for children (the volume containing the entry on the Victorian era).

Talk occurring in the entire session was transcribed in rich detail using the CA notations, with proper modifications to fit the bilingual nature of the talk. In addition, relevant information regarding the nonverbal actions (sitting postures, gestures, keyboard movements and, to some extent, glances) were included in the transcript.

An important resource in analyzing both sets of data was the sequential ordering of talk and other actions that played an important organizational part in the social interaction taking place within the group. This analytical standpoint is grounded in the theoretical conception of social interaction as entailing inherently dialogic and shared practices of meaning construction, in which mutually recognizable interactional projects are accomplished through sequentially organized trajectories of action.

3. Language choice and the organization of group interaction

3.1 Cartoon story (Danish-Turkish group)

Elsewhere, I have shown that the group's work with the assignment is organized as an extended, collaboratively produced narration (Cromdal, 2000; forthcoming). That is, all the activities involved in producing a cartoon-like strip (finding, cutting out, discussing and finally pasting

newspaper and magazine clips) relate, in different ways, to the joint production of a verbal narrative. Along the way, this narration is written down under the pictures. Hence, each text strip serves as a document of a single visual image (either a single picture or a small collage of clips) rendering the image as interpretable in terms of the storyline. In Garfinkel's (1967) words, the written storyline serves as a scheme of interpretation for each visual image.

The previous analyses detailed a crucial aspect of the bilingual organization of the group's work, namely the division of labor between Turkish and Danish that informed the participants' verbal conduct. In brief, whereas both languages were used for a variety of interactional purposes, the storyline itself was produced in Danish. Naturally, producing a strictly monolingual storyline in the midst of bilingual talk, and indeed, producing a continuous storyline in the midst of a variety of other interactional projects, calls for minute organization of verbal actions.

For instance, when a narrative sequence begins in a Turkish sequential environment, the use of Danish for the narrative turn sets off the storyline from other talk, as in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 1.
[Erol has just settled a negotiation with Esen, postponing the writing of the story. Simplified version of transcript from Steensig (2000b) pp. 51-52. Original transcript in Turan (1999) p. 213]

```
   01 EROL:  godt sonra yazarsın
             (right you can write it later)
   02 ASIYE: [ öbür xxx bunların işi ne oluyor]
             (the other xxx what are they gonna do)
→  02 ESEN:  [ hun kommer over  til biografen ]  køber popco:rn
             (she arrives  at  the  movie       buys  popcorn)
```

In contrast, when a narrative sequence is initiated in a Danish environment, speakers tend to exploit a variety of methods, such as different temporal markers or preface units, to set off their turn from preceding talk:

Excerpt 2.
[All participants have been discussing illustrations for the movie theme. From Turan (1999) pp. 215-216]

```
   01 SELMA:der er en kæreste øje nej
            (it is a boyfriend eye no)
   02 (?):  (xxx)
   03 EROL: du skal altså holde kæft først tage det roligt
            (first  you   shut up   then   take it easy)
→  04 ESEN: vil I høre historien hun ringer til biografen for
            (do you wanna hear the story she calls the theater)
   05       at bestille nogen billetter
            (to book tickets)
```

Moreover, in cases where several speakers produced extended narrative sequences, the preference for Danish was observed without exception. That is, none of the participants involved in co-narration would switch to Turkish within a narrative sequence. Finally, the transition from storyline talk to non-narrative interaction was frequently marked by a 'postnarrative' switch into Turkish:

Excerpt 3.
[Simplified version of transcript from Steensig (2000b) pp. 51-52. Original transcript in Turan (1999) p. 213]

```
   01 ESEN:  [ hun kommer over  til biografen ]  køber popco:rn
             (she arrives  at  the  movie       buys  popcorn)
   02        (.6)
   03 EROL:  og c[ ola ]           t[ o col] a
             (and cola two  cola)
   04 ESEN:      [ o::g] (.)        [ cola ]  sammen me
                  (a::nd)            cola   together with)
   05        si[ n   kæreste  og    ser    Sp:eed]
             (her  boyfriend and  watches Speed)
   06 SELMA:   [ >og så ska hun ti<  frisør  fris] ør
             (and then she's going to the hairdresser hairdresser)
   07        (2)
→  08 EROL:  Speed ↑_ey mi ø::hm
             (is Speed eh)
   09 ESEN:  hi
             (what)
```

In sum, the group's inherently bilingual organization of this assignment implies that the joint production of the storyline is normatively conducted in Danish, and Cromdal (2000) shows that a handful of deviations from this pattern can be accounted for in terms of participants' orientation to this shared norm.

3.2 Victorian households (Swedish-English group)

It has been shown that the students in the Cartoon group produced the storyline exclusively in Danish. However, Danish was also used, along with Turkish, for other interactional projects. Now, in the Victorian group the linguistic division of labor took a somewhat different shape. Here, English was used for reading, dictating, quoting and assembling the words and phrases in the unfolding text, while Swedish was generally spoken for all other purposes, like in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 4.
[Ebba and Lara are dictating the text]

```
   01  LARA:   >alright< öm[ men >i alla fall<
                        (ehm but  anyway)
→ 02 EBBA:                 [ mm  in Victorian (fami[ lies) ja skriv de
                                                    (yea write that)
   03 LARA:                                       [ VA? (1.5) ska ja skriva
de?
                                                  (WHAT?  you want me to write
it?)
   04 EBBA:    mm bara de (1) du kan skriva de första
                (just the  you can write the first ones)
→ 05 LARA:    ska  ja  skriva  rich  families  from  [ rich  x  (.5)  oj
((deleting))
               (should I write)
   06 EBBA:                                         [ mm ((nods))
→ 07 EBBA:    rich mnej (.) vänta lite ((looks at manuscript)) rich people
                    (mno       hang on)
   08          lived [ in
   09 LARA:          [ oj ja skriver rits
                     (oops I'm writing rits)
```

We can see that English is used for solicited and unsolicited dictation (lines 5 and 2 respectively) as well as for direct quotation of the text (line 8). In contrast, interaction that does not relate directly with the text is conducted in Swedish. In other words, compared to the Cartoon group, the two girls in the Victorian group maintain a much more clear-cut division of labor between the two languages.

Now, it is seems plausible that the text itself and the pedagogic materials dictate the use of English and it may be argued that apart from that, the girls are basically interacting in Swedish. However, whereas the practice of language choice illustrated above is very stable (i.e., employed throughout the session), we will see in the next section that there are exceptions to this pattern which seem very significant, in terms of the interactional work being accomplished.

To sum up, we have seen how two groups of students organize their joint production of text along different patterns of language choice. These patterns constitute two varieties of what Gafaranga (2000; 2001) has labeled 'bilingual interactional medium', which provides a local scheme of interpretation (Garfinkel, 1967) for the participants' actions. With this organization of language choice as a backdrop, the next part of this paper will highlight some interactional aspects of the students' code-switching.

4. Code-switching as an interactional resource in group work

Through the years in the Danish school, a number of children in the Køge data have become quite skilled at exploiting the bilingual environment, and a number of studies illustrate how code-switching is used to accomplish a

variety of interactional goals (e.g., Holmen & Jørgensen, 1997; Jørgensen, 1998; Maegaard, 1998; Møller, 1998; Steensig, 2000a). In the Cartoon group, the linguistic contrast resulting from code-switching frequently served to enhance the production of accountable actions. Let us then consider, in some detail, a transcript from an early phase of the group's work, illustrating several different uses of code-switching:

Excerpt 5.
[Esen has just announced that she has an idea about how to do the assignment. Simplified version of transcript from Steensig (2000b) pp. 41-44. Original transcript in Turan (1999) pp. 211-212]

```
   01 EROL:  Coca cola var! Valla bunu bir_eye kullanırız=
             (there's coca cola! gosh we can use this)
   02 ESEN:  =dinle bir [ dinle]
             (listen just listen)
→  03 EROL:             [ r e h] klam
                         (commercial)
   04 ESEN:  onu °çıkart° (.) °bak° hm bak (.) hun ringer til
             (take it off  and look hm look   she calls the)
   05        biografen for at bestille en billet så ankommer hun
             (theater   to    book   a ticket  then she arrives)
   06        (0.7) og så køber hun popcorn og °ser° Speed
                 (and then she buys popcorn and watches Speed)
→  07 EROL:  vay yavrum Esen! og coca co[ la reklame]
             (woaw baby Esen! and coca cola commercial)
   08 SELMA:                            [ ↑WU:hh!↑  ]
   09        (1)
→  10 EROL:  [ha önde] hh hahh hah hhh
             (in front)
→  11 SELMA:[ YEA:H! ]
   12 ESEN:  °og° hun køber (.)
             (and she buys)
   13 SELMA: COCA COLA ay ▪unu bir=
             (COCA COLA oh this one)
   14 ESEN:  = (xx)   ne:[ j
                        (no:)
   15 SELMA:            [ hall[ o du kan] =
                         (hello you can)
   16 EROL:                   [ ne:j    ]
                               (no:)
   17 SELMA: =(jo også købe) (.) (v:e: øh) popcorn og (du køb)
             (also buy                  eh  popcorn and you buy)
   18        coca ↓colaer=
             (coca colas)
→  19 EROL:  =JA: (EXACTLy)=
             (yes)
```

In the beginning of the excerpt, we can see that Erol's enthusiastic presentation of the Coca-Cola advertisement is partly disrupted by Esen, who makes an effort to get the others' attention (lines 2 and 4) and presents her previously announced idea, producing a short narration about a girl visiting a movie theater (lines 4 through 6). We can see Erol vividly

aligning with Esen's story in line 7 ('*vay yavrum Esen!*'), his use of Turkish resulting, on the level of conversational structure, in a code-switch. Thus, Erol's token of alignment with Esen's idea stands as an isolated Turkish unit in the midst of talk in Danish, and one interpretation of such language choice may be that code-switching serves to enhance expression of affect (cf. Aronsson, 2000). We should also note that Erol uses his turn space to reintroduce the Coca-Cola commercial. Notably, to accomplish this he switches to Danish, appropriating Esen's story on the level of language choice.

As this move receives no immediate response, Erol elaborates his idea, '*ha önde*' (*in front*), that the commercial should go in front (in the illustration). It is difficult to pinpoint the local meaning of this switch into Turkish, but it may be that it is an effect of the lack of response from the others, resembling Auer's (1984b) analysis of 'nonfirst firsts', where turns receiving no response from their recipients are repeated in a different language. Also, but again, not necessarily alternatively, the switch may be used to mitigate his disruption of the story (note the laugh tokens following on line 10). However, Erol's turn in line 10 is overlapped with Selma's enthusiastic support for Erol's suggestion (line 11), and again the contrastive language choice (this time of English) seems to do the sort of interactional work Aronsson (2000) describes as intensifiers of affect.

In effect, what we have here is an 'incipient alignment' between Selma and Erol, that is, a prospective alignment which has not yet been confirmed by both parties. At this point in the unfolding sequence of actions, Esen does not respond to either party. Instead, she picks up the storyline with the words 'og hun køber' ('and she buys') followed by a micropause. This provides a structural slot for further suggestions for objects that should be part of the narration, a slot that Selma exploits to insert the Coca-Cola suggestion (line 13); and again we may see Turkish being used to disrupt the projected continuation of Esen's story. This time Esen explicitly rejects the suggestion (lines 15 and 16), and Selma upgrades the opposition initiating her turn with the token 'hallo' and arguing her case that if the storyline character can buy popcorn, she can buy Coca-Cola too. It might be argued here that implicit in her argument is the suggestion that popcorn and Coca-Cola go together in a movie context, and it would seem that Esen expresses precisely this recognition through his intense agreement (line 19) with Selma, thereby ratifying the alliance between the two of them. Again, the delivery of a strongly supportive action involves a code-switch, this time to English.

The analysis above has proposed rather differential uses of code-switching between Turkish and Danish (as well as English), highlighting

such interactional functions as display of intensified affect (lines 11 and 19), alignment with the language of the storyline (line 7), and solicitation of response (line 10). Given that code-switching is used to contextualize participants' accountable and irremediably situated actions, it is not surprising to find that code-switching may be used to accomplish very different sorts of actions.

Turning now to the Victorian group, we may recall that apart from quoting, dictating and assembling parts of the text-in-spe in English, Lara and Ebba spoke Swedish throughout the session. The next example shows a deviation from this pattern, situated in an exchange where a misunderstanding has escalated to the verge of conflict:

Excerpt 6.
[Lara and Ebba negotiate linguistic form]

```
01 LARA: washed  (.5)   washing
02 EBBA: washed (.) the laundry (.5) washed the laundry
03 LARA: näh hon did (.) washed the laundry [ hon tog klä[ derna
         (no she                          she  took the clothes)
04 EBBA:                                  [ (she) did     [ she did (.) it=
05 LARA: she washed the laundry in:: ((starts writing))
06 EBBA: stor bokstav (.) stor bokstav istället för
         (capital        capital letter instead of)
07 LARA: mm
08 EBBA: anej she did the laundry (.) she did (.) the laundry hö::::hh
         (eh no)
09 LARA: hh aja she washed (up)
           (right)
10 EBBA: a:: de ska vara washed
         (yeh it should be)
11 LARA: a varför säger [ du (då)
         (so why do you say)
12 EBBA:              [ she washed the laundry inte she did the laundry för
                                      (not                  cause)
13       de va de du sa
         (that's what you said)
14 LARA: a men de så säger du nä she did the laundry
         (yeh but then you say nah)
15       (1.5)
16 EBBA: nä ja sa she did: (.) de e inte laundry
         (nah I said        that's not)
17 LARA: a: men sen så sa: du: att [ hon did
         (yeh but the you said that she)
18 EBBA:                          [ I SAID that she did tha:t (.) she [ washed the=
19 LARA: ((smiling))                                                  [ she washed
20 EBBA: =laundry
21       (1.5)
22 EBBA: °jesus°
23 LARA: (står de om de) ((in the book))
         (does it say that)
24 EBBA: ja vhheth inthe
         (I hhdhon't knowheh)
```

I rough outline, the girls are trying negotiate the proper linguistic form for the expression 'doing the laundry', managing at the same time a misunderstanding pertaining to who said what form should be used. While a number of issues could be raised regarding the management of the misunderstanding, suffice it to note here that in lines 1-17 the girls are engaging in massive language alternation, sustaining the division of labor between Swedish and English.

However, at line 18 the sequence of oppositional statements seems to have reached its peak, as Ebba switches to English declaring loudly what she has previously meant to say: 'I SAID that she did that (.) she washed the laundry'. Lines 18 and 19 thus show a bracketing of the previously established order of language choice as Ebba is using English to address Lara, as well as to comment on the previous episode (line 22). The previous order is restored in line 23 as Lara turns Ebba's comment into a joke, by treating it seriously at face value.

We may thus view the temporal bracketing of the established order of language as an effect of the extended misunderstanding and prolonged building of oppositional versions of what has been said and by whom. In this way, it may mark the peak of the argument. At the same time, switching to English may allow Ebba specify what she has meant without the possible interference of language alternation.

Another excerpt showing the bracketing of the bilingual medium may be considered below:

Excerpt7.
[Betty wants to borrow something off the computer table]

01 EBBA: ((sounding the syllable while writing)) b:eu:- (.) ((looks up at Lara))
02 *säg du hur du stavar*
(*tell me how you spell*)
03 ((Jean, at table nearby, comes up facing the girls))
04 JEAN: *kan ja få låna din::ö:=*
(*can I borrow your eeh*)
05 EBBA: *=näe=*
(*no*)
06 JEAN: =ööh
07 ((Lara and Ebba turn back to the computer and Lara reaches over the
08 keyboard, but Ebba fences off her hand))
09 EBBA: *näe* (3) °(beau)°tifu[l
(*no*)
10 JEAN: [Lara:
11 LARA: *a↑::*
(*yeh*)
12 JEAN: *kan ja få låna din:öh din:ö:h* (x)
(*can I borrow your eh your eeh*)
13 LARA: ((eyes on the manuscript)) I don't wanna leave the computer
14 ((JEAN turns to leave))

15 EBBA: ((points in manuscript)) °(*här*)° (1.5) *de ska ju inte finnas nåt u*!
(*here there shouldn't be a u*)
16 LARA: jo: (.5) ful
(*yes it should ful*)

In brief outline, as Ebba is asking Lara to help her with the spelling of the word 'beautiful', Jean comes over from a table nearby, asking to borrow something from the computer table (line 4). As Ebba refuses to comply with the request, Jean goes on to ask Lara (line 12) who responds by providing an account for her refusal to comply. We should also note that whereas all the talk so far has been conducted in Swedish, Lara's implicit refusal to comply is produced in English, resulting in a suspension of the previously established order of language choice. In the subsequent turns the girls return to Swedish, restoring the previous order.

How can we account for the code-switch in line 13? According to Conversation Analytic work on preference structures, noncompliant responses to requests constitute dispreferred actions types (cf. Heritage, 1984). An important feature of such actions is that they are overwhelmingly dealt with in more elaborate ways than preferred actions. For instance, whereas compliant responses to requests may take the shape of a simple 'yes', noncompliant responses are typically delayed, prefaced by various hesitation markers and/or furnished with some sort of account for the noncompliance. Whereas in line 5 Ebba did in fact plainly refuse to comply, a second refusal within the same exchange may be a somewhat uncomfortable project. Accordingly, in line 13 we find Lara exploiting several techniques to produce a noncompliant response. First, she does not actually refuse to comply, instead (and second) she provides an account for her implicit noncompliance. Finally, we might see her switching into English as yet another means for accomplishing a dispreferred action.

Summing up, this section has illustrated the students' use of code-switching in accomplishing a variety of social actions. Whereas the analysis has focused on the contextualizing functions of code-switching exclusively, it should be stressed that in the majority of cases several other contextualization cues have been employed, such as prosodic and temporal shifts as well as a range of nonverbal cues such as gestures, pointing and facial expressions. As Auer (1995) points out, speakers tend to employ multiple cues so as to provide for the intelligibility of their actions.

Let us turn to the final part of the analysis, which hints at some ways in which the task of the two groups, to produce a written text, may serve as a resource for participants in pursuing various interactional projects.

5. Bilingual text production as task and resource

Whereas the production of written text clearly constitutes the task for the two groups of students, the construction of text may also be thought of as a resource for the accomplishment of certain actions and interactional projects.

For instance in excerpt 7 above, Lara's engagement with the word-processor allows her to legitimately refuse to comply with Jean's request. In other words, she is invoking her engagement in the group's task to account for her not being helpful to her classmate. Another instance of Lara taking advantage of the keyboard for other practical purposes may be seen below:

Excerpt 8.

[Lara is operating the keyboard and Ebba dictating the text]

01 EBBA: *okej skriv de*
(*okey write it down then*)
02 LARA: *ja ska göra de* (.5) (*ja ska bara*) ((gives outdated manuscript page
(*yes I'm going to I'm just gonna*)
to Ebba)) *här har du* (.) >*kan du slänga den*< (.) *medans ja skriver*?
(*there you go can you throw this away while I'm writing*?)

Here, we can see another way of taking advantage of being engaged in a crucial part of the task activity: such engagement may be invoked as a way of legitimizing participants' attempts to direct the actions of the other group members.

The students' interaction in the Cartoon group provides numerous instances of participants exploiting the task to control the actions of the co-participants. For instance, Excerpt 2 above shows how the storyline narration is used to terminate a conflict between two of the group's participants. A final example will serve to illustrate how the storyline narration may be used to suppress alternative activities (Cromdal, forthcoming):

Excerpt 9.

[Participants are discussing various illustration materials. From Turan (1999) p. 214]

01 SELMA: *ay ben şunu bir yerde gördümya* hvor
(*oh I have seen this before but* where)
02 EROL: *ben de gördüm*
(*I've seen it too*)
03 ESEN: bagefter skal de på skal de til koncert nu
(and then they are going to they are going to a concert now)
04 SELMA: hallo *bak bir*
(hello *take a look*)
05 EROL: nå ja så skal de også købe en kniv og sådan noget
(allright then they also buy a knife and stuff like that)

At the outset of this episode, Selma declares in Turkish that she is looking for a certain illustration. The switch into Danish for the final particle of her turn (‘hvor’/‘where’) may be seen as a way to extend the scope of recipients of her talk (cf. Auer, 1984a; Guldal, 1997) to include everyone present – in essence, to invite the group to participate in the search. Esen then aligns with this project, confirming that she has seen the image as well. In line 3, however, Esen demonstrably ignores their search, picking up the storyline with the temporal marker ‘bagefter’ (‘bagefter skal de til koncert nu’/‘and then they are going to a concert now’), which is the most typical way of introducing the storyline in this group. However, she finishes her narrative turn with another temporal marker ‘nu’ (‘now), which clearly does not belong to the storyline, and I would suggest that this is a way to solicit the others’ engagement in the storyline narration. In fact, Esen’s entire turn may be seen as a directive aimed at the others to give up their search for an illustration and return to the storyline. This interpretation is confirmed by the responses of Selma and Erol who, although they respond in very different ways, both orient to Esen’s turn as precisely that: a summons to get back to work.

Thus, in line 4, Selma challenges Esen’s request using the attention token ‘hallo” and a code-switched request that the others look at her things. Erol, on the other hand, picks up the story theme (line 5), prefacing his contribution with a token of acceptance and aligning, in this way, with Esen’s agenda for the group’s activity.

Summing up this section, I have shown that the task activity may be used by participants to regulate the interaction in the group. More specifically, by invoking engagement in the task activity, participants may disattend other activities taking place in the group, as well as suppress these alternative activities, by soliciting co-participants’ alignment with (what counts as) the task activity proper.

6. Concluding summary

The principal task of interaction analysis is to expose the culturally available methods through which participants are able to concertedly construct socially accountable actions. In line with this aim, I have tried to highlight three features of work which provide them with interactional resources in the joint organization of the group’s conduct.

First, I have showed two distinct forms of division of labor between the locally available languages. The notion of functional distribution of language use has been observed in other studies of bilingual children’s activities. For instance, Guldal (1997) demonstrated hoe children made use of code-switching between English and Norwegian so as to contrast fiction-

level actions from non-fiction interaction. In the present materials, such distribution of language use was mainly related to the main task activities.

As a second type of interactional resource, I have highlighted some aspects of the children's use of code-switching which served to enhance the production and interpretation of situated actions.

Finally, the task itself and its related activities and materials were exploited for local purposes, and the analysis has demonstrated how students invoke their engagement in the task activity to legitimize, or indeed to legitimately avoid, certain actions.

References:

Aronsson, K. 2000. 'Address, affect and audience design in bilingual multiparty talk,' in J. N. Jørgensen & A. Holmen (red). *Det er Conversation 801, de˝il mi? Perspectives on the* B*ilingualism of Turkish Speaking Children and Adolescents in North Western Europe,* Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, Køge Series, K7, The Royal Danish School of Educational Studies, Copenhagen, pp. 91-100.

Auer, J. C. P. 1984a. *Bilingual Conversation,* John Benjamins, Amsterdam

Auer, J. C. P. 1984b. 'On the meaning of conversational code-switching,' in J. C. P. Auer & A. di Luzio (eds.), *Interpretive Sociolinguistics. Migrants – Children – Migrant Children*, Gunter Narr, Tübingen, pp. 87-112.

Auer, J. C. P. 1995. 'The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach,' in Lesley Milroy and Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Cromdal, J. 2000. 'Creating a monolingual story in bilingual conversation,' in J. N. Jørgensen & A. Holmen (eds.), *Det er Conversation 801, de˝il mi? Perspectives on the Bilingualism of Turkish Speaking Children and Adolescents in North Western Europe,* Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, Køge Series, K7, The Royal Danish School of Educational Studies, Copenhagen, pp. 57-75.

Cromdal, J. 2000b. *Code-switching for all practical purposes*, Diss., Linköping Studies in Arts and Science, 223.

Cromdal, J. forthcoming/2002. 'The creation and administration of social relations in bilingual group work,' To appear in the *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*.

Durán, R. P. & Szymanski, M. 1995. 'Cooperative learning, interaction and the construction of activity,' *Discourse Processes*, 19, 149-164.

Garfinkel, H. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology,* Polity Press, Cambridge.

Gafaranga, J. 2000. 'Linguistic identities in talk-in-interaction: Order in bilingual conversation,' *Journal of Pragmatics, 33,* 1901-1925.

Gafaranga, J. 2001. 'Medium repair vs. other-language repair: Telling the medium of a bilingual conversation,' *The International Journal of Bilingualism, 4,* 327-350.

Guldal, T. M. 1997. *Three Children, Two Languages: The Role of Code Selection in Organizing Conversation*, Diss., NTNU Trondheim, Norway.

Holmen, A. & Jørgensen, N. 1997. 'Aspects of the linguistic development of minority children in a majority school,' in J. N. Jørgensen & A. Holmen (eds.), *The*

Development of Successive Bilingualism in School-age Children. Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, 27, The Royal Danish School of Educational Studies, Copenhagen, pp. 129-146.

Heritage, J. 1984. *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Hutchby, I & Wooffitt, R. 1998. *Conversation Analysis*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Jefferson, G. 1990. 'List-construction as task and resource,' in G. Psathas (ed), *Interaction Competence*, International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America, Washington, D. C, pp. 63-92.

Jørgensen, J. N. 1998. 'Children's acquisition of code-switching for power-wielding,' in P. Auer (ed), *Code-switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, Routledge, London, pp. 237-258.

Jørgensen, J. N., Holmen, A., Gimbel, J. & Nørgaard, I. 1991. 'From Köy to Køge: A longitudinal study of the bilingual development of Turkish immigrant children in Danish schools,' *Language & Education*, *4*, 215-217.

Maegaard, M. 1998. 'Sprogvalget i gruppesamtaler' [Language choice in group conversation], in J. Møller, P. Quist, A. Holmen & J. N. Jørgensen (eds.) *Tosproget Udvikling*. [Bilingual development]. Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, Køge Series, K4, The Royal Danish School of Educational Studies, Copenhagen, pp. 21-40.

MacWhinney, B. 1995. *The Childes Project. Tools for Analyzing Talk*. Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, N. J.

Møller, J. 1998. 'Identitet og kodevalg hos unge piger med tyrkisk-dansk baggrund.,' [Identity and code choice in young girls with a Turkish-Danish background], in J. Møller, P. Quist, A. Holmen & J. N. Jørgensen (eds.), *Tosproget Udvikling*. [Bilingual development], Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, Køge Series, K4, The Royal Danish School of Educational Studies, Copenhagen, pp. 41-70.

Steensig, J. 2000a. 'Notes on some uses of code-switches and other interactional devices in Conversation 801,' in: J. N. Jørgensen & A. Holmen (eds.), *Det er Conversation 801, de˝il mi? Perspectives on the Bilingualism of Turkish Speaking Children and Adolescents in North Western Europe*, Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, Køge Series, K7, The Royal Danish School of Educational Studies, Copenhagen, pp. 9-30.

Steensig, J. 2000b. 'CA transcript of Conversation 801, Køge Project,' in J. N. Jørgensen & A. Holmen (eds.), *Det er Conversation 801, de˝il mi? Perspectives on the Bilingualism of Turkish Speaking Children and Adolescents in North Western Europe*, Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, Køge Series, K7, The Royal Danish School of Educational Studies, Copenhagen, pp. 31-55.

Turan, F. (ed.). 1999. *A Text Collection of Turkish-Danish Bilingual Grade School Students' Conversations*, Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, Køge Series, K6, The Royal Danish School of Educational Studies, Copenhagen.

Tuyay, S., Jennings, L. & Dixon, C. 1995. 'Classroom discourse and opportunities to learn: An ethnographic study of knowledge construction in a bilingual third-grade classroom,' *Discourse Processes*, *19*, 75-110.

Appendix:

Transcription key:

(2)	numbers in single parentheses represent pauses in seconds
(.)	micropause, i.e. pause shorter than (.5)
(( ))	investigator's comments
[	indicates start of overlapping speech
=	indicates latching between utterances
(x)	inaudible word
(xxx)	inaudible words
→	highlights a particular feature discussed in the text
:	prolongation of preceding sound
og c<u>o</u>la	sounds marked by emphatic stress are underlined
EXACTLY	capitals represent markedly increased amplitude
°( )°	embeds talk markedly lower in amplitude
↑ ↓	indicates rising/falling intonation in succeeding syllable(s)
?	indicates rising terminal intonation
.	indicates falling terminal intonation
> <	embeds talk that is faster than surrounding speech
< >	embeds talk that is slower than surrounding speech
hi; ha; he; hö; hh	indicate varieties of laughter
v<u>a</u>y yavrum	italics mark speech in Turkish (Cartoon group)
men hallå	italics mark speech in Swedish (Victorian group)