Linköping Studies in Pedagogic Practices No. 40
Linköping Studies in Education and Social Sciences No. 18

Monolingual Policy, Bilingual Interaction

English-taught Education in Bangladesh

Rizwan-ul Huq

Linköping Studies in Pedagogic Practices No. 40
Linköping Studies in Education and Social Sciences No. 18

Monolingual Policy, Bilingual Interaction

English-taught Education in Bangladesh

Rizwan-ul Huq

Department of Behavioural Sciences and Learning
Faculty of Educational Sciences
Linköping 2020

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Rizwan-ul Huq

Monolingual Policy, Bilingual Interaction: English-taught
Education in Bangladesh

© Rizwan-ul Huq, 2020

Cover illustration: Lutfa Sharmin

Cover design: Martin Pettersson

Cover background: Traditional handcrafted Bangladeshi quilt

Cover material courtesy: Shamima Akter

Printed in Sweden by LiU-Tryck, 2020

ISSN 1653-0101

ISBN 978-91-7929-721-3

Distributed by:

Department of Behavioural Sciences and Learning

Linköping University

SE-581 83 Linköping

SWEDEN

*To Abba, Ma,
Ananya,
Ibaad
&
Lutfa*

Acknowledgements

This dissertation is the fruit of several years of work. The journey has been both positively challenging and enriching. Many people have accompanied me, and contributed emotional, moral and intellectual support.

I want to express deep gratitude to anonymous students, parents, teachers, and staffs of two schools in Bangladesh. They welcomed me into their schools and allowed me to conduct the project. Without their kind permission and active participation, this dissertation would not have achieved any substantial foothold.

I humbly thank my thesis supervisors: Jakob Cromdal and Katarina Eriksson Barajas for giving me the opportunity of conducting this project and to grow as a researcher. Thank you Jakob for teaching me innumerable surviving skills and in particular reading critically, challenging own writing, and staying focused with one thing at a time. Thank you Katarina for gleaming inspiration and optimism, staying patient with my repeated refractions, and teaching me the importance of staying prepared ahead. Sincere thanks to both of you for unwaevring support and encourgaement over the years.

Many thanks to all, former and present, colleagues for their thoughtful contributions at seminars and small talk. I am specially thankful to Anders Albinsson, Anna Martín Bylund, Eva Bolander, Eva Reimers, Ingrid Karlsson, Josefin Rostedt, Katarina Elfström Pettersson, Lina Söderman Lago, Linda Häll, Linnea Bodén, Linnéa Stenliden, Maria Simonsson, Martin Harling, Polly Björk-Willén, Sara Dalgren, Susanne Severinsson, and Tünde Puskas. Thank you Kirsten Stoewer for always bringing charm, staying a loyal friend, and lending generous support. Thank you Lars Wallner for giving tested counsels, pushing me beyond my comfort zone, and inspiring life beyond books. Thank you Daniel Björklund for sharing our *förskarstuga* and offering pragmatic views of life. I wish all the best to Elinor Månsson, Feyza Cilingir, Samuel Gyllenberg, and Ulrika Bodén. I thank Anna Ericson, Anneli Carlbring, Rowena Sarinas Bladh and Jafar Asadi for handing out

administrative and technical support. Thank you Thomas Dahl for offering opportunity to teach *Film and Video as Aesthetic Expression*.

Thanks to splendid organizers and guests of the SIS group at LiU. I sincerely thank Asta Cekaite, Charlotta Plejert, Karin Osvaldsson Cromdal, Leelo Keevallik, Mathias Broth, Nigel John Musk, and Sally Wiggins Young for mentoring CA to me. Thank you *Alia Amir* for supervising my Masters thesis at LiU and teaching the basics of CA, Ali Reza Majlesi for inspiring me, Maziar Yazdanpanah and Inaam Hasan Raouf for kind, warm friendship. I also want to thank teachers and colleagues working at Aalborg University (Denmark), Loughborough University (UK), University College of Southeast Norway, and Hacettepe University (Turkey). Thank you Alexa Hepburn, Elizabeth Stokoe, Paul Drew, Paul Bruce McIlvenny, and Susan Danby for mentoring data analysis. Thank you Polly Björk-Willén for conducting my 30% seminar, and Karin Aronsson for 60% seminar. Thank you Olcay Sert for providing critical reading of the manuscript at 90% seminar. Thank you Björn Touqan and Emma Lindberg (*Språkservice Sverige AB*) for providing language correction. I also want to thank Amanda Bateman, Amelia Church, and Ufuk Balaman for getting me published with the empirical studies.

I would like to express thanks to my teachers at Shishu Monojagotik School, Rampal Primary School, St. Paul's High School, Mongla Port School & College, and Cantonment College, Jessore. I am deeply grateful to Bishnu, Tapos and Deepu sir for teaching me basics of English, Gazi, Motin and Debu sir for honing my skills, Hafiz and Rafiq sir for inspiration, and Asif vai (Mongla) for mentoring the taste of learning. I am also deeply indebted to all the teachers and staffs of Department of English, *Khulna University* (KU). I sincerely thank Abdur Rahman Shahin, Ahmed Ahsanuzzaman, A R M Mostafizar Rahman, Md. Emdadul Huq, Fariha Ishrat Choudhury, Gazi Abdullah-hel Baqui, G. M. Javed Arif, Sabiha Huq, Mahmuda Nasrin, Md. Samyul Haque, Md. Sarwar Jahan, Md. Shahjahan Kabir, Shayla Sharmin Snigdha, Sk Abdullah al Mamun and Rumana Rahman. A lot of thanks to *G. M. Javed Arif* for supervising my graduate thesis. Thank you Sarwar

vai ('00 Batch, KU) for mentoring debate, Sena, Parag, and Ashikq vai ('02 Batch, KU) for providing academic support, and Atiq ('07 Batch, KU) for staying concerned.

I would like to thank my friends who supported me over the years. Thank you Md. Waliullah and Dilruba Nasrin for offering unwavering moral support, Mahbub Quaderi and Salma Parvin Quaderi for aspiration and eco-friendly foods, Rizvi Hasan and Dina Hasan Anna for bestowing care. Thank you Shariar Ahmed and Tamman Islam for your congenial, homely presence. Thank you Mamun, Kamal, Moin, Pavel, Rana, Ranjan, Riyad, Rumi, Shahin, Zia, Zilani, and Zoheb vai. I am greatly indebted to *Toufiqur Rahman Shuvro*, Ian Ahmed, Gafoor and Abdur Rahman. Thank you *Maidul Islam Choudhury* for being a smooth pal, source geek, and beacon of optimism. Thanks to Momtahina Rista for bestowing care to Ibaad. Many thanks to my dearest *Rubayet Hossain* for sharing laughs and joy, swimming together (Centralbadet), and pushing me into new territories. Many thanks to Maria for lively posts and all the best wishes for newbie Meher binte Rubayet. Thanks to Md. Shadat Hossain Swapan and Fahima Akhter for laughter. Thank you *Prabhat Upadhyaya* and *Jamshaid Hussain Asif* for your constant care.

Thank you my RUET gang: Belal, Arif and Rifat. Many thanks to Imran, Rochie, Anwar, Rony, Porag, Limon, Sajib, Dreams, Shafiq and Amir Hamza. I thank *S M Musfiqur Rahman Shaown* for being a compassionate friend and guiding me to Sweden. Thank you Tutul and Alam. Thank you all of my friends at Department of English, Khulna University ('03 Batch): Alam, Amina, Asad, Chanda, Debu, Fatema, Kakoli, Liton, Lutfa, Majed, Masud, Mehedi, Mithun, Momota, Mostofa, Mou, Nitish, Nurullah, Rina, Robiul, Romana, Sajeeb, Shaikat, Shila, Sumona, Tamal and Tanveer. Many thanks to Mr. and Mrs. Delwar Hossain, Firoze Rehan, Lovely Kamal, Mr. and Mrs. Mahbub Choudhury Sumon, Maruf Hossain, Nazmul Hossain, Mr. and Mrs. Nazrul Islam, Rehana Parveen, Rifat Jahan, Shahana Akhter and Tuhin Das Tito.

I want to thank all my relatives who constantly showed concern. A big thanks to Khaleda Akhter, A K M Nazmul Hossain, Nilufar

Jahan, Md. Abdul Qaiyum, Mahbuba Khatun, and Md. Akhtaruzzaman. Thank you Hafizul Haque Shaikat for infusing urge of knowledge and being the best pal. Thank you Khokhon, Pratik, Biplob, Pallob, and Polash vai. Many thanks to Chanda, Likhy and Pia apu. Thank you Soumik, Omi, Sakchor and Katha. Thank you Mr. and Mrs. Hasanur Rahman, Shahanur Rahman, Mr. and Mrs. Hafizur Rahman, Mr. and Mrs. Md. Mainur Rahman, Hafiza Akhter, Shamima Akter, Pervin Akter, Firoza Begum, Saiduzzaman Rid and Sharmin Hossain. Thank you Ayan, Din Islam, Labonno, Tazim, Shourjyo, Turjo, and Tuktuki.

I also would like to express gratitude to my close ones who would be happy today to see this project finished. I am deeply indebted to *Maksuda Khatun* for being my best adviser and well-wisher, and A K M Zakir Hossain for unconditional care. I also want to express gratitude to my paternal grandparents Anarul Haque and Durratunnesa, maternal grandparents Soleman Hossain Joaader and Mazedha Khatun, Azizul Haque, Rahima Khatun, Halima Khatun, Hasina Akter, Shafiqul Haider, and father-in-law Mizanur Rahman.

Last but not the least, I am deeply grateful to my family. I like to express gratitude to my father: *Md. Azimul Haque* who taught me the value of knowledge, importance of integrity, and urge of exploring beyond the box. I want to thank my mother: *Mahmuda Haque* for having faith on me, sowing vision, and staying awake for me. Thanks to my sister *Ananya* for her care and love. I am immensely grateful to my wife *Lutfu Sharmin* for being gracefully patient with this ride and staying optimistic. Many, many thanks to *Masrur Ibaad Huq* for making life vibrant and giving happiness when I was deeply in need.

Alhamdulillah!

Rizwan-ul Huq
Norrköping
Sweden

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
Aims	4
Structure of the Thesis	4
2. ENGLISH IN BANGLADESHI SCHOOLS AND SOCIETY	7
Background	7
Historical Roots of English in Bangladesh: British Period (1757–1947)	8
Bengali: Shaping of the National Identity (1947-1971)	10
The Status of English in the Post-independence Period	12
English in the Compulsory Education System	14
Bengali-medium Education	15
Religious Education	16
Education in English	17
English-medium Schools	17
English-version Schools	18
Policy Documents on Education in English	21
The Banglsh Debate in Bangladeshi Society	24
Language Alternation and English-taught Education	26
Summary	28
3. BILINGUALISM IN EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE: LANGUAGE POLICY, ALTERNATION AND CLASSROOM INTERACTION	29
Language Policy in Practice	30
Language Alternation	31
Auer’s Sequential Approach: The Local Order Approach	34
Gafaranga’s Overall Order Approach: Medium of Interaction	36
Medium and Language Policy in Bilingual Classrooms	40
Two Models of Bilingual Education	43

Relevance of CLIL to the Current Study	45
CLIL and Bilingual Interaction: Science and Vocabulary	46
Summary	50
4. THEORETICAL AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK	53
Forerunning Foundations: Ethnomethodology and the Study of Social Actions	53
Conversation Analysis: Key Theoretical and Analytical Principles	55
Talk as Social Action	55
Talk as Orderly Activity	56
Emic Approach of Analysis	56
Context and Sequential Organization of Interaction	58
Multimodal Conversation Analysis	59
5. DATA, SETTING AND METHODOLOGY	63
Data	63
Setting and Participants	63
Finding the Field of Study	63
Capital School	64
Provincial School	66
Data Collection	67
Contact with the Schools	67
Ethical Considerations	69
Video Recordings	71
Processing and Transcribing Data	73
6. SUMMARY OF STUDIES	77
Study 1: <i>What topic we've been to?</i> Progress Reviews in English as a Medium of Instruction Classrooms	77
Study 2: Sparkling, Wrinkling, Softly Tinkling: On Poetry and Word Meaning in a Bilingual Primary Classroom	79
Study 3: Doing English-only Instructions: A Multimodal Account of Bilingual Bangladeshi Classrooms	81

7. CONCLUDING DISCUSSION 83

English-taught Teaching through Monolingual and Bilingual Mediums of Interaction	83
Participants' Roles during Teaching Activities	86
Multimodal Organization of Classroom Interaction	87
Educational Implications	89
Bilingual Education	89
Multimodality and the Medium of Classroom Interaction	92
Implications for Future Research	94

8. SVENSK SAMMANFATTNING 97

Bakgrund	97
Syfte och frågeställningar	99
Tvåspråkighet i pedagogisk praxis	100
Kodväxling	100
Gafarangas övergripande förklaringsmodell	101
Tvåspråkig utbildning: Språk och ämnesinnehåll	103
Sammanfattning	104
Teoretiska perspektiv	105
Multimodal konversationsanalys	106
Metod, datainsamling och deltagare	106
Resultat och diskussion	108
Flera interaktionsmedier i multimodalt samspel	108
Tillämpning	111

REFERENCES 112

STUDIES INCLUDED IN THE THESIS

APPENDICES I-III

“It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of
wisdom, it was the age of foolishness . . .”

Charles Dickens (1812-1870)

1. Introduction

On February 16th, 2012, the Honorable Supreme Court of the People's Republic of Bangladesh passed a *suo moto* rule reprimanding commercial television and radio stations for actively promoting Banglish – a contemporary bilingual practice of mixing vernacular¹ Bengali and English – in the programs they broadcast (Agence France-Presse [AfP], 2012; Raidió Teilifís Éireann [RTE], 2012). The ruling highlighted an “urgent” need to curb such practices on the grounds that this youth-based, linguistic sub-culture is detrimental to “1000 years old” “unique” Bengali language, literature and culture (ibid.). Invoking the need to comply with existing legislation that promotes Bengali as the national language in all domains of public life (Bengali Language Introduction Act, 1987:2), the ruling also issued further directives to the authorities concerned to establish feasible measures to ensure the necessary support for preserving its linguistic purity. Besides addressing the concern that the growth of such bilingual practice is a significant threat to the sacrosanct status quo of Bengali, the ruling implicitly echoes an emerging debate concerning the role of English in Bangladeshi society.

¹ Here, ‘vernacular’ is used as a term to denote the native tongue of the majority of the population.

As a South-Asian country with an ethnically homogeneous population, the English language does not have an easy position in Bangladesh – especially as a language linked to colonial rule in the Indo-Pak sub-continent. Following the War of Liberation in 1971, the first Constitution of Bangladesh (1972) instituted Bengali as the only official language. As a nation where the majority of the population (98%) speaks Bengali as their mother tongue, this legal provision and the generous support of state apparatuses have helped to ensure that the majority of compulsory education, from grade 1 through to grade 12, is provided in Bengali only.

Although English is still an important language used in various domains of public life, it does not have any official status in Bangladesh. Nonetheless, compulsory English-taught education – at both public- and private-funded institutions² – has flourished significantly, especially in major metropolitan areas around the country. The official number of students enrolled in education in English is 125,233 (Bangladesh Bureau of Education Information and Statistics [BANBEIS], 2016, p. 279). However, the actual number of schools and the number of students attending these schools is far greater than reported in government records (see Hamid & Jahan, 2015; Mousumi & Kusakabe, 2017a, 2017b). In spite of their relative popularity, little is known about these schools and in particular how everyday teaching activities are arranged under the English-only policy. It is to these instructional activities that this thesis turns its analytical focus.

Different forms of compulsory L2-only English education are available in many countries around the world. Bilingual programs, such as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) (Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Nikula, Dalton-Puffer, & García, 2013; Cenoz, Genesee & Gorter, 2013) and Content and English Integrated Learning (CEIL) (Dalton-Puffer, 2011), have flourished significantly both in European (Navés, 2009; see also Eurydice, 2006) and non-European pedagogical settings (Jawhar, 2012; Duran, 2017; see also Hall & Cook, 2012). Such programs typically have a dual

² There are different modes of education available in Bangladeshi settings offering English as the medium of instruction. Further details are discussed in chapter 2.

pedagogical focus, on the one hand aiming to facilitate understanding of the lesson content and on the other hand seeking to develop students' language competence in the medium of instruction. Several studies have examined various aspects of classroom interaction in such settings, offering a better understanding of the relationship between bilingual pedagogy and learning (Evnitskaya, 2012; Pekarek-Doehler & Ziegler, 2007; Moore & Dooly, 2010; Kääntä, Kasper & Piirainen-Marsh, 2018, Kääntä & Piirainen-Marsh, 2013) and shedding light on the participants' *in situ* language choices, which may often be sensitive to their interpretation of local language policies (Bonacina, 2010, 2017; Bonacina-Pugh, 2012; Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011; Amir, 2013a).

With respect to Bangladeshi schooling, interaction-oriented studies addressing English-taught teaching and classroom language practices are very sparse (cf. Akhter, 2018; Hamid, 2009, 2016; Hamid, Nguyen, & Baldauf, 2013; Hamid, Jahan & Islam, 2013). Hence, there is a considerable lack of knowledge about the educational practices taking place in the compulsory school classrooms across Bangladesh where subjects are taught in English. In order to inform educational and general language policies, and to further increase our understanding of the challenges and affordances of bilingual education, there is clearly a need for empirical research into the classroom activities through which the teaching and learning of curricular content alongside English takes place.

Hence, the current thesis attends to this gap using multimodal conversation analysis (CA). The data on which this study is based consists of video recordings of classroom interaction collected from three groups of students, aged from 9 to 13, attending two Bangladeshi institutions that offer instruction in English. The corpus consists of 44 hours of video recordings of naturally occurring classroom interaction.

Aims

The overarching aim of this thesis is to contribute to an empirically grounded understanding of classroom interaction in Bangladeshi English-taught compulsory education. In pursuing this aim, the following research questions are examined:

- How are classroom activities organized in the presence of two languages – Bengali and English – in Bangladeshi schools offering instruction in English?
- What, if any, are the consequences of the institutional language policy on the participants' interaction within different classroom activities?

To address these questions, multimodal conversation analysis is used to examine a corpus of video-recorded lessons at two compulsory English-taught schools in Bangladesh. The thesis comprises three empirical studies that analyze different pedagogical activities focusing on participants' social interaction, with a particular interest in matters of language choice and alternation. In examining the participants' actions, the analysis highlights a variety of multimodal resources (Goodwin, 2000, 2002, 2003; Mondada, 2007b, 2008, 2014a, 2014b, 2018) including embodied moves (e.g., gestures, body postures, eye gaze) as well as material features (e.g., surrounding classroom ecology and material objects) in relation to the unfolding activities.

Structure of the Thesis

The thesis is organized into two parts.

Part I contains seven chapters. Chapter 2 provides a historical and ethnographic background relevant to the setting of this thesis. As the study has been carried out in a Bangladeshi context, a basic sketch of its education system is also provided in this section along with discussions on the status of English in policy documents as well as

existing studies on bilingual practice in Bangladeshi education. Chapter 3 offers a comprehensive overview of three research fields of particular interest to the thesis, namely language policy, language alternation, and CLIL programs. Chapter 4 briefly reviews the academic schools of ethnomethodology and multimodal conversation analysis, which have informed the theoretical and analytical approach of the thesis. The data collection process and subsequent considerations are discussed in Chapter 5. In Chapter 6, a summary of the articles is presented. Chapter 7 offers a concluding discussion of the findings. In Chapter 8, there is also a Swedish summary (*Svensk sammanfattning*) for the Swedish-speaking readers.

In Part II, three empirical studies are presented in the format of journal articles (Studies 1 and 3) and a book chapter (Study 2).

2. English in Bangladeshi Schools and Society

Background

Populated approximately from the fourth century B.C. (Ahmed, 2014), the current territory of Bangladesh has been traditionally known as Bango or Bangal – home to a variety of ethnic groups with roots of Dravidian, Tibetan-Burman, and Austroasiatic origin (ibid.). Located in the northeastern part of South Asia, Bangladesh – officially *the People's Republic of Bangladesh* – covers an area of 148,460 square kilometers (ibid.) bordering India and Myanmar (Burma), with an opening to the Bay of Bengal. The current political boundary was shaped in the aftermath of the partition of the then British-ruled India in 1947. Until 1971, it was part of Pakistan known as East Pakistan. Later that year, it emerged as an independent nation following the War of Liberation (Riaz, 2015, 2016).

This flat, riverine, pre-dominantly agrarian region is the twelfth most densely populated country in the world, inhabited by 158.9 million people (Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics [BBS], 2017, p. vi) and with a growing tendency toward urbanization and industrialization. During the post-independence period, Bangladesh has seen moderate but consistent economic growth followed by a gradual progression of upward mobility in the Human Development Index, currently ranked at number 136 (United News Bangladesh [UnB], 2018). The annual GDP is USD 690.3 billion and per capita income is USD 1,385 (BBS, 2017, p. vi). It secured lower-middle income status in 2018 (Bhattacharya & Khan, 2018), leaving behind a long-standing status of least developed country.

Figure 1: Bangladesh on the map of Asia (Parvez, 2009)

Figure 2: Territory of Bangladesh (van Schendel, 2006, p. 2)

As a member state of the United Nations, Bangladesh endorses the UN's Education for All (see Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, 2015) objectives, the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), and other key commitments to growth of human development (Rahman & Islam, 2009). Due to increased government and non-government efforts, it has observed moderate growth in the education sector, especially in terms of the population's overall literacy and female education, and an increase in tertiary-level education. At present, the average literacy rate is 72.6%, with significant adult literacy (92.9% in the 15-24 age group), according to a 2017 estimate (UNESCO Institute of Statistics, 2020).

Historical Roots of English in Bangladesh: British Period (1757-1947)

The historical roots of English in this region are associated with the arrival of the British East India Company (EIC, colloquially "the Company"). Before the arrival of the British colonizers, Bengal was officially part of the then Mughal Empire, but as an independent

princely state. In the early 18th century, it formed a short-lived independent kingdom under the rule of the Nawab of Bengal, with a loose political allegiance to Mughals. Although the EIC was primarily a business endeavor trading goods en route to India (i.e., spices and tea), the decaying Mughal Empire offered an opportunity to consolidate its political ambition in the sub-continent. With the establishment of military forts and the accumulation of large margin of tax-free profit due to a royal decree from the Mughal court of Delhi (Islam, 2015), the EIC set its political ambitions on Bengal by seizing the opportunities offered by infighting between existing stakeholders of power bastions in the court of Bengal. On June 23rd, 1757, a decisive battle was fought at Palassey between the EIC and the Nawab of Bengal (the semi-independent king ruling the then Bengal region), resulting in victory for the British troops (ibid.). From then on, the EIC expanded its territories on the sub-continent, securing its final achievement by toppling the decaying Mughal Empire in 1857 (ibid.). Later on, direct rule by the British monarchy – abolishing the Company rule – was established.

With the shifting political landscape, English gradually found its way to the mass population. Although the EIC had been an established political entity since the early 18th century in Bengal, English was not instantly introduced to public domains such as administration, education, and the judiciary. The then education system of the sub-continent, for instance, was based on religious adherence such as Arabic and Farsi for Islamic *madrasah* education, Sanskrit and the local vernacular for Hindu *tols*, and Pali and the local vernacular for Buddhist monasteries (Rahman, 2000, pp. 19-21). The establishment of the British rule, however, made centralized, secular education possible across the sub-continent. The province of what was then Bengal was no exception. In the British-run education system, English naturally received significant importance, resulting in the subsequent growth of an English-literate population in this region.

As English was associated with the arrival of colonization in this region, an antipathy against English was also prevalent. In the wake of demands for self-rule and resistance against British colonial rule

in the early 20th century, the opposition toward English spread among the population, especially within the strong pro-nationalist groups demanding self-rule. Following the departure of the British rulers from the sub-continent, initiatives such as the vernacularization of Anglicized names, the re-introduction of vernacular languages in the public domain, and other similar efforts testify to this pro-nationalist zeal (see Rahman, 2000; Sultana, 2013). Nonetheless, a fair number of British contributions to society (including legislation, bureaucracy, and education) survived these nationalist movements. As the social elites in charge of state affairs were educated in the British tradition, English remained the default language of administration, even after independence.

Bengali: Shaping of the National Identity (1947-1971)

In 1947, India (i.e., present-day India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh, united under British colonial rule) was partitioned into two countries – India and Pakistan – based on a popular mandate. The two constituent territories of Pakistan – West Pakistan and East Pakistan (now Pakistan and Bangladesh respectively) – were separated by 1,600 kilometers of land across the width of the Indian sub-continent. One of the challenges faced by this new state was the lack of a unified national language. This proved to be a major fault line between the two territories. Indeed, the right to use Bengali – promoted by the civil rights movement – became the vehicle of Bengali Nationalism (i.e., *Bangali Jatiyotabad*), and played a key role in the formation of present-day Bangladesh.

In West Pakistan, the languages spoken by the population included Punjabi, Sindhi, Baluchi, and Pashto (Rahman, 1995) – each one a major language in provinces created on the basis of linguistic identities. In East Pakistan, the majority of the population spoke only Bengali. Urdu – spoken by only 7.6% of the whole population of Pakistan in 1961 (Rahman, 1995, p. 15) – was the language of the ruling elite of West Pakistan, and was consequently adopted as the official and national language (Banu & Sussex, 2001a; Imam, 2005;

see also Jabeen, Chandio & Qasim, 2010). English, as a colonial legacy, was also given the status of an official language as it served the role of a lingua franca in affairs of the state (Imam, 2005). However, the official policy of the Pakistani rulers was to introduce Urdu as the *de facto* language of communication by teaching Urdu to the Bengali-speaking population and displacing Bengali from public affairs. In the early years of the Pakistan era, it was proposed that standard Bengali script should be replaced with Arabic script to help the Bengali-speaking population adapt to such a vision of Urdu literacy (Islam, 2008).

The proposition of Urdu as the official and national language created a heated debate, especially among the Bengali-majority East Pakistanis. In East Pakistan, it sparked a pro-Bengali civil rights movement that was violently subdued in 1950 by the state forces. The intervention resulted in numerous killings of peaceful protesters – mostly students at the University of Dhaka in the provincial capital city (Griest, 2015, para. 16). These deaths sparked further protests demanding equal status for Bengali in state affairs. As a result of the popular uprising against the pro-Urdu policy, the Federal Assembly voted in support of giving Bengali the status of official language. In 1956, Bengali was finally adopted as an official language of Pakistan alongside Urdu (Griest, 2015, para. 19). The language movement holds emotional, nationalist appeal for independent Bangladesh, and February 21st – the date of the student killings – is still commemorated as Language Martyrs' Day³.

In the 1950s, the civil rights movement gathered greater momentum, triggering further demands for autonomy in East Pakistan and resulting in a decade-long resistance movement against the West Pakistani military junta throughout the 1960s (Hasmi, 2019). In the aftermath of a ruthless military intervention against East Pakistanis starting on March 25th, 1971, an all-out war broke out between West and East Pakistan. This resulted in the birth of present-day Bangladesh on December 16th, 1971 (see Choudhury, 1972; Riaz, 2015, 2016).

³ UNESCO also recognizes it as *International Mother Language Day* from 1999.

The Status of English in the Post-independence Period

In the post-independence period beginning in 1971, the overwhelming majority of the Bengali-speaking population simplified the matter of a national policy on language. As Bengali is spoken by 98% of the population (Akhter, 2018, p. 301), it was adopted as the national and official language of the republic. Both Urdu and English lost their status as official languages in the post-independence period.

Table 1: Languages spoken in Bangladesh (author's classification, see also Nawaz, 2016)

Languages spoken in Bangladesh	
Official language	Bengali
National language	Bengali
Regional languages	Chatgaiya, Sylheti, Rangpuri
Tribal languages	Bishnurpiya, Chakma, Chin, Garo, Khumi, Kurux, Meitei, Mizo, Mundari, Mru, Oraon, Rajbanshi, Sadri, Santali, Tippera
Main immigrant languages	Bihari, Burmese, Rohingya
Main foreign language	English

The very first constitution of Bangladesh explicitly addressed the language issue, stating that “The state language of the Republic will be Bengali” (The State Language, 1972:3). Hence, various initiatives were taken to offer support for Bengali language in the post-independence period. Such efforts included establishing a research institute for language and culture (the Bangla Academy), introducing national Bengali book fairs, vernacularizing Anglicized names, and passing a range of laws favoring the status of Bengali. The name of the capital, for instance, was changed in 1982 from the Anglicized to the vernacular tongue – from Dacca to Dhaka. This “Banglisitation

of ‘Bengali’” (Sultana, 2012a, p. 57) was aimed at symbolically challenging the colonial legacy of English.

To ensure a structural framework for implementing Bengali, a law known as the Bengali Language Introduction Act (1987:2) was passed in 1987, legislating mandatory observance of Bengali-only policy in all public spheres. Although such an approach appeased nationalist zeal, it also triggered public debate concerning the status of other languages present in the region. Nonetheless, the call to implement Bengali at all levels is still an unfulfilled endeavor as English is still used in many domains of public life (“HC rules on use of Bangla”, 2014). Knowledge of English is still considered a linguistic asset, especially as a resource for greater employability in the public and private sectors, upward social mobility, migration opportunities, higher education, and other economic and social advantages (Erling, Seargeant, Solly, Chowdhury, & Rahman, 2012, pp. 12-17; Naik, 2018). The use of English, especially as a tool for correspondence and documentation, is prevalent in both government and non-government sectors. For instance, English is still used as a language for drafting the rulings of the court, especially in the upper tier of the judicial system (Khan, 2019; Yeasin, 2016; Shaon, 2018; Ferdousi, 2017). Government reports, government websites, the national constitution, and other forms of government-related print and digital documents are well documented in English versions alongside the original Bengali versions.

In terms of efforts to solicit an official status for English, a writ was recently petitioned in the High Court on April 17th, 2019. This petition sought to grant English official status on the basis of its existing usage as a second language in key state organs including the legislative, executive, and judiciary institutions (“PM urges to deliver verdicts in Bangla”, 2019). However, the writ was scrapped on the grounds that the Bengali-only policy of the Bengali Language Introduction Act (1987:2) dictates the protection of the status of Bengali in the national discourse (Rahman, 2019a, 2019b; “HC refuses to recognise English”, 2019). English therefore does not have any official status in Bangladesh today.

English in the Compulsory Education System

There are various avenues for education in English in Bangladesh. In formal educational settings, students are taught English as academic content (i.e., English grammar and literature) or as a medium of classroom instruction (i.e., as the language used for teaching other academic subjects, such as mathematics or biology). Official compulsory education starts at the age of 6. Attending school is mandatory from grades 1 to 8. The stages of education can be classified into four tiers: (a) pre-primary, informal education (ages 3-5); (b) primary education (ages 6-10, grades 1-5); (c) secondary education (ages 11-17, grades 6-12); and (d) tertiary, university-level education (ages 18 to 22) (see Ministry of Education, 2010). Primary and secondary education is financed by the state, and is free of charge at public schools.

Alongside institutionalized education, there are also alternative ways of learning English such as private tutoring agencies (known as coaching centers), international institutions (e.g., the British Council, or English teaching programs at foreign embassies), and informal home tuition services. Home schooling is only permitted in extraordinary circumstances, and non-schooling is prohibited by law. According to the language arrangements used in classroom instruction, existing compulsory education falls into three main categories (cf. Imam, 2005, pp. 475-479; Mousumi & Kusakabe, 2017a, pp. 2-5).

Figure 3: Education in Bangladesh (grades 1-12) according to languages used in instruction (author's own classification)

Bengali-medium Education

Bengali-medium schools are officially and colloquially known as *general* schools, where the default language of classroom instruction is Bengali. The curriculum of these schools is also offered in Bengali, except for English grammar and literature. The textbooks provided for these schools are government-approved national curriculum books (i.e., National Curriculum and Textbook Board or NCTB textbooks), which are distributed freely to students. General schools operate under public and private enterprises. The schools on the government payroll offer free compulsory education. At private schools, tuition fees are moderate to high based on location (e.g., schools in urban areas are more expensive) and market demand.

As general schools are spread around the country and the majority of students attend such schools, this is considered the mainstream form of education in Bangladesh. According to a government report, there are 122,176 schools at primary level (grades 1-5) attended by 19,067,761 students, 20,297 secondary level schools (grades 6-10)

attended by 9,743,072 students, and 4,113 higher secondary institutions (grades 11-12) attended by 3,678,869 students (BANBEIS, 2016, p. 30).

In Bengali-medium schools, English is taught only as an academic subject starting from grade 1 and continuing through to grade 12. The main focus is teaching English grammar and literature. Traditionally, there is a strong emphasis on rote learning of grammar, which often results in relatively moderate communication skills. A reform was therefore introduced to use the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) method in the curriculum, which yielded less than satisfactory results (Ali & Walker, 2014; Hamid, 2010, 2011). A prevalent concern regarding these schools is the lack of satisfactory proficiency in spoken English. A fair proportion of students fail to obtain satisfactory grades in English in central examinations (grades 10 and 12) (Habib, 2018; “Poor show in English”, 2017; see also Sultana, 2018; Akhter, 2018). Thus, there is consistent criticism against the prevailing teaching practices and the lack of resources (e.g., insufficient curriculum, oversized classes, and lack of exposure to interpersonal communication) for English as a subject in Bengali-medium schools.

Religious Education

Historically, Bangladesh is home to four major religions: Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Christianity. The religious education available to adherents of these religions is usually offered through the languages of their sacred or classical texts (e.g., Arabic, Pali, Sanskrit, Farsi, or Urdu). The schools offering Islamic education, known as madrasahs, offer mixed-mode instruction in which Bengali is used alongside Arabic and Urdu. These schools follow either the government-approved national curriculum with added religious content (e.g., schools under the Bangladesh Madrasah Education Board or the Aliya system) or an autonomous curriculum system (e.g., the Bangladesh Qawmi Madrasah Education Board) (Hoque, 2008). Although English is taught as a subject at government-approved curriculum schools, its importance is generally less

compared to Bengali-medium schools. The number of students enrolled at Aliya madrasahs is 2,409,373 (at 9,319 institutions) (BANBEIS, 2016, p. 30).

Education in English

Formal compulsory education in English is generally offered under two major streams: (a) *English-medium* and (b) *English-version* schools. At these schools, English is not only taught as an academic subject (i.e., grammar and literature) but typically also serves as the medium of classroom instruction.

English-medium Schools

English-medium schools are privately owned institutions, under the supervision of the Ministry of Education, offering education from grades 1 to 12. Two major types of schools can be identified: (a) English-medium schools, which follow “international standard” curriculum and assessment procedures, and (b) English-medium “kindergarten” schools, which follow locally developed, non-government, approved curriculum and assessment procedures (cf. Imam, 2005, pp. 477-479). An empirical study (Study 2) included in this dissertation is situated at a kindergarten school.

International standard schools are operated in collaboration with UK-based or other international institutions (e.g., Cambridge Assessment International Education, Pearson Edexcel, Oxford International AQA, or International Baccalaureate (IB)). At these schools, major examinations take place in grade 10 and grade 12: ordinary (O-level) and advanced (A-level) exams respectively (BANBEIS, 2016). Catering generally to middle- and high-income families, international standard schools are usually located close to foreign embassies and high-end residential areas. A trademark feature of these types of schools is high tuition fees compared to other available modes of education (Alamgir, 2014).

The English-medium⁴ *kindergarten schools* follow locally developed curricula customized to meet the needs of middle- and higher-income families. Also known as “kindergardens” and “nursery schools”, this mode of education provides pre-primary, informal education (ages 4-6) and formal primary education (ages 6-11). These schools usually act as preparatory institutions aimed at developing basic skills in English. As many kindergarten schools only offer education from grades 1 to 5, students attending these schools often switch to Bengali-medium or English-version schools upon completion of their primary education.

As the official documents do not give a detailed categorization, government reports and policy documents typically refer to these establishments as English-medium schools. According to the latest government sources, there are 162 registered English-medium schools in Bangladesh attended by 125,233 students (BANBEIS, 2016, p. 279). The same dataset also reports that there are 38 O-level schools (grades 11-12), 99 A-level schools (grades 9-10), and 25 junior secondary schools (grades 6-8) (ibid.). However, the actual number of English-medium schools, across all levels, is far greater than stated in government sources. Hamid and Jahan (2015), for instance, argue that the official figures are seriously underestimated, and the disparity in this information is due to the fact that governmental supervision of this mode of education is lax. They propose an estimate of 2,000 English-medium schools with an enrollment span of 300,000 to 500,000 students (p. 78; see also Hamid, 2011; Mousumi & Kusakabe, 2017a, 2017b; Hossain & Tollefson, 2007; Al-Quaderi & Mahmud, 2010; “Policy for English medium schools a must”, 2005).

English-version Schools

English-version schools (grades 1 to 12) are private and autonomous (i.e., they are partially operated with government funding and have autonomous governance). Although these schools follow

⁴ Bengali-medium kindergarten schools are also available in Bangladesh starting from age 4, offering pre-primary and primary education from grades 1 to 5.

government-approved curriculum and assessment procedures, the mode of instruction is English. This form of schooling emerged as a reconciliatory approach to address the need to improve students' English skills while keeping the national curriculum and assessment procedure. To this end, the curriculum taught in these schools uses identical translated versions of government-approved national curriculum textbooks (i.e., NCTB textbooks), and is taught in English for all academic subjects other than Bengali (i.e., Bengali grammar and literature). The assessment procedures are also similar to Bengali-medium/general schools, offering identical English versions of question papers and tests. These schools also provide two key certification exams (grade 10 and grade 12).

Figure 4: Government-approved NCTB textbooks for Bengali-medium (left) and English-version (right) schools. These are examples of pages from the Bangladesh and Global Studies textbook (grade 3) (Nasreen, Maleque, Chakraborti & Akhter, 2018, p. 2).

English-version schools offer an opportunity for students to learn curriculum content in English without losing their commitment to mainstream education. Military-funded schools (cadet colleges) and

many Christian missionary schools (convent or mission schools) are English-version schools. They are city-based, high-demand schools for middle- and higher-income families. In terms of tuition fees, English version schools are not as expensive as the international standard English-medium schools. They therefore offer English education to wider sections of society. Such a mode of education is generally unavailable in rural areas, and Bengali-medium schooling or madrasahs are the default form of education instead. However, some measures have been taken recently to introduce English-version schooling in rural communities too (“Outstanding success in PECE”, 2016).

English-version schools are often operated on a dual-mode basis, where both Bengali-medium and English-version schooling is offered either in different shifts, such as morning shift for English-version schooling and noon shift for Bengali-medium schooling, or at parallel infrastructural resources, such as separate buildings or complexes designated for different instructional modes within the same institution. In so doing, the same infrastructural resources – buildings and equipment, staff, and assessment systems – are used interchangeably for both types of education. Complete English-version only education is also available at many institutions, such as cadet colleges.

In government reports, this system of education is not reported as a distinct form of education. The number of institutions offering the English-version curriculum is therefore essentially unknown. Unofficially, cursory research suggests the existence of 57 institutions in Bangladesh (see Billah, 2011), but such estimates need to be treated with caution. In terms of official approval, only an application to the Ministry of Education is necessary to open a parallel shift of an English-version school alongside the mainstream Bengali-medium schooling (Mousumi & Kusakabe, 2017a). Government support is available for the purchase and distribution of textbooks. Empirical studies 1 and 3 in this dissertation report on academic activities taking place at an English-version school.

Policy Documents on Education in English

In the post-independence period, numerous government-funded reports and policy documents were published. In total, there were six education commissions, and numerous national education committees and taskforces were formed to offer policy guidelines for education (Rahman, 2000; Khan, 2015; Rahman et al., 2019, p. 14). The only national education policy was published in 2010, with texts available in both Bengali and English.

Table 2: Policy documents on Bangladesh's education policy (see Rahman, 2000; Rahman & Pandian, 2018; Rahman et al., 2019)

Government-funded policy documents	
Education commissions	Dr. Qudrat-e-Khuda Education Commission (1974)
	Mofiz Uddin Education Commission (1988)
	Shamsul Haque Education Commission (1997)
	Dr. M. A. Bari Education Commission (2002)
	Dr. Mohammad Moniruzzaman Miah Education Commission (2003)
	Kabir Chowdhury Education Commission (2009)
Education policy	<i>National Education Policy: 2010</i> [Bengali: <i>Jatiyo Shikhaniti</i>] (texts available in both Bengali and English)

One of the key debates that emerged during the post-independence period concerned the role of English in the education system. In the education policy, this issue was discussed under two key topics: (a) English as an academic subject in the education system, and (b) English as a medium of classroom instruction in schools. Although a fair amount of space is dedicated to discussion on the importance of English teaching in all spheres of schooling, the general tendency – as dictated in the *National Education Policy: 2010* – is to keep English limited as an academic subject with the minimum use of English as a medium of classroom instruction unless absolutely necessary (Ministry of Education, 2010, p. 13).

In fact, one of the earliest propositions in the post-independence period, emerging out of Bengali-only advocacy, was to introduce a *uni-track education* system (Qudrat-e-Khuda et al., 1974; “Ensure unitrack edn”, 2009) that proposed replacing other forms of education – religious, English, and other forms of schooling that involved using other languages – in favor of a “uniform”, Bengali-only mode of education. The first education commission – the *Bangladesh Education Commission Report* – proposed making Bengali the medium of instruction for compulsory education from grades 1 to 12, and to introduce English in grade 6 as a foreign language (Qudrat-e-Khuda et al., 1974, pp. 13-15). Hence, the commission proposed that Bengali – the language spoken by the majority of the population – should naturally be the only medium of instruction for all students, at least in primary-level education.

In other words, policy support for English education was under severe threat (Banu & Sussex, 2001a, p. 129). With the gradual decline in importance of English in policy discussions during the first two decades after independence, and especially during the 1980s, students’ English skills suffered significantly (Banu & Sussex, 2001a; Rahman, 2015). When this was noted, a range of government interventions were implemented to reverse the decline in the population’s English literacy. For instance, English was established as a compulsory academic subject from grade 1, and international donor-funded projects – such as the English Language Teaching Improvement Program (Rahman, 2000, p. 144; Hamid & Erling, 2016) and English in Action (Mott MacDonald, 2020) – were introduced, with a particular emphasis on incorporating modern technology into English teaching. Although this resulted in a revival of schooling in English, much of this effort was primarily concentrated on Bengali-medium schools, which had suffered the most in terms of students’ command of English. In addition, English was made a compulsory academic subject in public tertiary education (Rahman, 2000, p. 34). In spite of these efforts to enhance the knowledge of English among the population, the policy documents did not articulate any explicit support for English-medium schooling (cf. Hossain & Tollefson, 2007; Hamid, Jahan & Islam, 2013).

Nevertheless, there was some recognition of the necessity of English-medium schooling. In response to changing market needs in the 1990s (moderate economic growth, increased per capita income, and aspirations for international migration), the need for greater emphasis on English and communication skills in particular was felt among Bangladeshi citizens, especially the urban elites (see Mousumi & Kusakabe, 2017a, 2017b). In 2003, the Moniruzzaman Miah Education Commission commented on the presence of different streams of education in the following way:

The existing diversified streams in primary and secondary education in Bangladesh creates socio-economic and intellectual discrepancies, which is assumed to be detrimental to social justice and solidarity. Since it would not be wise to change the tradition over night, curriculum needs to be prepared in coordinating the different streams so that the major parts of the streams become consistent. (Ministry of Education, 2007).

In effect, while the policy documents adopted a cautionary attitude toward English-medium schooling, there was a growing recognition that English-medium schooling needed to stay. Indeed, the emergence of English-version schools, which are an instance of “coordinated streams”, is a product of such a reconciliatory approach aspiring for education to be customized to enhance students’ skills in English. A reconciliatory approach – as dictated in the *National Education Policy: 2010* – was also taken toward the international standard English-medium schools offering accreditation of O-level and A-level education with two pre-conditions: (a) government approval of these institutions, and (b) the introduction of Bengali and Bangladesh Studies as an academic subject in the school curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2010, p. 23).

This is not to say that the education policy endorses education in English. The education policy is still committed to “uniform basic education for all” (Ministry of Education, 2010, p. 13). The prevailing assumption articulated in the national policy, therefore, is

that “a uniform curricula and syllabus will be followed in some specific subjects at the primary level in all schools across the country”, and that efforts should be directed toward integrating “all the streams of primary education such as government and non-government primary schools, kindergartens (both Bangla & English media) and ibtedaye madrassas” (ibid.). Clearly, this would seem incompatible with the accreditation of international standard English-medium schools, and with the presence of English-medium kindergarten schools, both of which offer compulsory education following autonomous curricula. The fact that these forms of education take place under the (more or less explicit) approval of the government testifies to the ideological, political, and educational dilemma inherent in the question of the place of English in Bangladeshi society. The dilemma can be viewed as a tussle between *protectionist* and *developmental* discourses around the English language. Hamid and Erling (2016) formulated the dilemma as a “zero-sum game” between English and Bengali (p. 36; see also Alam, 2018), where a stronger, explicitly articulated policy which supports education in English is feared to be detrimental to Bengali-medium education and the Bengali-only policy for all levels of public domains.

The Banglish Debate in Bangladeshi Society

The idea of a contested relationship between English and Bengali is further relevant to an understanding of various aspects of existing linguistic practices in Bangladesh. Among urban-centric, English-educated youth, there is a growing tendency of “high degree of code-mixing between English and Bangla”, characterized by “anglicized and affected pronunciation of Bangla words” (Basu, 2016, p. 59, see also Sultana, 2012a, 2012b, 2014; Tahereen, 2016). This distinct type of bilingual practice has become colloquially known as Banglish or Bangreji, and has massively fueled the public debate. An array of social thinkers have questioned its use for various reasons, including a concern for linguistic purity and an incumbent threat to the status of Bengali as the national language. In an essay titled

“Language pollution is as deadly as river pollution”, noted scholar Syed Manjurul Islam argued that such bilingual practices are a misappropriation of linguistic assets, and may prove detrimental to the purity of Bengali. He also viewed such language use as subversive “street language”, and compared its consequences to a construction of “a building uprooting the grave of his forefathers” (AfP, 2012). Some scholars also argued that such a practice of mixing of the two languages reflects the mindset of a range of citizens who seek to downplay the significance of Bengali. F. Mazhar (2007) argued:

It seems that the neo-colonial linguistic practice would like to prove that Bangla is a ‘failed’ language – just like Bangladesh is a ‘failed’ state. Neo-colonial Bangla is eager to demonstrate that Bangla bhasha⁵ as a language and sign system does not have the capacity to express the day-to-day needs and concept of a modern society, not to mention serious thoughts; its vocabulary is so poor that one must borrow English words in every sentence. (Cited in Sultana, 2012b, p. 50.)

In response to such prevalent criticisms (see Basu, 2009, pp. 5-9), the Supreme Court issued a *suo moto* rule in 2012 to regulate the use of Banglish in media outlets, especially commercial television and FM radio stations. Invoking the glorious past of the culture of Bengali literature stretching back thousands of years and the Language Movement of 1952, the ruling stated that such language forms constitute a violation of the Bengali linguistic identity, and ordered the relevant authorities (e.g., broadcasting corporations, the Bangla Academy, and the Ministry of Information) to take essential measures against its use in public affairs (AfP, 2012; RTE, 2012). This power-coercive approach against Banglish is often reiterated in public discussions (Bay, 2018) to appease the popular appeal with an undertone of protecting the sanctity of Bengali. Basu (2009), for instance, sums up the protectionist attitude as a “deep mistrust of English-medium educated upper class youth on the part of the

⁵ In Bengali, ‘bhasha’ means language.

largely Bengali-medium educated and middle class population” resulting in a “resistance to the hybrid variety” (p. 30).

By contrast, Sultana (2013) questioned such a power-coercive approach against Banglish. She argues that the “belief” that it may be possible to preserve a language as “static and unchanged” (Sultana, 2012a, p. 56) is in itself problematic. In her view, the use of Banglish in society shows that young adults “do not limit themselves to identifiably different resources” (e.g., Bengali or English), and therefore results into this “transgressive transformation of language and identity” (Sultana, 2014, p. 297, see also 2012a, 2012b). She also argues that the use of Banglish demonstrates the very transformative characteristics of language, and young adults do not only “borrow, mimic or repeat certain resources”, but also re-localize “various global linguistic and cultural resources” (Sultana, 2013, p. 303) through such practice. Leaving apart the discussion on the “moral” dilemma around Banglish in the national discourse, these studies show the current critical discussions that are pertinent to the contested relationship between English and Bengali.

Language Alternation and English-taught Education

As English has been in contact with Bengali for a while, language alternation is fairly common conversational practice in Bangladesh. Banu and Sussex (2001b), for instance, have reported that switching between Bengali and English is spontaneous, unpredictable, and typical of spoken discourse, and educational institutions are no exception to this trend. With regard to Bengali-medium schooling in secondary education, a few studies have in fact observed that Bengali-English language alternation occasionally occurs, and seems to facilitate students’ comprehension and participation in classroom instruction. Islam and Ahsan (2011), for instance, reported that the use of Bengali during English lessons is an everyday practice of which students seem to approve, as they feel more comfortable in Bengali and Bengali-heavy instruction. Haider and Chowdhury (2012), on a similar note, also observed that bilingual talk is the

default communicative practice during English lessons. They observed that teachers – during the reading aloud activity – used Bengali to clarify English textbook content (see also Kabir, 2019).

As the bulk of public and private university students are recruited from Bengali-medium institutions, a growing number of studies have investigated the role of alternation in tertiary-level education. In an public university setting where instruction is offered in English, Akhter (2018) observed that language alternation was used as resource for clarifying L2 vocabulary items. During academic instruction to a mixed cohort of students with English- and Bengali-medium schooling backgrounds, the use of alternation, she argued, helped generate an increased understanding of the curricular content, especially for Bengali-medium educated students. The “monolingual meanings” of the L2 lexical items, she argued, “made learning of new words more difficult than the target words themselves” for students recruited from Bengali-medium schools, and bilingual definitions were rather used as a resource to help those students to retain the meaning of the L2 words in their mother tongue (Akhter, 2018, p. 311). Concerning the implications of following a strict English-only policy in a private university setting, Sultana (2014) observed that the students’ comprehension of instruction suffered severely, especially those students who were schooled in Bengali-medium compulsory education. She argued that their inability to understand the teachers’ strict English-only instruction resulted in the students failing to participate in the classroom discussion and therefore led to less satisfactory grades in their examinations. With regard to the “optimal” mode of instruction, some studies have therefore investigated students’ views on bilingual instruction in tertiary-level education. Conducting interviews with students attending lectures in an private university setting taught in English, Hamid, Jahan, and Islam (2013), for instance, observed differing opinions concerning the mode of academic instruction. They found that some students favored the idea of maintaining strict monolingual-only instruction, whereas others favored the idea of bilingual instruction (*ibid.*, p. 154). A few reasons – as offered by the interviewed students – for supporting bilingual instruction were their

lack of extensive vocabulary in English and their Bengali-medium schooling background.

Hence, some glimpses are available regarding English-taught education in a Bangladeshi setting. Nevertheless, the majority of studies have investigated either English lessons at Bengali-medium schools or academic instruction in tertiary-level education offered in English. No empirical studies on language alternation were found in the context of primary- or secondary-level English-medium or English-version schools in Bangladesh.

Summary

This chapter has discussed the historical, political, and ideological development necessary for an understanding of the intricacies of the linguistic and educational landscape of Bangladesh. As English is associated with the colonization of this region, the chapter has discussed its historical roots, its establishment in the education system, and its current role in the national discourse of Bangladesh. This chapter has also discussed the role of Bengali in developing the national identity as well as the contested relationship between Bengali and English in the education sector.

The contact between Bengali and English has, however, resulted in various forms of bilingual practices in Bangladeshi society, and – to date – few studies have been conducted that examine the bilingual practices. Notably, most of these studies have been conducted in tertiary and secondary education and have focused on matters of attitudes, identity, language policy, and planning, without systematically examining participants' interaction in instructional settings. This dissertation thus seeks to reduce the gap by offering an empirically anchored account of the social interaction in the settings of Bangladeshi schools that teach curricular content in English.

3. Bilingualism in Educational Practice: Language Policy, Alternation, and Classroom Interaction

The fact that I
am writing to you
in English
already falsifies what I
wanted to tell you.
My subject:
how to explain to you that I
don't belong to English
though I belong nowhere
else

Gustavo Pérez Firmat,
Bilingual Blues

This chapter offers a research background to this thesis. It is situated at the crossroads of several overlapping fields of inquiry, including studies of language policy, language alternation, and bilingual pedagogy. Drawing on Spolsky's (2004) work, I first discuss the relevance of participants' practice as an approach for understanding the workings of a language policy. Next, I offer a brief historical account of CA research on language alternation, which will lead us to discuss Gafaranga's (e.g., 1998, 1999, 2007a, 2007b, 2018) concept of "medium" to account for a participant's perspective on bilingual interaction.

The chapter also presents two key models of bilingual educational programs – English as Medium of Instruction (EMI) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) – and discusses their relevance for the types of bilingual programs examined in this dissertation. The chapter finally ends with a brief discussion of the key issues in recent CA studies of classroom interaction in bilingual

education, where the analytical focus is on a whole range of multimodal resources – besides the availability of more than one language – by which teachers and students participate in and jointly produce instructional activities. In this way, the chapter outlines the starting point for the empirical approach of the thesis.

Language Policy in Practice

Spolsky's model of language policy offers a framework of three discrete but interrelated realms of language policy, such as language practice (i.e., ecology), language beliefs (i.e., ideology), and language management (i.e., planning) (Spolsky, 2004, 2007, 2008, 2017). This framework is grounded on the concept of choice. For instance, language practice, in Spolsky's proposition, stands for participants' everyday linguistic behavior – “the regular patterns of choice” (2005, p. 2152) members of a community produce on an everyday basis. Researching language ideology, Spolsky argues, involves the study of participants' “beliefs about choices” and “values of varieties and of variants” (Spolsky, 2005, p. 2152). Therefore, studies on language beliefs – i.e., belief systems, conceptions, and myths regarding language – deal with matters of appropriateness, often drawing upon attitudinal dualities such as good vs. bad, accurate vs. inaccurate, acceptable vs. unacceptable, native vs. non-native, standard vs. non-standard, official vs. unofficial, grammatical vs. ungrammatical, or formal vs. colloquial use of language (Shohamy, 2006, p. 2). Finally, Spolsky also discusses the management of language policy, by which the ideologies and attitudes toward language are implemented – “the efforts made by some to change the choices and beliefs of others” (Spolsky, 2005, p. 2152). For instance, policy documents originating from judicial, administrative, constitutional, and/or legal authorities comprise a common set of tools designed to influence participants' beliefs about language, as well as their linguistic choices.

Crucially, Spolsky's framework highlights the importance of understanding actual practice (see “de facto” policy in Schiffman, 1996; see also ethnography of communication in Hymes, 1974/2003)

as a point of departure for studying language policy. While policy documents clearly comprise a declaration of policy intentions (see “de jure” policy in Schiffman, 1996), they are always subject to negotiation among members of the speech community. Therefore, when looking for actual outcomes of a language policy, one must focus on participants’ language practices – on “what people do” in real-life settings – rather than looking at “what they think they should do” or “what someone else wants them to do” (Spolsky, 2005, p. 2161). In important respects, this praxeological orientation makes Spolsky’s work compatible with a CA approach toward social interaction in policy-regulated settings. For instance, Spolsky and Shohamy (2000) argued that language practice constitutes “a recognizable and analyzable set of patterns” (p. 29) offering “the deducible, implicit rules that seem to underlie the language of a defined community” (p. 2). Indeed, one of the core aims of CA is to understand local orderliness of interaction, as well as underlying patterns of everyday conversation (for further details, see Chapter 4). It is in this spirit that I examine the participants’ actual, oriented-to language practices in this thesis to find out what, if anything, they can tell us about the workings of policy-governed, compulsory education in English in Bangladesh.

Language Alternation

The study of language alternation (i.e., the use of two or more languages within the same conversation) has attracted sustained research interest in a range of speech communities and bilingual/multilingual settings, including bilingual classrooms. Leaving behind the earlier view that language alternation is a deviant, random phenomenon (Weinreich, 1953/1963), an array of interaction-oriented studies have addressed the issue of orderliness in bilingual communicative exchanges. As depicted below (Figure 5), the orderliness of bilingual behavior falls under two major approaches, grammatical and social, or socio-functional (Gafaranga, 2018).

Figure 5: Perspectives on language alternation (adapted from Gafaranga, 2018, p. 36)

Starting with an interest in the grammar of bilingual speech (e.g., Poplack, 1980; Sebba, 1998; Myers-Scotton, 1993a, 1993b; see also Nilep, 2006), studies have paid attention to describing the “structural constraints that are said to determine where and how” language alternation could occur (Li Wei, 2005a, p. 375). The grammatical approach is therefore primarily concerned with identifying syntactic and morphosyntactic constraints on where in the course of a sentence alternation between languages may take place without violating the grammatical structures of either language. The socio-functional perspective, by contrast, has addressed language alternation as a discourse phenomenon addressing concerns such as implications of language alternation and meaning-making process, in other words its discursive functions. Introduced in the work of Blom and Gumperz (1972; see also Gumperz, 1982, 1992a, 1992b), the socio-functional approach has subsequently developed along two research strands: those seeking to explain language alternation in terms of speakers’ social identity, and those setting out to examine the internal – or local – organization of bilingual conversations. In Gafaranga’s

(2018) model, these are referred to as *identity-related* vs. *organizational* explanations of language alternation.

In the setting of a small settlement in Norway called Hemnesberget, Blom and Gumperz (1972) observed a systematic use of available standard and non-standard dialects (i.e., Bokmål and Ranamål). The latter, they argued, was associated with domestic use, closeness, familiarity, intimacy, and in-group relations (i.e., “we-code”), while the former, being the standard national variety, was associated with work, distance, authority, public, and out-group relations (i.e., “they-code”). The “we-code”, they argued, was used for in-group, informal activities, whereas the “they-code” was reserved for formal, out-group conversations. In consequence, Blom and Gumperz argued, alternating from one variety to the other meant taking on board and ascribing a set of symbolic values associated with each specific code into one’s speech. In a similar spirit, the Markedness Metric Model (Myers-Scotton, 1993a, 1993b) also includes identity-related explanations of language alternation patterns. Myers-Scotton’s model was later rebranded as the Rational Choice Model (Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai, 2001) which sought to explain participants’ motivations underlying their language behavior in terms of marked or unmarked choices of language. In other words, both Gumperz’s and Myers-Scotton’s work focused on generating sociolinguistic explanations for *why* language alternation happens, typically in terms of “societal values of languages” in relation to “societal categories of speakers’ speech communities” (Bonacina, 2010, p. 93), as well as the “rights and obligations” that govern the relationship between social identity and speech community (Musk & Cromdal, 2018, p. 20). A significant criticism of the identity-related approach, however, lies in the fact that the features of meaning that are “brought along” (Auer, 1992, p. 26) in relation to participants’ conversation revolve around the idea that languages carry with them typical sets of symbolic values, without demonstrating the relevance of such symbolic features to the participants engaging in talk (see Musk & Cromdal, 2018).

Instead of explaining why speakers alternate between languages by ascribing symbolic meaning to their choices, the organizational

perspective focuses on *how* language alternation happens as talk unfolds turn-by-turn (Li Wei, 1998). The organizational perspective first took shape in Auer's (1984) introduction of CA into the study of code-switching, focusing on the *local order* of language alternation, and was subsequently elaborated on in Gafaranga's (1998) work on the *overall order* of bilingual interaction.

Auer's Sequential Approach: The Local Order Approach

Inspired by the ethnomethodological agenda of seeking to examine members' methods for partaking in social life, Auer (1984) proposed studying bilingual talk on its own terms. That is to say, rather than starting out with a set of assumptions about the symbolic values of languages derived from a more or less articulated "language-reflects-society" framework (see Gafaranga, 2005), Auer stressed the benefits of "an analytic interest in *members' methods* (or procedures)" that would allow researchers to "analyze *member's procedures to arrive at local interpretations of language alternation*" (1984, p. 3, italics in original; see also "emic perspective" in Psathas, 1990, 1995). The focus, then, is on whichever sociolinguistic theories inform the participants' situated conduct, not those entertained by the analysts. Li Wei (2005b) sums up the gist of the CA approach to language alternation as follows:

The CA approach avoids imposing *analyst-oriented* classificatory frameworks and attempts, rather, to reveal the underlying procedural apparatus by which conversation participants themselves arrive at local interpretations of language choice. In contrast to other theories of bilingual code-switching, the CA approach dispenses with motivational speculation in favour of an interpretative approach based on detailed, turn-by-turn analysis of language choices. It is not about what bilingual conversationalists may do, or what they usually do, or even about what they might see as the appropriate thing to do. Rather, it is about *how* the meaning of code-switching is constructed in interaction. (Li Wei, 2005b, pp. 381-382, italics in original.)

Following the principle of CA, Auer (1984) treated language alternation as a sequentially embedded, locally available component within participants' emerging interaction. In consequence, any potential meaning of language alternation, Auer argued, needs to be understood in terms of its placement within the turn-by-turn, sequential order of the ongoing conversation.

The local order approach to language alternation is strictly informed by the conversation analytic principle of *order at all points* (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), the implication of which is that bilingual talk, like any instance of social interaction, is methodically organized. Consequently, Auer (1995) argued that any account of language alternation that overlooks its sequential environment is bound to fail.

Based on extended sequential analyses of participants' interpretations of language alternation within bilingual talk, Auer proposed two basic types of analytical distinctions for language alternation, *transfer* vs. *code-switching* and *participant-* vs. *discourse-related* language alternation (Auer, 1988, p. 192), where the first pair relates to the placement of alternation within the structure of the talk, and the latter pair to the local attributions it engenders for the participants. By transfer (later termed *insertion*), he referred to the type of momentary deviation from the language currently spoken that has little influence on the subsequent turns. By contrast, in the case of code-switching, there is no structural means of projecting a return to the previous language, which has specific implications for the turns that follow: "the new language invites succeeding participants to also use this new language" (Auer, 1988, p. 200). Considering the second pair, participant-related alternation offers cues about the "attributes of the speaker", such as linguistic competence or ideological preference (which may relate to the speaker's personal or national, political or local policy concerns), whereas discourse-related alternation has more to do with the participants' understanding of what they are currently doing. It therefore has discourse organizing implications, and Auer points to several examples such as change in participant constellation, topic

change, and sequence management (e.g., opening and closing of a side sequence).

Although Auer's local order approach has successfully introduced the CA approach to language alternation, positioning participants' situated practice as a central point of analytical concern, a recurring problem of the local order perspective is a lack of explanation for bilingual practices where participants do not demonstrably orient to the use of several languages as problematic, non-normative, pragmatically functional, or otherwise noticeable (see Gafaranga, 2000; also Bonacina, 2010, p. 96 for a further discussion of the limits of Auer's approach). Indeed, Auer himself readily acknowledged that "... if more than one participant frequently switches languages within turns [...] it becomes less and less relevant to speak of a language-in-interaction forming the background against which language alternation, must be seen" (Auer, 1984, p. 84; see also Auer, 2007). That is to say, if the participants do not themselves attend to the fact that several languages are being spoken, the very notion of language alternation seems inadequate for capturing *their* perspective on their own conduct. This is partly due to the presupposition that language alternation is an instance of alternation from a *base language* to another *language-in-interaction* (see discussion of "base language" in Auer, 2000). The overall order approach introduced by Gafaranga (1998, 1999, 2000) is a development of the sequential approach proposed by Auer, designed to account for a wider scope of bilingual interaction.

Gafaranga's Overall Order Approach: Medium of Interaction

One of the key concepts that emerged from the overall order approach is the notion of a medium that is "the actually oriented-to linguistic code", or put simply, the participants' own linguistic code (Gafaranga, 1999, p. 216; see also Gafaranga & Torras, 2001, pp. 195-6). As noted above, a general tendency in studies of bilingualism is to perceive language from a linguist's point of view, rather than from that of its speakers. In alignment with the call for an

emic perspective on language alternation (Li Wei, 1998), Gafaranga argued that the “scheme of interpretation” regarding language alternation is a concern not only for analysts, but also for participants in the interaction (2000, p. 347). Thus, the question of whether language alternation has taken place in a stretch of talk needs to be understood in terms of “speakers’ own perspective” (ibid.) rather than the analyst’s identification of different languages.

Gafaranga (2000) therefore proposed that the study of code-switching should start with the investigation of the participants’ “base code” in any instance of bilingual interaction (see discussions on codes in Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1990, 1998, 1999; Lin, 2013). Because the medium of interaction may well be composed of several linguistic systems, Gafaranga (e.g., 1999, 2000, 2007b) saw a need to rephrase Auer’s notion of a preference for “same language talk” into a preference for “same medium talk”, where that medium may well include different linguistic systems. This resulted in the following taxonomy of language alternation:

Figure 6: Types of language alternation (adapted from Gafaranga and Torras, 2002, p. 19; italics added)

Accordingly, participants may produce their conversation using elements from different linguistic systems without orienting to this bilingual use as relevant to their conduct. As noted above, when talk is produced in this way – i.e., along a bilingual medium – participants do not tend to view language alternation as a particularly salient feature of their conduct, because the “base code” which they take for granted is in itself bilingual. The following extract shows an example of bilingual medium interaction between a receptionist and an enquirer in a Spanish setting.

Extract 1 (Gafaranga & Torras, 2001, p. 206).

1 Receptionist	què volies? (Catalan)
can I help?
2 Enquirer	yo? eh venía a entregar estos papeles. (Castilian)
me? erm I've come to hand in these papers
3 Receptionist	aquí entran a la dreta. (Catalan)
over there on your right
4 Enquirer	vale gracias (Castilian)
okay thank you

Although the turns that the two participants produce are in different languages, there is nothing to suggest that they treat the talk of the other as a lack of alignment with their own choice of language – or that they treat the other's talk as somehow deviant – which implies that the medium of the interaction is bilingual. Because the overall approach incorporates the participants' view of language – their “scheme of interpretation” (Garfinkel, 1967/1984) – issues of language choice and alternation are not analytically relevant.

However, talk may also be organized along a monolingual medium – what Auer (1984) referred to as the preference for same language talk – in which case alternating to a different language will mean departing from the current medium. That is to say, a monolingual medium does not mean that only one language is used, but rather that the overall organization of the interaction takes place in one language. According to Gafaranga and Torras (2002), in interactional encounters organized by a monolingual medium,

language alternation falls into two sub-categories: *medium-repair* and *interactional otherness* (code-switching). The former refers to instances when the observed deviation from the current medium results in conversational repair – produced by the speaker himself/herself or by a recipient of the talk – by which the medium is restored. The latter category includes instances of observed deviance from the medium that does not call for repair. It is this class of language alternation that Auer (1998) referred to as code-switching, and the label that Gafaranga and Torras (2002) proposed – interactional otherness – highlights that deviance from the medium is observed in the first place by the participants; it is a participants' accomplishment. To illustrate this, Gafaranga and Torras offer the following example:

Extract 2 (Gafaranga & Torras, 2001, p. 204)

- 1 Secretary hola bon dia.
 hello good morning.
2 Enquirer bon dia er I'm looking for a list of of of erm of list of
 good morning er I'm looking for a list of of of erm
3 *www www* companies in Catalonia.*
 of list of www www companies in Catalonia.
4 Secretary *mmm mmm yes # and # the reason er:?*
 **www corresponds to the nationality of the companies.*

Although the greetings are exchanged in Catalan, after the enquirer's switch into English, the secretary follows suit and the rest of the conversation takes place in the enquirer's preferred language. Clearly, the secretary does not treat the enquirer's preference for English as a repairable choice, and we are dealing with an instance of medium switching, whereby an initially used medium is replaced by a new monolingual medium.

The final category in the model above – medium suspension – refers to a temporary switch of a medium, that is, where the initial monolingual medium is reestablished after having been temporarily suspended by a new medium (monolingual or bilingual). It should be stressed that the notion of medium here is a participants'

phenomenon, not a linguist's presumptive conceptualization of a linguistic system. For that reason, the differentiation between the categories of medium suspension and medium switching is, along the lines of Gafaranga and Torras (2002), a question of the participants' own accomplishment: "Participants orient to language alternation either as a bid for a new medium or as a temporal suspension of current medium" (p. 16). Just like Auer's sequential approach, then, the overall approach seeks to address the omnirelevant question for participants, "Why that now?" (Sacks et al., 1974) – or, in the case of participants in bilingual talk "Why that, in that language, right now?" (Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005; see also Üstünel, 2004, 2016) – thereby observing the ethnomethodological principle of viewing social interaction from a member's perspective. What the notion of medium offers beyond Auer's sequential approach is an analytical conceptualization of bilingual interaction that stretches beyond the immediate conversational sequence, allowing us to account for a host of bilingual phenomena in a range of social and institutional contexts.

Medium and Language Policy in Bilingual Classrooms

One research topic to which the idea of medium in bilingual interaction may be fruitfully applied concerns the workings of a language policy in educational contexts. It has often been assumed in studies of bilingual classrooms (e.g., Ferguson, 2009; Heller, 1999; Lin, 1999) that the prescribed language of instruction also functions as the default base code for the interaction taking place there, and that instances of other language use comprise noticeable deviances from the norm, resulting in interactional otherness or code-switching. However, as Bonacina and Gafaranga (2011) and Bonacina-Pugh (2012) demonstrated, such an assumption may not necessarily be warranted.

For instance, when examining the language practices of students enrolled at a French complementary school in Britain, Bonacina and Gafaranga (2011) observed that the actual talk between the

participants was occasionally carried out using a different interactional medium than the sanctioned monolingual use of French. They therefore proposed that the oriented-to medium – what they refer to as the *medium of classroom interaction* – should be conceptually distinguished from the institutionally prescribed *medium of instruction* (2011, pp. 330–331). Their analysis demonstrated that the participants routinely negotiate their preference for which medium to use in any interactional episode, and their options included two monolingual media – English-only or French-only – along with a bilingual medium where the two languages were intermixed. Note that it is only in one of the three instances that the medium of classroom interaction coincides with the prescribed medium of instruction.

In other words, from the perspective of the school, opting for a French monolingual medium is the normative choice, and the other two options – being deviances from the medium of instruction – may be seen as policy infractions. That, however, need not be the way that the participants themselves orient to their interaction. Instead, Bonacina and Gafaranga (2011) found instances of participants using French, where alternation into English for specific communicative purposes was oriented to as deviant and called for medium repair, just as they found instances of English being used as the monolingual medium, allowing for observably deviant switching into French. In both cases, it was the ways through which participants managed the alternation – either as repairable or as interactionally other (i.e., as code-switching) – that revealed their orientation to a monolingual medium. In a third category of cases observed, the participants would use both of the languages without otherwise either orienting to any deviance or otherness, or treating it as a repairable occurrence. When this happened, the participants' interaction proceeded along a bilingual medium.

In a similar fashion, Bonacina-Pugh (2012) studied the interactions among a group of newly arrived immigrant children in a so-called induction classroom at a French school, in which a French-only policy was applied. Her study demonstrates how students who share a preference for a language other than the medium of instruction

(French) would use that language as a medium of classroom interaction. From this medium, they would then switch into French for functional purposes, such as referring to their textbooks (see Cromdal, 2005; Kunitz, 2015; Lehti-Eklund, 2012, for similar uses of language alternation in bilingual classrooms). By contrast, in groups where the students did not share a language preference, the medium of instruction – being the one language that they had in common – would be used as the medium of classroom interaction.

The distinction between medium of instruction and medium of classroom interaction is an important conceptual development for studying language policy in practice. It facilitates an understanding of those norms pertinent to language use to which the participants orient themselves – borrowing from Bonacina-Pugh (2012), the “practiced language policy”. Further examples may be found in Amir (2013a) and Amir and Musk (2013), who examined the practices of students and teachers in English-only classrooms in a Swedish context. They observed that attending to the sanctioned policy, i.e. the “policy-as-workplan” (Amir, 2013a, p. 45), requires a continuum of actions. Establishing (or re-establishing) the target language as the medium of classroom interaction involved the participants engaging in “language policing” (Amir, 2013a, 2013b; see also Hazel, 2015). This takes the shape of a three-step process including (a) a (perceived) breach of the English-only rule, (b) an act of language policing, and (c) an orientation to the target-language-only rule (Amir, 2013a). Furthermore, the act of language policing is not merely carried out through verbal means, but also entails “multimodal aspects of form” ranging from “prosody to gaze”, as well as the “location of policing” such as the public, private, or semi-public spaces of the classroom (Amir, 2013a, p. 45; see also Jakonen, 2016).

The research above offers an important insight into the workings of language alternation and language policies. This is particularly relevant as many previous studies have started out by uncritically adopting the idea that language alternation is necessarily a conversational resource. As the research on conversational medium above shows, this may or may not be the case, and, whatever the

case, it needs to be analytically demonstrated, rather than assumed *a priori* (see Musk & Cromdal, 2018, pp. 25-34; see also Mondada, 2007a). Similarly, with respect to issues of language policy, many previous studies have uncritically treated the prescribed language as the default medium of classroom interaction, viewing alternative choices of language as policy transgressions, and thereby buying into the institutions' – rather than their inhabitants' – perspectives. As Bonacina-Pugh (2012) shows, approaching classroom interaction from the perspective of the participants yields a potentially different view of language policy.

Two Models of Bilingual Education

Bilingual education around the world has been implemented under different types of pedagogies, with Content-Based Instruction (CBI), immersion programs, English as Medium of Instruction (EMI), and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) perhaps being the most common instructional programs. A comprehensive review of their educational ideologies, practical applications, and outcomes falls outside the scope of this thesis, but given the Bangladeshi context discussed in Chapter 2, two of the major programs deserve further comment.

Given that EMI stands for English as Medium of Instruction, it is a clearly a potential candidate for the type of education analyzed in this thesis. EMI has generally been defined as an “umbrella term for academic subjects taught through English” without any explicit “reference to the aim of improving students’ English” (Dearden & Macaro, 2016, p. 456, Dearden, 2015). Hence, any pedagogical program taught under the policy of English-only to students whose mother tongue is not English qualifies – theoretically – as EMI. As opinions have differed on whether or not the sole focus should be on transfer of content learning in English (see Smit & Dafouz, 2012), other modes of education, such as CBI and CLIL, have often been treated as varieties of EMI (Brown & Bradford, 2016, pp. 329-330). I borrow Macaro et al.’s (2018) definition of EMI as “the use of the English language to teach academic subjects (other than English

itself) in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the majority of the population is not English” (p. 137).

As a bilingual or multilingual pedagogy, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has emerged as an often-used method of teaching primarily within European countries. With the publication of the *White Paper on Education and Training: Towards the Learning Society* (European Commission, 1995), the European Commission’s policy, often referred to as the 1+2 policy, aimed to promote linguistic competence in two additional languages besides the mother tongue. CLIL programs were generally introduced as educational initiatives toward this goal. Formally introduced by UNICOM in 1996 (Navés, 2009), CLIL programs have been implemented in pedagogical settings where foreign languages are taught to students with two core aims: competence in academic content, and exposure to a target foreign language in the classroom.

Although conceptualizations of CLIL remain blurry – and demarcations between CLIL and other bilingual programs have been debated (especially in relation to immersion programs and Content-Based Instruction, see Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2007; Dalton-Puffer, Llinares, Lorenzo, & Nikula, 2014; Cenoz et al., 2013, Cenoz, 2013) – a characteristic feature of CLIL is the equal emphasis on the content of teaching and the language used for instructing that content – the medium of instruction. Dalton-Puffer (2011), for instance, stated that CLIL is “an educational approach where curricular content is taught through the medium of a foreign language, typically to students participating in some form of mainstream education at the primary, secondary, or tertiary level” (p. 183). This mode of education, therefore, has been conceptualized as a “*dual-focused* education” (Marsh, 2006, p. 32; 2008, italics added), “a joint learning practice of subject matter and foreign language” (Smit & Dafouz, 2012, p. 1), “a fusion of both subject content and language learning” (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010, p. 6), and a “balancing” between curricular content and language (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012). All in all, a core value embedded in CLIL is to incorporate the twin goal of pedagogical activity – doing classroom instruction in a foreign language to achieve both understanding of the academic

content and linguistic competence in the medium of classroom instruction.

Although the success of CLIL has been questioned (see Hall & Cook, 2012, pp. 297-298, Sylvé, 2004), it can hardly be denied that CLIL has been firmly established as an acknowledged method of bilingual teaching in the European setting (Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Nikula et al., 2013; Nikula, 2017). Efforts have also been made to replicate this mode of teaching in other parts of the world, including several Latin American and Asian countries (Hall & Cook, 2012, p. 297; see also Lasagabaster, 2013; Yang, 2015; Jawhar, 2012). Because of its European heritage, CLIL has generally been used to teach through a small spectrum of “prestigious languages” (Dalton-Puffer, 2011, p. 183; also Eurydice Report, 2006). In fact, due to the overwhelming popularity of implementing English as the medium of instruction, it is also often termed Content and English Integrated Learning, or CEIL (Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Nikula et al., 2013).

Relevance of CLIL to the Current Study

Because the language policy of the schools studied in this dissertation is English, the pedagogical programs can in principle be termed EMI. Nevertheless, I argue that the features of CLIL pedagogy are a better fit, especially in terms of the types of pedagogical activities observed in these schools. The following extract shows an example of a ‘dual-focused’ approach between content and language during classroom instruction in a Bangladesh and general studies lesson (see example 2, Study 3).

Extract 3

1	Teacher	>sove ri nity< what (do) you mean by sove _r ini:ty:
2	Student 1	sadhinota
<i>freedom</i>
3	Student 2	= sa[dhinota ((quieter voice))
<i>freedom</i>
4	Teacher	[>u:tm _{ost} <] po _w er sadhinota na:
<i>it's not freedom</i>

- 5 (.) <pOWe:r>
6 (0.3)
7 Teacher to protect itself

In a whole-class teaching session, the participants become engaged in a discussion about the appropriate meaning of an L2 word. The students treat the teacher's query concerning the meaning of "sovereignty" as a request for translation of the target item, and they offer a prospective L1 equivalent. Although the students have given an incorrect answer to the question, the teacher's acceptance of answers in L1 followed by her bilingual response implies how a balance is struck between giving instruction in English and ensuring appropriate understanding of content unknown to students. The teacher's use of L1, in this case, is used to negate the meaning proposed by the students, while the correct answer in the shape of a synonym for the target word is produced in the medium of instruction. This emphasizes the distinction between the two concepts ("freedom" vs. "utmost power to protect itself") and offers additional L2 vocabulary resources. On the grounds that the pedagogical practices available in these schools offer such a dual-focused approach to classroom instruction, I have termed the educational settings studied in this dissertation as CLIL.

CLIL and Bilingual Interaction: Science and Vocabulary

Although many CLIL programs may not assign equal importance to linguistic resources, at ideational level – at least – it facilitates opportunities for incorporating participants' available languages as a resource for "academic language development" (Lin, 2015, p. 81), with an inherent, embedded aim of doing instruction to serve the dual aims. However, one of the core debates in CLIL pedagogy is how to ensure a balance between these dual aims of the program, i.e., content and language (see Cammarata & Tedick, 2012). Apart from proposing a ratio-based separation between how much focus should be allocated to these aims (e.g., "a 50:50/Content:Language CLIL-equilibrium" in Ting 2010), studies have also proposed minimizing the role of L1 – resulting in more exposure to L2 –

during classroom instruction as a prospective approach in order to address this debate. Starting with the assumption that too much use of L1 is detrimental for L2 learning (cf. “linguistic purism” vs. “semilingualism” in Tavares, 2015), an array of studies have argued that L1 use should be optimal and judicious (Macaro, 2019, 2009), strategic, planned and systematic (Lasagabaster, 2013; see also Tavares, 2015), limited and theoretically principled (McMillan & Turnbull, 2009), and organized and effective (Vázquez & Ordóñez, 2019). Such recommendations are partly embedded in the view that the teacher’s use of L1 during classroom instruction is “intuitive” (Tavares, 2015) as well as “unplanned” (Lin, 2015). Macaro (2005), for instance, argued for a threshold of 10-15% exposure to L1 as an “optimal” amount during L2 instruction, although this view of optimal exposure of L1 has been questioned (see Lo, 2015, for a critique). It has been suggested that arguments for a ratio-based separation between the dual aims and minimal, optimal exposure of L1 are symptoms of a conflicted relationship between content and language in CLIL (cf. Llinares, 2015, pp. 68-70, Gierlinger, 2015).

By contrast, rather than theorizing about the pedagogical components of CLIL, an array of conversation analytic studies set out to examine how instruction in CLIL is organized, pointing to the inherent, mutually inclusive relationship between these dual aims. In science classrooms, for example, a key goal of doing instruction is to convert the concepts that are relevant to the curricular content (e.g., theory, or scientific terminology) from everyday mundane language into the repertoire of a specific science (Evnikskaya, 2012; Kääntä et al., 2018). In a tertiary-level biology lesson in a German setting, Laupenmühlen (2012) has observed how this task of translating the scientific terms from students’ everyday language into the specific register of science requires a mutually inclusive approach to the linguistic resources available to participants. He observed that in explaining “red blood cells”, the classroom instruction is facilitated not only by its German equivalent (i.e., “Rote Blutkörperchen”), but also by the subsequent comparative discussions on the meaning of similar concepts in both L1 and L2 (i.e., “Erythrozyten” and “Erythrocytes”). This shows that the practice of incorporating available linguistic resources is a key strategy for furnishing students

with an appropriate understanding of the academic content in a way that is otherwise impossible if only one linguistic resource – the medium of instruction – is used.

In a plenary discussion in a Catalan/Spanish teacher training setting, Moore and Dooly (2010) made similar observations. Tasked with a discussion topic of “How do apples reproduce?”, the participants delve into the discussion on how to conceptualize the English term “reproduce” adeptly and scientifically by drawing on linguistic resources available to them (i.e., Spanish and Catalan). To facilitate the discussion on “Do apples reproduce themselves?” or “Do apples just grow on their own?”, the participants’ discussion deals not only with linguistic equivalents of the terms in both L1 and L2, but also with the conceptual clarification of the equivalent terms. In other words, the “linguistic form” and “meaning”, Moore and Dooly have observed, are “dialectically dependent upon one another” (2010, pp. 75-76) and the new concepts are constructed (and/or modified) over the participants’ existing knowledge of the curricular content and of the languages used in the discussion.

In other words, doing subject matter instruction in the classroom does not mean that participants are only attending to one pedagogical aim at a time. As Pekarek-Doehler and Ziegler (2007) have argued, the interconnectedness of “doing science” and “doing language” is often misleadingly obscured by the binary distinction between the “traditionally accepted separation” for bilingual classroom interaction between “work” and “focus on communication” (p. 72). Therefore, envisaging an “optimal” line of separation between content and language is hardly helpful, as such separations do not reflect the core purpose of doing a dual-focused education program. That is to say, CLIL is not only a foreign language learning program but also “an educational program that takes into account the whole curriculum” (Cenoz, 2013, p. 392), an integrated approach to classroom instruction where content and language are interconnected as “two sides of one coin” (Llinares, 2015, p. 69; Urmeneta & Evnitskaya, 2013; see also discussion on “every teacher is also a language teacher” in Scarcella, 2003; Mehisto, 2012; Gottlieb & Ernst-Slavit, 2014).

In addition to research focusing on spoken interaction, the mutually inclusive relationship between content and language has been addressed by including multimodal aspects of instruction. In a Finnish CLIL setting, Jakonen (2018) reported how a lexical item that cropped up during L2 instruction was explained to students using a range of resources including the surrounding material ecology and embodied resources alongside the languages available to them. In a similar vein, Kääntä et al. (2018) observed during a physics lesson how the teacher's work to clarify a scientific concept (Hooke's law) entailed combining a spectrum of instructional means, including writing and drawing on the board, embodied and ambulatory practices, object manipulations, and recruiting the material ecology of the classroom (p. 712).

Clearly, analyses of bilingual interaction within CLIL have highlighted concept- and vocabulary-oriented activities, as these have proved central to its pedagogical aims. Beyond CLIL settings, a number of CA studies have examined vocabulary-centered activities in L2 classrooms, yielding further insights into the multimodally organized practices of instruction relevant for this thesis. For instance, in a Danish FL setting, Mortensen (2011) demonstrated how teachers go through a four-step process of doing unplanned vocabulary explanation sequences: (a) highlighting problematic target vocabulary arising in interaction; (b) inviting students' verbal repetition of the target item; (c) asking students to attempt to explain or elaborate on the meaning of the target item; and (d) finally offering an explanation. Mortensen argued that multimodal resources (e.g., writing the item on the blackboard and gesturally invoking the items on the board) play a role in the process of highlighting the target word. Such highlighting helps the teacher to bring forth discussion on the issue as an object of learning. In so doing, the item is also provided with a discrete identity as an explainable item and as an object of learning, offered to students both verbally and visually.

A rather similar practice of vocabulary teaching was observed in an American immersion setting by Waring, Creider, and Box (2013). They also noted a four-step process of explaining problematic vocabulary items: (a) "targeting" the word in focus (e.g., repeating it

to students, showing it on the board); (b) “contextualizing the word” (e.g. using it in a sentence or enacting it in a dramatized scene); (c) “inviting” students to show their provisional understanding of the item (understanding display sequence, UDS) or offer an explanation; and (d) closing the sequence with a repetition or by summarizing the steps (2013, p. 262). They also found that teachers often try to contextualize the meaning of the word in the fabric of the explanation to students, as well as trying to engage them in discussion to work out the meaning of the item – what Waring et al. (2013) call the principles of contextualization and engagement. Examining the teachers’ work, Waring et al. (2013) also distinguished between *analytic* or *animatic* methods of vocabulary explanation. The analytic approach included textual, narrative, and other verbal means focusing on the “grammatical” and “semantic” explanation of the target item (pp. 251-254), whereas the animatic approach involved multimodally built actions designed to explicate the social and situational aspects of meaning.

Clearly, explaining nuanced aspects of word meaning may require elaborate, multimodally organized instructional work. This is also evident in the work of Majlesi (2014a, 2014b, 2015), who examined the teaching practices in a Swedish L2 classroom for immigrants. Focusing on the embodied aspects of vocabulary explanation, Majlesi (2014b) found that when students use a gesture to initiate a vocabulary inquiry, teachers supply a matching gesture in their responding explanation (cf. return gestures in Eskildsen & Wagner, 2013). By tying gesturally onto the student’s prior action, teachers may cue a mutual understanding of what the student has said, as well as amplifying the ‘learnable’ (i.e., the object of teaching) to the other participants present, thereby widening the audience of the pedagogical exchange.

Summary

In this chapter, I have discussed three key topics – language policy, language alternation, and interaction-oriented studies in CLIL and other bilingual and L2 settings – that form the research background for this thesis. In recent decades, research on language choice and

alternation (previously subsumed under the cover term “code-switching”) has developed from sociolinguistic accounts that mainly offer identity-related explanations of bilingual practices – explanations that start with a variety of assumptions about the symbolic and cultural values inherent in a language – to CA-informed accounts built on the organizational aspects of those practices, where matters of language choice and alternation are analyzed in sequential terms. This provided an opportunity to understand how the participants themselves treat their own language practice, thereby offering an insight into bilingual practice, incorporating *members’ perspective* in and through locally available interpretations of language alternation. This shift was then further elaborated in the work of Gafaranga (1998, 1999, 2007a, 2018) and colleagues (Gafaranga & Torras, 2001, 2002), and in subsequent CA studies (e.g., Cromdal, 2005; Kunitz, 2015; Musk, 2006) that specifically highlighted the notion of interactional medium as participants’ “scheme of interpretation” in bilingual talk. Several attempts at applying this perspective to account for bilingual practices taking place in educational settings in which participants’ linguistic practices are regulated by an institutional language policy (e.g., Bonacina, 2010; Bonacina-Pugh, 2012; Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005; see also Musk & Cromdal, 2018, for discussion) yielded a need to distinguish between the prescribed medium of instruction and the oriented to, medium of classroom interaction. The CA approach to language alternation also echoes Spolsky’s proposition (2004, 2005, 2017) that the actual, oriented-to practice – “what people do” in reality – is the primordial point of reference for understanding language policy. In a similar vein, this thesis seeks to examine the language policies practiced by participants in classroom interaction within the realm of schooling in English in Bangladesh.

A related issue of bilingual pedagogy is found in the context of CLIL programs. With a core aim of teaching content lessons in a foreign language (Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2013; Cenoz, 2013), one of the substantial questions addressed in CLIL literature is how a balance should be drawn between the dual focus of content and language. In other words, this inquiry into achieving a balance touches upon both

the scope of pedagogy, i.e., *how content should be taught*, as well as policy, i.e., *how the medium of instruction should be followed* in a bilingual classroom. Based on an aspiration to promote students' L2 learning, some studies have argued for a quantitative, controlled exposure to L1 in the classroom that leads to “limited” and “systematic” bilingual practices thought to be optimal for CLIL instruction (Macaro, 2005, 2009, 2019; Lasagabaster, 2013). Although this thesis has little to offer with respect to quantified recommendations for language choice in the classroom, it does seek to produce analytical descriptions of participants' linguistic choices and alternation grounded in their own orientations to these matters. Therefore, whether or not their bilingual practices may be seen as “systematic” is an empirical question, and as I show in the analyses of the studies in this thesis, certain patterns relevant to pedagogical aims and local language policies can be discerned. Furthermore, in line with previous practice-based studies of CLIL (e.g., Pekarek-Doehler & Ziegler, 2007; Moore & Dooley, 2010), the studies included in this dissertation point to a mutually inclusive relationship between the dual pedagogical aims of such programs, where the focus on curricular content cannot be easily separated from a focus on L2 learning.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the relationship between English and Bengali in Bangladeshi society at large has been contested on political and ideological grounds, with implications for compulsory English-taught education. Despite the political controversies, no practice-oriented research exists on English-medium and English-version primary and secondary education. For this reason, this chapter has offered some insight into the growing body of CA research on bilingual classrooms and the literature on CLIL, on which I will examine the interactional practices of teachers and students enrolled in English-medium and English-version schools in Bangladesh.

4. Theoretical and Analytical Framework

It is better to debate a question without settling it than
to settle a question without debating it.

John Gribbin,
In Search of Schrödinger's Cat

This dissertation employs multimodal conversation analysis as a methodological and analytical framework. As discussed in the previous chapter, an array of interaction-oriented studies have investigated participants' language practice in policy-governed bilingual pedagogical settings incorporating a conversation analytic approach. The aim of this chapter is to introduce some of the key theoretical principles and analytical concerns of multimodal conversation analysis. I proceed by discussing the studies carried out by Harold Garfinkel and Erving Goffman, whose work may be seen as theoretical foundations of CA. Next, I discuss some central issues in CA as viewed through the formative work of Harvey Sacks and his colleagues. There then follows a brief review of the key concepts and principles of the multimodal turn in CA research. Taken together, Chapters 3 and 4 comprise the analytical framework and the research background for the three empirical studies of this thesis.

Forerunning Foundations: Ethnomethodology and the Study of Social Actions

Ethnomethodology appeared at a time when much of the research effort in sociology was geared toward abstract theorizing of large-scale structural phenomena (Clayman & Gill, 2004). For instance, Talcott Parsons (1937) theorized the social world under a “tripartite analytic conception of cultural, personality, and social systems”

(Goodwin & Heritage, 1990, p. 284). In so doing, the “causal drivers of social behavior” are associated with the internalized, imposed values on “personality dispositions” (ibid.). The Parsonian approach viewed the social world through an abstract, objectivistic, top-down perspective, reducing its actors to “cultural” or “judgmental dopes” (Garfinkel, 1967/1984). Rather than taking an interest in how members of society come to act in social settings, the notion of judgmental dope implies that their behavior is virtually determined by society’s norms and conventions, as the “product of the interplay of social forces upon society-members” (Watson, 1992, p. 262; see also Zimmerman, 1978).

One of Garfinkel’s key arguments against Parson’s sociology, then, is that it fails to account for social conduct in terms of members’ practices, i.e., how people arrive at shared norms (rather than unquestionably acting along with them), and how they produce actions and ascribe them meaning in mutually cohesive terms. In other words, Garfinkel’s work draws attention to people’s practical reasoning of arriving at a “locally achieved everyday construction of reality” (Gardner, 2004, p. 265), as manifested in and through mundane, ordinary affairs of “accounting for” people’s “own actions” and “those of others” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 27; see also Rawls, 2008). It seeks to account for how the members’ social world is constituted, sustained, and achieved, and positions the analytic interest toward the study of *members’ knowledge* of ordinary affairs (Garfinkel, 1974, p. 18).

One implication of this stance toward social behavior is that ethnomethodology challenges the cognitivist assumptions informing much of the social and behavioral sciences (Heritage, 1984), proposing instead a procedural approach to members’ commonsense activities (Li Wei, 2002, p. 161). The consequence of this is that ethnomethodology takes an interest in members’ practices in terms of “overt”, “scenic”, and “directly observable” (ten Have, 2007, p. 27) phenomena, rather than whichever underlying “motivations”, “functions”, or other cognitive processes may be at play (Heap, 1997; Li Wei, 2002).

Conversation Analysis: Key Theoretical and Analytical Principles

Talk as Social Action

Originating in the early 1960s with the collaborative works of Harvey Sacks, Emmanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson (1974; Sacks, 1984, 1992a, 1992b), CA emerged, beyond its sociological origin, as a multidisciplinary endeavor dedicated to the pursuit of analyzing talk (or rather, talk-in-interaction) as a “basic and constitutive feature of human social life” (Sidnell, 2010, p. 1). Like Garfinkel, Sacks argued that the then prevalent approaches in sociology would treat members’ ordinary social actions as epiphenomena of social structure or discard them as inherently disorderly (Sacks, 1984). Rather than adopting such deterministic ideas, Sacks took an ethnomethodological stance, pursuing an analytic interest in the “methods persons use in doing social life” (Sacks, 1984, p. 21) – that is to say, the explicative procedures through which interlocutors produce meaning in face-to-face interaction. In this respect, the development of CA was also influenced by Goffman’s conceptualization of the *interaction order* (1983; see also 1963, 1967), in which he stressed the importance of understanding social organization at the micro-level, arguing that human interaction is a *sui generis* social institution subject to its characteristic obligations, and is thus a distinct domain of sociological interest.

The analytic interest in members’ practical reasoning in ordinary social activities – that is, how members of society “come to know” and “know in common” about “what they are doing” and the surrounding “circumstances in which they are doing it” (Li Wei, 2002, p. 162) – requires a scrupulous scrutiny of members’ practices of interactional production of natural language. The notion of interaction (see Goffman, 1967), borrowed from the ethnographic tradition, is of critical importance, as CA proposes to analyze everyday, ordinary conversations as a social practice. That is to say, the analysis of the language used by the participants is also an analysis of the “active production of social organisation” (Watson,

1992, p. 260) and subsequently the study of the intrinsic social order at the micro-level. As a result, CA does not treat talk as separate from action, but as intertwined, mutually oriented social actions between the attending participants.

Talk as Orderly Activity

Social actions are to a large extent organized in and through mundane conversations, and a key proposition of CA is that talk is an orderly activity – indeed, Sacks argued that “there is order at all points” (1984, p. 22). This proposition is based on the empirical findings as observed in the earliest studies of Sacks and colleagues, and in the subsequent literature on CA. If talk were a disorderly, random practice, it would be impossible for members to achieve social meaning. Nevertheless, the orderliness is not a product of extrinsic, pre-existing, imposed-on order over participants. Instead, CA proposes this order to be inherently intrinsic, as it evolves in and through mundane interaction (see “intrinsic orderliness of interaction” in Psathas, 1995). The analytic task of early CA was therefore to describe how this order is achieved in the first place.

As a tool for analyzing human interaction, CA thus took up the challenge of accounting for just how talk – as a generic property of social interaction – is organized. A basic issue, then, is to explicate the procedural logic, or rationale, underlying the participants’ management of talk and actions – the quest for explaining “Why that now?” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). This question captures the quest to explain social action (“Why that?”) manifested in an emerging sequence (“right now”), accounting for the talk-intrinsic, endogenous context and the process of actualizing this context in and through interaction.

Emic Approach of Analysis

Although Garfinkel and Goffman have respectively incorporated “quasi-experimental demonstrations” and “ethnographic methods” (Clayman & Gill, 2004, p. 590) as tools for analyzing social actions, CA has evolved as a naturalistic observational discipline (Schegloff

& Sacks, 1973) carrying on inquiry through direct observation of participants' *naturally occurring* and *naturally organized* conversation – the way it has taken place in real-time situations. That is to say, CA takes stake neither at suppositional, hypothetical, idealized, or invented examples, at role-playing, nor at experimentally induced activities, as such types of data are essentially influenced by the analyst's "ungrounded" (Clayman & Gill, 2004, p. 590), "unaided" (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, p. 3) intuitions.

Social interaction emerges in and through a situated practice. To encapsulate the procedural explication of underlying interactional patterns, CA adopts an *emic* perspective (Psathas, 1990; see also Pike, 1967, for emic-etic distinction) comprised of participants' orientations to one another (Sacks, 1992a, 1992b) displayed in interaction. Adopting an emic approach implies that presumptive assumptions (e.g., participants' ethnographic information, macro-social assumptions, social categories), for instance, are not interpreted as determinative stimulants of participants' actions, unless and until they are made relevant (see "relevance" in Schegloff, 1992) by the participants themselves. That is to say, the analytic interest is directed toward those issues that participants themselves are "demonstrably aware of and/or oriented to in the course of their actions" (Psathas, 1995, p. 46). Therefore, the researcher's recollected description (e.g., field notes) or post hoc data collection methods (e.g., interviews, surveys) are considered inadequate empirical materials, as they do not facilitate access to situated practice. At best, such methods generate accounts of social practice, not the practice itself. Instead, the availability of mechanically recorded data – what is audible and visible in real time – and an authentic, meticulous transcription of participants' actions are fundamentally essential in CA analysis.

The emic-etic distinction is analytically consequential (see also Chapter 5). In this dissertation, for instance, the analytic interest in language policy does not imply an etic approach to treating language policy as a top-down analytic concern. The emic perspective to language policy, here, demands scrupulous analytic attention to how

participants' actions inform us about their orientation (i.e., participants' perspective) toward the language policy of the pedagogical setting that is the "procedural infrastructure of situated action" (ten Have, 2007, p. 35) of language practices (see "language policy-in-practice" in Bonacina, 2010, 2017; Bonacina-Pugh, 2012), as available in naturally occurring actions in this specific educational setting.

Context and Sequential Organization of Interaction

The emic perspective clearly has implications for CA's notion of context. A key proposition of CA is that participants' conversations are both *context-shaped* and *context-renewing* (Heritage, 1984; see also Seedhouse, 2004; Sidnell, 2010). Participants' contributions are context-shaped by the "immediately local configuration of preceding activity", as well as the "larger environment of activity" (Drew & Heritage, 1992, p. 18). Participants' contributions are context-renewing as their actions also "renew" (i.e., maintain, sustain, or change) "any broader or more generally prevailing sense of context" (ibid.). Participants' prior and prospective talk, thus, respectively gives shape to (prospective) and gets shaped by (prior) talk. What has just been said (especially the immediately preceding turn) gives participants the room for delineating the meaning of the prospective utterances. Hence, context is not simply a "set of variables" (e.g., static and fixed macro variables) enshrouding the "strips of talk" (Goodwin & Duranti, 1992, p. 31). Instead, the relationship between context and talk is "reflexive" and "mutual", allocating room for "shaping context as much as context shape talk" (ibid.).

The endogenous approach to context implies the critical importance of a *sequential organization of interaction* (Schegloff, 1972, 1988, 2007; Heritage, 1984, 2010). In fact, one of the aims of CA is to unravel this sequential organization through a procedural explication of "how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk". The inherent, turn-by-turn, progressive presence of context within the fabric of naturally occurring talk is a key resource for participants to establish mutually cohesive understanding in interaction. As "utterances are in turns" and "turns are parts of

sequences” (Schegloff, 1988), the analysis of moment-by-moment, turn-by-turn sequential organization, as available in interaction emerging in real time, offers an understanding of “the construction of human interaction as a shared sense-making enterprise” (Heritage, 2010, pp. 210-211), regardless of how its surrounding social context may be described exogenously. That is to say, the sequential organization of action is the bedrock of mutual intelligibility. The fact that, for instance, a participant’s current action generally projects the “next” relevant action or the probable “next” actions (Schegloff, 1972) implies the critical importance of context. With the production of next actions, participants display their understanding of prior actions resulting in subsequent tacit mutual confirmation (or not).

The interactional organization of talk can be thought of in terms of two basic clusters, i.e., *practices of* and *practices in* conversation (Mandelbaum, 1990, p. 347; also “conversational structures” and “conversational practices” in Bonacina, 2010). The practices of conversation – “the mechanical features of talk upon which social action is hung” (Mandelbaum, 1990, p. 347) explicate the “context-free mechanisms” (Sacks et al., 1974) of underlying general patterns of sequential organization of talk. The practices in conversation – “the activities” participants “carry out in and through these mechanical features” (ibid.) – explicate the context-sensitive practices of these patterns in specific, locally given situations. The context-free machinery of participants’ practices, e.g. taking turns at talk, or doing repair to rectify troubles within talk (Schegloff, 2006), are thus “generically informative” (Sacks et al., 1974), as these practices account for the inherent structural formation of how mutually cohesive understanding is achieved in human interaction.

Multimodal Conversation Analysis

In its early days, CA was geared toward examining the organization of talk – or talk-in-interaction. Besides the scrupulous transcription of participants’ verbal resources, CA scholars paid rigorous attention to the analytical importance of addressing members’ non-verbal

(such as laughter, breathing in, and breathing out) actions as well as (less frequent) non-vocal aspects of actions such as gaze (Goodwin, 1979, 1981), gestures (Goodwin, 1986, Schegloff, 1984), or body postures (Heath, 1984, 1986, 1992). However, a more systematic use of video as a method of documenting “embodied actors” (Schegloff, 2010) – the “embodied” (Nevile, 2015), “visual turn” (Mondada, 2013) in social sciences – took a while to emerge. In a later development of CA now known as multimodal conversation analysis, scholars of social interaction began to address the analytical concern that interactional resources are organized not only in terms of vocal-conduct-in-interaction (Psathas, 1995), but also in several multimodalities; and members’ embodied actions – such as gesture, gaze, head movements, facial expressions, body posture, body movement, and the use of surrounding material objects and ecology – became topics of methodic inquiry (see Goodwin, 2000, 2003; Mondada, 2007a, 2007b, 2014a; Streeck, Goodwin & LeBaron, 2011; Hazel, Mortensen & Rasmussen, 2014; see also Hutchins & Nomura, 2011; Mortensen, 2012; Haddington, Mondada & Nevile, 2013; Nevile, Haddington, Heinemann, & Rauniomaa, 2014a, 2014b).

The term multimodality has been used in several disciplinary fields (e.g. computer sciences, semiotics, gesture studies) in somewhat different ways. In CA, the concept refers to “various resources mobilized by participants for organizing their action – such as gesture, gaze, facial expressions, body postures, body movements, and also prosody, lexis and grammar” (Mondada, 2016, p. 338). That is to say, the notion of multimodality acknowledges the fact that members-in-interaction may draw forth any and any number of the resources available to them in their local settings, for the purposes of producing social actions. Hence, an emic approach requires interaction to be treated not as a “*mono-modal*” enterprise (Hazel et al., 2014, p. 3, italics in original), but rather in terms of “plurality” of “modalities” (Mondada, 2016, p. 338), sustaining the view that “interaction as the primordial site for human sociality is *always* multimodal” (Hazel et al., 2014, p. 3, italics in original). Understanding social interaction from the perspective of multimodal conversation analysis does not imply unraveling a logo-centric

vision of human communication (Mondada, 2016, p. 336), but a visuo-centric vision of embodiment (ibid., p. 336) offering a holistic approach of understanding human interaction.

Adopting multimodal CA implies revisiting well-studied concepts (as proposed in early work on CA) as well as rafting new waters. For instance, the temporal and sequential organization of action, as presented in the early works of Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974), has offered a “linear and successive conception of how action unfolds” (Mondada, 2016, p. 341) on a moment-by-moment basis, with a miniscule level of intermittent pauses or chances of overlaps. Lately, work on multimodal CA has sparked an elaboration of the notion of sequential order where “forms of sequentiality that integrate and intertwine multiple simultaneous sequentialities and temporalities” facilitate our understanding of the “complex forms of projective and responsive actions” (ibid.) that members demonstrably engage in (see Mondada, 2011, 2018, 2019; Arminen, Koskela & Palukka, 2014; De Stefani & Gazin, 2014; Stukenbrock, 2014; Keevallik, 2014; Evnitskaya & Berger, 2017; Kääntä & Kasper, 2018).

Finally, multimodal CA also highlights the importance of unraveling how members’ actions are co-organized in multiparty settings – the placement of members’ talk “within larger sequential structures, encompassing activities, and participation frameworks constituted through displays of mutual orientation made by the actor’s bodies” (Goodwin, 2000, p. 1489). Classrooms, for instance, are typical multiparty settings where participants jointly coordinate their actions by mobilizing a wide spectrum of embodied and material resources – such as whiteboards, projection tools, textbooks, or surrounding material ecology – and therefore offer a fertile ground for multimodal CA. This is true not least in bilingual and L2 settings (see Chapter 3). This thesis is no exception, and as will be seen in the empirical studies, its analyses offer multimodally oriented accounts of the *in vivo* pedagogical features of classroom interaction.

5. Data, Setting and Methodology

Data

The data used in this dissertation comprises video recordings of three groups of students attending Bangladeshi schools where academic subjects are taught in English. The recordings took place in two institutions: an *English-version* school and an *English-medium* kindergarten school (see Chapter 2). I made the recordings on two fieldtrips to Bangladesh in 2013 (summer semester, two months) and 2014 (spring to summer semester, four months). In total, the corpus consists of 44 hours of video recordings from 64 lessons. The English-version school is situated in the capital city of Bangladesh (pseudonym: Capital School), and the English-medium kindergarten school is situated in a mid-sized, provincial city (pseudonym: Provincial School). In this dissertation, the Capital School data is used in Studies 1 and 3, and the Provincial School data is used in Study 2.

Setting and Participants

Finding the Field of Study

The aim of this thesis is to contribute to an understanding of classroom interaction in Bangladeshi English-medium and English-version compulsory education. Given that English is taught in both primary (grades 1–5) and secondary (grades 6–12) education in Bangladesh (Mousumi & Kusakabe, 2017a, 2017b), all types of schools, age groups, and subject content was considered at the initial

stage of the project. In the spring of 2013, I started making enquiries with Bangladeshi schools in various metropolitan cities via email and personal contacts. From these enquiries, two schools showed interest in taking part in the project. The school authorities at both schools selected the potential participants for the study (e.g., teachers, groups of students) at random.

Capital School

The video recordings at Capital School were collected from two groups of students attending grade 6 lessons in an English-version school. Both groups were based in a designated room on the same floor of a multistorey building. The building hosted teaching activities offered in English, from grade 6 to grade 10. The same institution also offered Bengali-medium education in separate buildings within the school compound. The teaching activities were operated in two shifts. The morning shift ran from 8:00 to 13:00, and the afternoon shift ran from 13:00 to 17:30. The recordings of both groups are from the morning shift lessons.

The official starting age for formal education in Bangladesh is 6, and primary education lasts for five years from grades 1 to 5. The ages of participants at Capital School range from 11 to 13. In both groups, boys and girls attended the lessons together. The number of participants often varies throughout the semester, but there were generally 45 students per group. Starting in January, the academic year lasted until the end of December. The students' progress was assessed four times in a year, i.e., via half-yearly and yearly examinations, and via two mid-term examinations. During the data collection phase, the students sat a mid-term examination.

The classrooms for both groups were spacious and full of sunlight, with large open windows. Both rooms were also adjacent to streets full of traffic and crowds. To avoid creating more noise in a loud classroom, the teachers routinely asked students to stay quiet. As both classrooms were equipped with microphone systems, the teachers generally used them during instruction. When they did not use this microphone, the teachers generally delivered lecture in a

louder voice. A persistent challenge for the teachers, however, was to understand students' utterances, especially if the students were sitting toward the back of the room. Hence, students were routinely asked to speak louder than normal and to repeat their answers.

Table 3: Classroom lessons recorded at Capital School

Subjects	Number of lessons recorded	
	Group A	Group B
English	12	1
Bengali	8	1
Mathematics	9	1
Bangladesh and general studies	6	1
Science	5	1
Information and communication technology	4	-
Home economics	2	-
Agriculture	3	-
Sports (theory)	1	-
Religious studies	1	-
Art	1	-
Work and life orientation	2	-

Attending lessons is mandatory for every student, and the teachers in charge of each group of students verified compulsory attendance at the beginning of the first lesson of the day. Both groups of students received six lessons per day, and the amount of time allocated was 35 minutes. The duration of the lessons sometimes varied according to the changing schedules. The change of lessons was indicated using a centralized bell system at the beginning of each lesson.

During classroom instruction, teachers often reminded students to pay attention to lectures, take down notes, answer their questions, help them with information if needed, and jot down homework tasks. Although asking relevant questions was appreciated, doing so usually required asking the teacher's permission by raising a hand in

the air or verbalizing e.g., “Sir”. Students were not allowed to leave the classroom of their own accord, and permission was required before entering or leaving the room.

In the classroom, there was normally one teacher, a class monitor, and an assistant class monitor. In the absence of a teacher, student representatives played a key role in maintaining order in the classroom. These student representatives, the class monitor and assistant class monitor, were also in charge of assisting teachers, for example by distributing and collecting students’ homework, wiping whiteboards clean, and helping teachers with the microphone system. The students held these positions for a semester.

Provincial School

Situated in a multistorey building, Provincial School is an English-medium school providing compulsory education from grades 1 to 10. The primary level section conducts classes from grades 1 to 5, and secondary education is operated from grades 6 to 10. Although the secondary education at this institution is affiliated with the international IGSCCE curriculum and assessment system, the primary section follows a locally adapted curriculum and assessment system. The entire institution is therefore a blend of “international standard” English-medium and local kindergarten school (see Chapter 2).

Table 4: Classroom lessons recorded at Provincial School

Subject	Number of lessons
English	3
Bengali	1
Science (general)	1
Social science and history	1

The video recordings at Provincial School were collected from a group of students attending grade 3 lessons. This is a mixed gender group. In total, there were 12 students. The participants were aged 9

to 10. The school only operated a morning shift, from 9:00 to 12:00. Each lesson lasted for 45 minutes. This school also had a centralized bell system to indicate a change of lessons. Attending lessons was mandatory. Students' homework played a key role during lessons, as teachers routinely highlighted the importance of handing in tasks, noting down future tasks, and having work corrected. The students sat three examinations in a year, and the academic year lasted from January to December.

A routine activity carried out by teachers was keeping students focused on instruction. Teachers knew each student by name. The relationships between teachers and students were also congenial. Students were generally allowed to ask questions or interrupt the teachers' instruction. The teachers were also facilitative toward students' demands. Parallel activities during instruction (e.g., gossiping, laughter) were often overlooked. Some teachers, however, remained po-faced during instruction and thereby ensured a quieter classroom.

Data Collection

Contact with the Schools

As mentioned earlier, the data collection took place at two separate institutions on two separate occasions. In both cases, I contacted the institutions' principals. After producing my professional credentials, I explained the purpose of this project and the procedures of carrying out the data collection process. As this project aimed to understand bilingual practices in classroom settings, I explained the implications of conducting interaction-oriented research in a Bangladeshi setting and the suitability of these institutions for understanding bilingual classroom interaction. A few key concerns raised by the school authorities at this stage were "Why is video recording necessary?", "Will data collection create any obstacle to day-to-day school activities?", and "How will the collected data be preserved and used?". Hence, I also explained the principles of the naturalistic observation method (ten Have, 2007; Sidnell, 2010) and explained why collecting video recordings of participants' classroom

interaction is an optimal approach for this project. In fact, one school authority was familiar with data collection for the purpose of research, especially conducting surveys and interviews. I therefore explained why I opted for the naturalistic observation method rather than surveys or interviews, and highlighted the importance of inquiring into naturally occurring and naturally organized everyday activities (see also Chapter 4).

Once formal approval had been received in the form of signed letters of consent from the school authorities (i.e., the principals of both schools), I also met other stakeholders to seek permission for making recordings. In both settings, the school authorities facilitated contact with other stakeholders involved in this process e.g., vice-principals (at Capital School), the section-in-charge teacher (at Capital School), teaching staff (at both schools), and representatives from the parents' committee (at both schools). I was first introduced to the teachers who would be teaching lessons during these recordings, and I explained my purpose as well as the data collection process. The teachers were interested in this project, and none of them had been involved in similar projects before. They felt it was an honor to be part of the data collection process. A few common concerns, however, were raised by some teachers (at both schools), such as "Will this collected data be shown to the school authority?" and "Will this data be used as a performance measurement method?". I explained the nature of CA research and highlighted the importance of complying with ethical concerns, such as the *criterion of protection of the individual* (Swedish Research Council, 2017, p. 13). I therefore explained to the teachers concerned that collected data would be used exclusively in the research setting, and that school authorities would not have access to collected data under any circumstances. A few teachers also asked what role they or their students should play during the data collection process. Hence, I also explained that the research interest of this project lay in "what they naturally do" during lessons. Besides the teachers, I was also introduced to parent representatives at both schools. They also asked similar questions, such as "What is the purpose of this project?", "Why are video recordings necessary?", and "How will it be preserved?". I explained the process and purpose of data collection,

the importance of video recordings, and the ethical issues concerning the preservation of data only for the purpose of the research setting.

In the case of students, their class teachers (at both schools) first informed the students about this data collection. Once I had been introduced to the students in the designated classrooms, I explained the purpose of this project and the data collection procedures. The students also had a range of questions, such as “Is it a documentary?”, “Why are you doing video recording?”, and “What does PhD mean, anyway?”. I answered these questions in such a way (i.e., word use) that the students would understand. During recess and post-lesson sessions, I availed myself of every opportunity to meet students, in order to answer any of their concerns regarding the data collection process.

Ethical Considerations

The data was collected in accordance with the research ethics guidelines for humanities and social studies, particularly in terms of information, consent, confidentiality, and use (Swedish Research Council, 2017). The data collection took place with the permission of the school authorities (at both schools), the participants attending video recordings (i.e., teachers and students), and the parents of students (at both schools). A written letter of consent (see Appendices 1 & 2) was issued to teachers, students’ parents, and the school authorities. This explained the key concerns such as the purpose and process of data collection, the grounds for collecting video recordings, and ethical concerns regarding these recordings. In terms of ethical concerns, I explained – both verbally to each group of participants on different occasions, and by written letter – that (a) the recording will be securely preserved and archived at the university, (b) the recording will only be available to myself and other researchers in an appropriate scientific setting, (c) the names and credentials of participants will be treated with confidentiality, and (d) the data will only be used for research. The participants were also informed about their right to participate (or not) (see Appendix 2), as well as their right to withdraw, without giving a reason, at any time. The participants agreed and consented to representations of

their original images (but keeping their names and locations confidential) being used in research findings. All participants were aware – having been informed both verbally and in writing – that this project does not handle “sensitive personal data” (Swedish Research Council, 2017, pp. 30-31). Furthermore, the project does not need to be reviewed by an ethics committee, as it does not deal with “physical encroachment on the research subject”, aiming to “affect the research subject physically or psychologically”, nor involve any “obvious risk of physical or psychological harm to the research subject” (Swedish Research Council, 2017, p. 30).

As the students at both schools were under 15 years old, consent to participate was sought from both guardians and the children themselves (Swedish Research Council, 2017, p. 27). In addition to informing and contacting the representatives of parent committees, the section-in-charge teacher (at Capital School) distributed the consent letters to all students, to be signed on their behalf. In addition to the written consent letter, a sample photocopy of the school authority’s approval was also attached to these letters. In the case of Provincial School, the principal personally took charge of this and sent the letter of consent to the relevant parents to request permission on the minors’ behalf. At both schools, it took a fair amount of time to collect all the signed consent letters, and students were reminded by their class teachers to bring them in. As well as providing written clarification of the collection process, I also had the opportunity to meet some parents at both institutions after school hours, to explain the importance of their informed consent for the ethical integrity of the data collection process. I informed them that participating in the project was completely voluntary, and that they could withdraw from the process at any time they felt it to be appropriate (Swedish Research Council, 2017, p. 27). I also notified them of the criterion that under no circumstances could the participants experience any harm or trouble in any way, either during or after the data collection process. In addition, I addressed the ethical concern that the participants’ privacy involving the information received from children be respected and safeguarded, and that the data collection would be conducted in strict compliance with this.

The collected materials were held on digital devices in the form of data storage drives. These devices were kept in a locked cabinet, along with field notes and other collected materials. The participants' identities were kept confidential, both in the transcriptions and in the notes, and their actual names were not used in the transcripts or notes. Participants' references to other students' names were also changed, and the names of the schools were changed to ensure confidentiality.

Video Recordings

After obtaining permission, I presented myself on the days on which video recordings were made of the classroom sessions. Both schools were open from Sunday to Thursday, followed by two consecutive days off (Friday and Saturday). The standard procedure was to present myself to the section-in-charge teacher (at Capital School) or the principal (at Provincial School) early in the morning. Next, the authorities led me to the designated classroom. On arriving there, I stationed myself in the classroom and recorded these lessons.

The position of the cameras in the classroom has a bearing on the data. To ensure quality recordings, and in particular a clear view of the participants' embodied behaviors (see Goodwin, 2000, Mondada, 2018, 2019), I needed to make selective choices. At Capital School, I used two cameras. As it was a large classroom, I positioned two cameras within the classroom. One camera was placed in a static position on the right-hand corner of the teacher's podium, with a lateral view of the teacher's activities and a frontal view of the first few benches of students. Another camera was positioned in the rear part of the classroom, providing a rear view of the majority of the students and a frontal view of the teachers giving lectures, facing the students. There were two aisles in the room. The rear camera was usually positioned in the rear section of the left-hand row. Sometimes I also positioned it in the rear section of the right-hand row. Leaving both cameras on tripods – thereby giving me the opportunity to remain in the corner of the room – ensured minimal interference in the participants' everyday activities.

Figure 7: Classroom in Capital School (WB: White board, P: Podium for teacher, S: Sitting arrangements for students (each desk allowing least 5), W: Window, M: Microphone system, C1: Camera 1, C2: Camera 2, D: Door, R: Rostrum)

Figure 8: Classroom in Provincial School (WB: White board, T: Table, D: Door, V: Verandah, C1: Camera 1, W: Window, S: Sitting arrangements for students, one desk for each student)

At Provincial School, only one camera was used. This recording provided a full lateral view of the teacher and the majority of students facing the teacher. As the classroom was small, one camera was enough to capture much of the teacher-student interaction. The presence of the camera aroused the students' curiosity. It took them a while to get used to the recording equipment.

Processing and Transcribing Data

The video-recorded data was processed in several stages. After each recording, a preliminary viewing was conducted with a focus on recurring actions made relevant by the participants themselves – what the participants themselves are “demonstrably aware of and/or oriented to in the course of their actions” (Psathas, 1995, p. 46; see also Drew & Heritage, 1992; Seedhouse, 2005) – in and through the situated practices. Other than a general interest in capturing naturally occurring classroom interaction in a bilingual pedagogical setting, I did not have, at the beginning of the study, an *a priori* interest in any specific phenomenon in this data. Hence, I started the analysis of the collected materials inductively by sustaining “unmotivated looking” (Psathas, 1990, pp. 24–25; Psathas, 1995; see also “emic analysis” in Chapter 4), and the goal was to explore interactional “phenomena rather than searching for instances of already identified and described phenomena or for some theoretically preformulated conceptualization of what the phenomena should look like” (Psathas, 1990, pp. 24–25).

In the next stage, I conducted a through viewing of these primary selections of recordings. All the recordings were roughly transcribed at this early stage of the research. Before embarking on the task of selecting detailed transcriptions and analyses, I repeatedly watched all these recorded materials, jotting down more detailed notes about these activities, and cross-checking and re-arranging the recordings on the basis of new observations. Based on the types of activities, topics or actions attended to by the participants, the sequences were primarily classified – as made demonstrably available through participants' actions – into discrete files, building up a series of

video recordings of similar types of classroom practices. The analytic endeavor is meticulously empirical, relying exclusively on *inductive, bottom-up, data-driven* reasoning (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 15; Seedhouse, 2005; see also ten Have, 2007) available in and through participants' orientation toward their naturally occurring actions and practices. On the same note, no order of detail is discarded as *disorderly, trivial, irrelevant, or accidental* (Heritage, 1984, p. 241; see also Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Seedhouse, 2004, 2005; Heritage, 2009).

I observed that, despite being obliged to follow the English-only policy, the participants frequently bracketed the language policy. As doing vocabulary inquiry was a prevalent practice spread around the whole corpus, I therefore focused on how teachers often asked students the meanings of lexical items, followed by subsequent teaching activities to clarify what these items mean in L1. In Study 2, I examined how language alternation was used in L2 vocabulary explanations during a single grade 3 poetry lesson. The selected transcripts used in this study documented how the lesson activity was initiated, participants' orientation toward available environmentally afforded resources during these activities, and underlying patterns emerging from these practices.

Next, Studies 1 and 3 addressed participants' approaches to L2-only content lessons (e.g., mathematics and science) taught to grade 6 students. In both studies, I focused on instances of language alternation during different types of pedagogical activities (e.g., lectures given by teachers, teacher-student question and answer sessions, carrying out tasks, vocabulary inquiries, and student-initiated requests for information), the types of resources mobilized during these activities, and the participants' perspectives on language practice during these activities. I observed how participants systematically transitioned between the types of *mediums* used during these lessons. Study 1, for instance, focused on participants' approaches to the procedural activity of curriculum progression, generally conducted in a bilingual medium. Study 3 focused on participants' approach of using English during core instruction, as well as negotiations in favor of bilingual mediums in response to

pragmatic pedagogical needs, such as content clarification and vocabulary explanation.

In each of the studies, I sourced the selected sections of the recordings from the original recordings in the form of short video clips. These clips contained the interaction during instruction as well as the participants' orientation toward language alternation, its local context, and the inception and transition of these episodes (see Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). Arranging these clips into different categories and sub-categories, I chose the representative samples of these pedagogical activities for the empirical studies included in this dissertation. After producing a preliminary transcription of these short clips, the initially selected transcripts underwent gradual granular refinement. In the first phase, I produced verbatim excerpts following CA notations (Jefferson, 2004). Later on, the multimodal notations (Mondada, 2007b, 2008, 2018, 2019) were added to the transcripts. The use of multimodal resources such as embodied resources (gestures, body language, and non-verbal and non-vocal resources) and material resources (e.g., use of material artefacts and surrounding material ecology) were placed below the verbatim transcripts, allowing for a visuo-centric vision of embodiment (Mondada, 2016, p.336). To provide further readability, the translation of Bengali conversations has been positioned beneath the original utterances. The first layer of translation provided a word-by-word, literal translation. In the second layer of translation, a holistic, pragmatic translation is provided. The original utterances in Bengali have been reproduced in *italics* and **bold** to contrast them with the conversations in English.

6. Summary of Studies

Study 1: What Topic We've Been To?

Progress Reviews in English as a Medium of Instruction Classrooms

Huq, R. & Cromdal, J. (Submitted).

In this study, we focus on lesson beginnings in a Bangladeshi English-version school. Empirical work with the data corpus early revealed that each lesson begins by reviewing the students' progress-to-date, often by consulting a textbook or other instructional documents or media. This jointly orchestrated routine procedure allowed the teacher to pin-point where the topic was left last time, which naturally yielded the topic or focus of the current lesson. As a lesson-opening activity, a progress review can be seen as a retrospectively as well as prospectively oriented undertaking, that provides for the continuity as well as coherence of curricular work. Because of their recurrent nature – as a natural part of a lesson – our analytical focus is on the interactional organization of progress reviews as well as on the ensuing transition into the next phase of the lesson – the topic-oriented session. Due to the fact that the lessons take place under an institutional English-only language policy, the language practices of the participants are of particular interest for the analysis.

The data analyzed were recorded in a grade 6 classroom. The lessons included different school subjects including Mathematics, Bangladesh and General Studies, Information and Communication Technology, and Work and Life Orientation. The interaction through which progress reviews and transition activities were accomplished were analyzed using multimodal conversation analysis.

It was found that teachers would often begin progress review activities, engaging select students, well before everyone was settled in and ready for curricular work. Hence, the doing of the progress review, and specifically its public nature, comprised part of the work of assembling the class into an attentive cohort, ready to take on the current lesson topic. It was also found that finding the topic of the day – that is, the product of the progress review – did not automatically allowed for the instruction to begin. Rather, the shift of activity took form of a transition phase, which entailed continuous effort to order the class into an instructable cohort.

With respect to the language practices of the participants, the analysis drew on the concept of interactional medium (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002), and particularly on its later application to classroom contexts (Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011). This revealed that during progress review activities, the interaction would either proceed along a monolingual medium (Bengali or English) or in a bilingual medium. However, after the lesson topic was established and the transition to lesson work initiated, the interaction would invariably proceed in a monolingual English medium. Here instances of discourse-related code-switching (Auer, 1988) would occasionally take place, organizing for instance insertion- or post-expansion sequences. In conclusion, these findings indicate that the participants orient their conduct to the school's monolingual policy as the class is reorienting its focus towards instructional business. Thus, the fine-grained empirical evidence of the local workings of an institutional language policy, contributes to a growing body of CA work seeking to explore the social, pedagogical and interactional realities of teachers and students attending bi- and multilingual education (e.g., Amir, 2013a; Lehti-Eklund, 2012; Stoewer, 2018a).

Study 2: Sparkling, Wrinkling, Softly Tinkling

On Poetry and Word Meaning in a Bilingual Primary Classroom

Huq, R., Barajas, K. E., & Cromdal, J. (2017). In A. Bateman & A. Church (Eds.), *Children's Knowledge-in-Interaction* (pp. 189-209). Singapore: Springer.

This study examines a single lesson dedicated to reciting and discussing a short English poem in a Bangladeshi English-medium school. The critical importance of literary texts for L2 learning, especially poetry, is a debated issue (Blatchford, 1974; Edmondson, 1995/96). Although a range of studies have emphasized the importance of literary texts as a source for L2 learning (Hanauer, 2001; Kramsch & Kramsch, 2000; McKay, 1982), much of their attention is focused on the formal aspects of language learning, e.g., acquisition of grammar, vocabulary, or phonology (see Lazar, 1993; Widdowson, 1981). The study of situated *practice* of poetry dedicated to language instruction (see Paran, 2008) is relatively untouched. Drawing on a multimodal conversation analysis of video-recorded classroom data, this study therefore documents how an English poem is taught in a bilingual pedagogical setting. Specifically, the study focuses on the participants' approaches to pursuing the holistic sense of the poem and the interrelationship between the instructional goals, i.e., appraisal of a literary text and language learning.

The single lesson analyzed in this article takes place in a grade 3 English-medium kindergarten school situated in a metropolitan city in Bangladesh. This lesson deals with a poem titled "Waters" by E. H. Newlin. In total, 12 students – aged 9 to 10 – attended the lesson. After producing a rough transcription of the whole lesson, the preliminary transcription was used to support the viewing of the data. During initial viewings, sequences were explored involving a range of actions made relevant by the participants during the lesson. After repeated viewings, seven extracts were selected for this paper and arranged into two sections: (a) participants'

approaches to reading a poem, especially the focus on literary aesthetics, and (b) participants' procedures for negotiating the L2 vocabulary items in the poem.

The analysis shows that the instructional practice of the teacher was informed in at least two ways: (a) the organization of instructional routine, and (b) enhancing the students' L2 vocabulary. The findings show that the whole lesson dedicated to reading and analyzing the single poem was systematically arranged through varied activities, e.g., introducing the poem and its author to students, reciting the poem to the cohort, and motivating students to stay engaged with the reading activity. The analysis shows that the participants use varied resources to pursue the holistic sense of the poetry. For instance, the teacher made students' existing mundane knowledge (e.g., popular nursery rhymes, and the motion of rivers and waterfalls) relevant during the instructional routine, and thereby addressed the aesthetic appraisal of the text as a source for L2 learning. The analysis further shows that the teacher selected L2 vocabulary items from the text and helped students unpack the varied layers of these words' meanings. The lesson was conducted in both monolingual and bilingual mediums (see Gafaranga, 2007a; Bonacina, 2010), and the bilingual construction – as a didactic routine – was used as a resource for carrying out cross-linguistic comparisons of word explanation activities, especially through multimodal means. For instance, an example shows that the participants – both the teacher and the student – used various embodied resources (e.g., pointing gestures and hand movement) as source for negotiating the nuances of the vocabulary items that would otherwise have been impossible if explained only through verbal means. In conclusion, the study demonstrates that the two instructional orientations – literature and vocabulary – are *interactionally interwoven*, thus documenting an integrative approach to L2 teaching and learning.

Study 3 : Doing English-Only Instructions

A Multimodal Account of Bilingual Bangladeshi Classrooms

Huq, R. (2018). *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 33, 278-297.

This article deals with multimodal accounts of classroom instruction of an English-version Bangladeshi classroom. The study examines bilingual interaction drawn from a grade 6 classroom situated in a metropolitan city in Bangladesh. As monolingual-only instruction designed for bilingual pedagogies often overrides the prescribed, institutional policy, an array of interaction-oriented studies explored participants' perspectives of bilingual pedagogies, especially their selective use of available languages sensitive to the pedagogical focus of the setting (Cromdal, 2005; Lehti-Eklund, 2012; see also Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005, Üstünel, 2004, 2016). Incorporating a social interactional approach into language alternation (Auer, 1984; Gumperz, 1982; Gafaranga, 1998, 2007a), the work of Bonacina and colleagues showed that a distinction could therefore be made between the medium of instruction – the language policy of the pedagogy – and the medium of classroom interaction – the actual, oriented to practice of participants (Bonacina, 2010; Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011). The aim of this paper is to examine this notion of “medium” in a bilingual pedagogical setting, where participants are obliged to follow a monolingual-only medium of instruction. The findings of this paper highlight the participants' approaches to accountably managing the official policy, especially multimodal accounts of organizing the medium of interaction during academic activities.

The analysis is based on a selection drawn from a corpus of video recordings of classroom interaction, documenting participants' practice in various subject lessons (e.g., mathematics, general science, agriculture, information and communication technology, and Bangladesh and general studies). The extracts presented in this

article are drawn from a collection of instances of interactional opportunities during classroom instruction, especially explanations of L2 vocabulary and scientific concepts relevant to the subject content. The presented extracts are from students aged 11 to 13, and provide each of three types of classroom interaction medium – (a) monolingual-L2, (b) monolingual-L1, and (c) bilingual medium – which emerged during classroom instruction.

With a specific focus on classroom instruction, this article observed a systematic distribution between the medium of interaction and pedagogical activities. A key finding is that the participants addressed the interactional challenges by both *suspending* and *sustaining* the English-only medium of instruction, and systematically used language alternation as a resource for various pedagogical purposes. The analysis shows that both the teachers and the students regularly used the monolingual-English medium, especially during formal lectures and formal question and answer sessions. Suspending monolingual-English either for monolingual-L1 or bilingual order emerged during activities where students experienced difficulties. For instance, it was observed that vocabulary explanations and clarifications of scientific terms and concepts – suspending the medium of instruction – were often conducted in monolingual-L1 and bilingual mediums. In other words, participants – especially the teachers – systematically prioritized the task of explaining the subject content for a sustained amount of time over prescribed policy. The findings also show that both teachers and students employed multimodal means (e.g., material artefacts and gestural resources), particularly when assigning them to various types of pedagogy-sensitive roles, e.g., clarifying the underlying meaning of the target content. The findings of this article highlight the critical importance of bilingual instruction as a tool for achieving the greater goal of encouraging students to achieve interactional goals, such as participating in classroom discussions, as well as instructional goals, such as ensuring students' comprehensive understanding of vocabulary through cross-linguistic comparisons using multimodal means.

7. Concluding Discussion

This thesis has examined academic activities taking place in English-medium and English-version compulsory school classrooms in Bangladesh. Drawing on multimodal conversation analysis, it has explicated some of the interactional practices of teachers and students, by which the teaching and learning of subject matter are routinely pursued. Of particular interest here was the presence of English and Bengali under a monolingual English-only institutional policy, and the way the availability of the two languages was exploited by the participants in and through mundane activities.

In the following discussion, I will review some key findings of the thesis and offer some implications of these findings to practitioners of bilingual education in the context of Bangladesh, as well as research on bilingual classrooms beyond their national setting. At the end of the chapter, I also briefly discuss the limitations and possibilities of future research.

English-taught Teaching through Monolingual and Bilingual Mediums of Interaction

I observed that Bengali was used as a resource during lessons for various pedagogical purposes, even though the policy of these institutions was to conduct lessons in English. Hence, language alternation i.e., the co-occurrence of two languages within the same conversation (Gafaranga, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2007a), was routinely observed in these lessons, and was used by both teachers and students. Bypassing the prescribed policy, ironically, facilitated

teaching as teachers in both pedagogical settings prioritized pedagogical activities addressing the locally relevant, emergent pedagogical needs, and this practice led to an emerging arrangement of a “dual-focused” approach (see Chapter 3) of attending curriculum-relevant lesson content and the L2-only medium of instruction.

As shown in Study 2, the task of reading a poem (“Waters” by E. H. Newlin) to grade 3 students required systematic prioritization of various phases of the activity through varied mediums of interaction. Reporting on a single lesson held at Provincial School, the study showed that some teaching activities targeted the task of disseminating rudimentary curriculum-relevant information in the mono-L2 medium: (a) introducing the lesson, and (b) quoting original text to the students (examples 1 and 2, Study 2). Nonetheless, clarifying the curriculum content was primarily conducted in the mono-L1 and bilingual mediums (see “bilingual unpacking of monolingual text” in Martin, 1999; see also Cromdal, 2005; Probyn, 2009, 2019). For instance, a routine activity in this lesson involved reading the text aloud to the cohort and inviting students to participate in the discussion on the literal and pragmatic meanings of the poem, especially the L2 vocabulary items (see also Mortensen, 2011; Waring et al., 2013). The teacher kept students engaged with his commentary on the poem, which was offered through mono-L1 and bilingual mediums addressing students’ comprehension needs through pragmatic, mundane examples. In so doing, the task of reading the poem is facilitated through a situated unpacking of the poetry, by soliciting the students’ tacit understanding which is made relevant through the use of L1 as a pertinent resource for such an activity.

Reporting on various subject lessons scheduled to be taught through English as the medium of instruction by specialist teachers (see discussion on CLIL in Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2013, p. 546; see also Chapter 3), the findings from Capital School (Studies 1 and 3) showed that the teachers routinely bypassed the language policy in favor of an array of locally relevant pedagogical necessities. Both studies 1 and 3 showed that if the “overall order” of the medium of

interaction is mono-L2, the participants treated the instances of alternation to L1 as either “repairable” or “non-repairable” deviance (see Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011). The repairable deviances were addressed in the form of interactional remedies, such as translating of prior L1 turns into L2 (example 2, Study 3), and providing a concise summary of prior L1 turns into L2 (example 5, Study 3). Concerning non-repairable deviances, teachers quickly returned to the mono-L2 medium (example 1, Study 3), sustaining the “overall order” (Gafaranga, 2007a, 2018) of teaching session conducted in English.

Studies 1 and 3 also showed that the mono-L2 medium was routinely bypassed for sustained periods in favor of bilingual and mono-L1 mediums (see “medium suspension” in Gafaranga & Torras, 2002; see also Chapter 3). For instance, Study 3 showed that teachers suspended mono-L2 to address various emergent problems: (a) students’ difficulties of understanding the subject content (example 3, Study 3), (b) a lack of clarity regarding the role and place of the current activity (example 2, Study 3), and (c) finding appropriate answers through open-floor question and answer sessions (example 4, Study 3). On a similar note, Study 1 showed that the *progress review* – the routine discussion between the teacher and students at the beginning of lesson focusing students’ progress-to-date often consulting a textbook or other instructional documents or media – was conducted in bilingual medium (examples 1, 3, and 5). Nevertheless, the more the lessons progressed toward formal aspects of teaching activities (e.g., delivering lectures), the more L2-intensive the medium of interaction became.

Taken together, each of the empirical studies (Studies 1, 2, and 3) showed that the teachers in both settings were aware of the language policy, and some teaching activities were therefore routinely held in English with minimal instances of alternation to Bengali. Nevertheless, the teachers in both settings routinely suspended the mono-L2 medium, prioritizing pedagogical needs – especially through the mono-L1 and bilingual mediums – over the mono-L2 language policy.

Participants' Roles during Teaching Activities

In contrast to some previous studies (e.g., Amir, 2013b; Amir & Musk, 2013), the corpus does not contain any explicit, publicly available verbal directive from teachers concerning students' breaches of the language policy (cf. "explicit language policing" in Amir, 2013a). The lack of explicit language policing does not necessarily imply that the language policy was not relevant to the classroom activities in the two pedagogical settings. On the contrary, the participants – and especially the students – would orient toward the English-only medium during instruction, without topicalizing their language choice, which – according to Auer (1984, 2007; see also Gafaranga, 2000) – is overwhelmingly the case in bilingual interaction. For example, in both settings, formal and impromptu question and answer activities were routinely performed in bilingual as well as mono-L1 and mono-L2 mediums. Students' responses varied, primarily according to teachers' cues regarding which medium they were using as a resource.

The students – nominated as prospective next-turn speakers – routinely interpreted the teacher's English-only topicalizations (line 1-9, example 4, Study 3; also examples 1, 2, and 6, Study 1) as a cue to continue the mono-L2 medium available in the form of students' responses in English (cf. preference for "same medium talk" in Gafaranga, 2000; see also Gafaranga & Torras, 2002). The students therefore generally understood a *tacit obligation* that they should follow L2-only, especially if the teacher's turns were exclusively in English. Exceptions to this practice – students responding in mono-L1 when the teacher asked the question in English – usually happened in situations where students understood that bypassing the policy was a relevant, legitimate response. For instance, Study 3 showed how a group of students interpreted the teacher's request for the meaning of an L2 vocabulary item as a translation request, and thereby used Bengali as an appropriate response (example 2). On the same note, if teaching activities were held in mono-L1 and bilingual mediums, some students routinely took advantage of following mono-L1 and bilingual mediums, while other students remained loyal to the mono-L2 medium. For

example, teacher-led question and answer rounds conducted in bilingual mediums included examples of both students' use of L1 (example 5, Study 3) and strict compliance with L2-only (example 4, Study 3). In other words, from the students' perspective, the choice of medium of interaction was treated as the teacher's prerogative. At the same time, responding in English was always a possible option. This would suggest that students oriented their actions toward the school's language policy, but they viewed the teachers' use of L1 – in a monolingual or bilingual medium of interaction – as justification for temporary loosening, if not entirely suspending the policy.

Multimodal Organization of Classroom Interaction

In both settings, the holistic interplay between various semiotic resources such as talk, body language, and material objects in the design of “meaning, knowledge and action” (Goodwin, 2002, p. 33; see also Mondada, 2018, 2019; see Chapter 4) played key roles for sustaining the dual-focused approach to subject content and language. For example, Study 3 showed that the teachers routinely piecemealed mono-L2 instruction in bilingual mediums, especially concepts, definitions, and terminologies of pedagogical relevance. Teaching activities aimed at clarifying concepts were routinely presented as being teachable exclusively through open-floor discussion rounds between the teacher and the students, and these sessions were usually targeted at emergent difficulties (cf. “learnable” in Majlesi, 2014a). Environmentally afforded resources, such as material objects (e.g., the whiteboard and textbooks) and embodied resources (e.g., gestures, motion of hands, pointing fingers, and active eye gazes), were routinely maneuvered in the service of the emerging pedagogical needs, especially students' difficulties conceptualizing the target content. Various forms of actions intended for such clarifications routinely took place: (a) *in vivo* embodied demonstrations (examples 1 and 3, Study 3; examples 5 and 6, Study 2), and (b) highlighting signature aspects of the target content exclusively through multimodal means

(example 5, Study 3; example 7, Study 2; see also “professional vision” in Goodwin, 1994).

Furthermore, Study 2 revealed that the teacher used a range of resources for *visually relevant* explication (see Waring et al., 2013; Stoewer, 2018a, 2018b; Stoewer & Musk, 2018; Stoewer & Cromdal, in press) to conduct a lesson on a piece of poetry. To unpack the aesthetic, pragmatic, and lexical meaning of the poem, a systematic comparison was created and the explication of the poem was premised on an orderly blending between officialized, formal knowledge relevant to subject content and students’ everyday, tacit understanding (see Kääntä et al., 2018). Therefore, the teacher not only asked the students to recite, read, and memorize the poem through mono-L2, but also made students’ tacit everyday understanding relevant in mono-L1 and bilingual mediums. In so doing, the students were taught not just the equivalent verbal explication of L2 lexical item in mono-L1 (e.g., translation and synonyms of linguistic equivalence in L1) but also a systematic discussion on varied *substrates* of meaning relevant to the poem, using students’ knowledge of mundane discourse and pertinent multimodal resources (see Mortensen, 2011; “analytic approach” in Waring et al., 2013; see also Stoewer, 2018a; St. John, 2014; St. John & Cromdal, 2016). As shown in example 5 in Study 2, the meaning of an L2 vocabulary item – the sound of a tiny brook – was offered as “learnable” (Majlesi, 2014a) through embodied enactments of the motions of a river (cf. “animatic” approach in Waring et al., 2013) along with onomatopoeic vocalizations. In other words, the pragmatic explication of how a “tinkling” sound is produced in a real-life environment was brought into the discussion using visually relevant resources. In so doing, the participants – both the teacher and the students – made the learnable relevant by mimicking embodied enactments of the differences between a tiny brook and a large river, which would otherwise have complicated if explicated solely through verbal, narrative resources. This example also shows that the comparison between the meanings of vocabulary items was discussed not only in terms of comparing cross-linguistic resources, e.g., Bengali and English repertoires, but also in terms of the relevance of multimodal aspects to either or

both of the available languages. All in all, the multimodal account of both settings revealed that the situated resources were used in the service of instruction.

Educational Implications

Bilingual Education

The official status of English and of bilingual education involving English, as discussed earlier in Chapter 2, is a debated issue in Bangladeshi setting. As a monolingual-majority country where 98% of the population speaks Bengali as their mother tongue, the use of English is legally restricted. For instance, English has no official status, even though it is used as an important language in various sectors, e.g., civil administration, the judiciary, and education. Although English-taught education – both English-medium and English-version schools – flourished during the post-independence period, key government policy documents generally discarded the potential of such schools as an optimal mode of education (see Ministry of Education, 2010). Educational commissions formed during the post-independence period generally favored the view that the medium of instruction for compulsory schooling should essentially be Bengali-only (see Chapter 2). This view reflects the impact of government policy (see the Bengali Language Introduction Act, 1987:2), whereby Bengali-monolingualism should be upheld as the national policy at all levels, thus promoting the view that allocating support for English is detrimental to the existing status of Bengali as the national language (see Hamid & Erling, 2016). Some academics questioned the role of such schools, and many argued that all existing diversified modes of compulsory schooling (i.e., Bengali-medium or “general” schooling, English-taught education, and religious education) should be merged as “uni-medium” education (see Chapter 2). This would mean that English would lose its current role as a medium of instruction at many institutions around the country.

This thesis fills the gap that exists in this field, and examines how teaching and learning take place in Bangladeshi English-taught schools. Little is currently known about this. Although a few studies have addressed bilingual schooling in a Bangladeshi setting (see Hamid, Jahan & Islam, 2013; Akhter, 2018; Islam & Ahsan, 2011; Haider & Chowdhury, 2012), practice-based study has been non-existent. The current thesis therefore offers an insight into the debate around the role of English as a medium of instruction in schools, and provides an empirically grounded conversation analytic account of compulsory education in English in Bangladesh. Taken together (Studies 1, 2, and 3), the findings highlight the fact that the arrangement of teaching activities in English-medium and English-version schools took place through a varied spectrum of mediums of interaction, i.e., mono-L1, mono-L2, and bilingual. In other words, participants at these schools used the available linguistic repertoires, i.e., Bengali and English, to attend to different types of pedagogical activities on a routine basis, even though the language policies of these institutions were English. The findings showed that Bengali was used as a pedagogy-relevant resource, and highlighted participants' approaches to instrumenting *mutually inclusive* roles between Bengali and English as available repertoires during teaching.

Looking beyond issues of schooling in Bangladesh, this thesis also attends to the wider field of bilingual education, specifically Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL, see Chapter 3). Although CLIL has flourished over the years, primarily in a European landscape, there is growing interest in the scope of CLIL in non-European settings. This thesis addresses this growing field of interaction-oriented research into CLIL by examining bilingual education in a different national setting (see Jawhar, 2012; Duran, 2017). Given that a key proposition is that CLIL is a form of “dual-focused education” (Marsh, 2006, 2008) – a “joint learning project of subject content and language learning” (Smit & Dafouz, 2012) – a core discussion addresses how the balance between these dual aims is to be achieved. This discussion is not only dealt with in terms of how the focus should be distributed between these dual aims (cf. “50:50/Content-Language CLIL-equilibrium” in Ting,

2010), but also with regard to the relevance of available linguistic resources such as mother tongue, target language of instruction, and other available languages (in a multilingual setting) during instruction. Although CLIL is generally open to the use of mother tongue as a resource, a fair share of studies have argued that “judicious”, “optimal” use of L1 (Macaro, 2005, 2009, 2019; Lasagabaster, 2013; Tavares, 2015) is a successful strategy for augmenting L2 learning. Such a view is primarily rooted in the argument that “too much” exposure to L1 is counterproductive for L2 learning, and hence its use should be kept to a minimum (cf. less than 15% in Macaro, 2005) only addressing absolute necessities such as vocabulary activity (Macaro, 2009; see also Lin, 2013). For instance, Lasagabaster (2013) argued that the use of L1 is often based on the teacher’s “intuitions”, and hence is “implemented with little systematic reflection on their everyday practices” (p. 17). Nonetheless, the findings of interaction-oriented studies in CLIL settings have questioned such propositions (see Pekarek-Doehler & Ziegler, 2007; Moore & Dooly, 2010; Urmeneta & Evnitskaya, 2013; Kääntä et al., 2018; see also Lo, 2015; Gierlinger, 2015; Llinares, 2015).

The examination of participants’ practice in this thesis favors the argument that proposing such a “top-down” threshold over L1 use is unpragmatic, and to a great extent contradicts the primordial purpose of a program like CLIL. A growing number of interaction-oriented studies have highlighted the observation that separating the dual aims does not help the purpose of CLIL, as “doing content” also means “doing language” (see Pekarek-Doehler & Ziegler, 2007; Moore & Dooly, 2010). A range of examples, as analyzed in the empirical studies in this thesis, similarly find that both of these aims are mutually inclusive, especially when manifested in situations where participants need to address emergent difficulties. Furthermore, the call for “optimal use” is also problematic in relation to prioritizing lessons in abstract, de-contextualized terms and proposing the ideal equilibrium between L1 and L2 throughout lessons as a prerequisite for the success of the pedagogy as a whole. In so doing, there is a tendency to treat L1 as resource in terms of individual instances, and as functions

rather than as an organic part of specific stages of a particular kind of curriculum genre as a whole (cf. “Whole lesson as curriculum genre” in Lin, 2013, p. 212). The empirical studies of this thesis showed that the teachers routinely addressed students’ pedagogical needs and bypassed the language policy as a resource during instruction in a variety of ways (Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005). For example, Study 1 showed that conducting some activities in mono-L1 and bilingual mediums helped teachers to carry out the progression of next-to-do academic activity in mono-L2 (cf. “procedural information”, “off-task activity” in Seedhouse, 2004, pp. 204-222; see also Nikula, 2005, p. 211). In other words, using mono-L1 and bilingual mediums during a progress review ensured a short, sharp start to academic activity during a lesson, thus allowing for concentrated engagement with core activities. Therefore, proposing a pre-mediated, ideal threshold of mother tongue use disregards the fact that classroom instruction – as shown in the empirical studies in this thesis – is responsive to a range of divergent pedagogical needs that are otherwise impossible to predict *a priori*, especially in idealized, quantified terms. This thesis therefore contributes to the existing debate on CLIL education, strengthening the practice-based view of mutually inclusive relationships between the dual aims of such programs.

Multimodality and the Medium of Classroom Interaction

The empirical findings of this thesis revealed that the pervasive presence of embodied resources and the surrounding material ecology played significant roles in both suspending and sustaining the current medium of interaction, and therefore highlighted a systematic, robust *reflexive relationship* (see “pedagogical focus” in Seedhouse, 2004, 2011; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005) between the medium of interaction and multimodal aspects of instruction. The decisions – whether the current medium be sustained or suspended – taken during the instruction were highly influenced by the use of situated resources. For instance, Study 3 (example 3) revealed how the teacher mobilized embodied resources in the

service of sustaining the mono-L2 order during a formal question and answer session and only suspended it when it was an absolute pedagogy-relevant necessity e.g., students' lack of response. This (example 3) showed that, even in the presence of ample visual cues targeting the correct answer, the emergent problem of students' lack of response (see "Claims of Insufficient Knowledge" in Sert, 2013, 2015; Sert & Walsh, 2013; Sert & Jacknick, 2015; see also Majlesi, 2014a) was eventually addressed by the teacher by mobilizing a shift in mediums from mono-L2 to mono-L1. Furthermore, Study 3 (example 5) showed how the teacher used his gaze toward the students around the classroom and the subsequent orientation of his torso as a resource to solicit participants' displays of knowledge (see "embodied noticings" in Kääntä, 2014; see also Kääntä, 2010, 2012, 2015; Evnitskaya & Berger, 2017) which were relevant to the impromptu bilingual vocabulary inquiry session. As students' knowledge concerning the L2 lexical item was tested over multiple turns, providing the scope for an appropriate answer (see Mortensen, 2009; Lauzon & Berger, 2015; aus der Wieschen & Sert, 2018), the vocabulary inquiry sequence – held in a bilingual medium – was further sustained for a period of time on the grounds that the students needed further elicitation. Sustaining the medium was mobilized not only due to a lack of satisfactory answers verbalized during the sequence, but also due to long pauses, quieter student turns, and a significant *absence* of embodied resources (e.g., students raising their hands or mutually establishing strong eye gaze with the teacher which routinely inform students' needs). In other words, embodied resources – irrespective of which medium of interaction is used – played significant roles for the teachers to help making decisions about what should be done with the current medium of interaction. As the shift from one medium to another was often tied to the locally available needs, embodied resources were also mobilized as a resource addressing such impromptu decisions and thereby helping the systematic, procedural progression of classroom interaction.

The findings also highlighted that the students were aware of the fact that real-time assessment of locally emerging needs was continuously influenced by the deployment of a multitude of

situated resources. In other words, the multimodal organization of the situated resources gave students cues regarding the type of activity the participants were embarking on, and the transition of an *embodied participation framework* (cf. Goodwin, 2007) was often situated at the transition points where significant embodied and environmentally afforded resources were placed. Examples are therefore also drawn from the corpus showing students' orientations toward such transitions from one medium to another. Study 2 showed (example 7, line 18–22) how a student interpreted the teacher's warning to stay quiet – while the teacher was holding the textbook against the whiteboard facing gossiping students – as a template for a prospective assessment activity on L2 vocabulary. In other words, the teacher's call for students' attention followed by a statement (“ami kintu dhorbo”/ “I will ask you questions”) was interpreted not only in terms of *what* the teacher had said but also *how* it was said. Summing up, the empirical findings of this thesis therefore imply that deploying situated resources could be used as a cue for a prospective shift of medium of interaction, and participants – both teachers and students – routinely oriented toward its use during instruction in order to achieve a balance between the emerging pedagogical needs and the language policy.

Implications for Future Research

One of the key implications of this thesis is that it addresses the critical dearth of understanding concerning practice-based approaches to bilingual education in a Bangladeshi setting. By analyzing teacher-led whole class teaching, especially vocabulary and content explanation activities, formal and impromptu teacher-led question and answer sessions, and procedural activities such as doing progress review, this thesis attempts to fill the gap. Nevertheless, further research can be conducted into student-student classroom interaction in bilingual institutions in Bangladesh. Hence, there is ample opportunity to study participants' perspectives on language policy in bilingual pedagogy in Bangladesh, especially participants' interactions beyond the scope of formal classroom teaching, such as recess sessions.

Concerning the data collection, this corpus constitutes data from two types of schools in Bangladeshi setting i.e., an English-version school operated under the government-approved national curriculum and an English-medium school operated under the locally developed curriculum. As discussed earlier in Chapter 2, formal compulsory education in English in a Bangladeshi setting is also offered at private-owned, international curriculum English-medium schools – O-level and A-level schools – and English is also an academic subject taught at Bengali-medium schools. Therefore, more practice-based research will provide additional knowledge for this line of research, especially the discussion concerning the contested relationship between Bengali and English in Bangladeshi educational institutions.

This thesis has also addressed an emerging research interest concerning a practiced-based understanding of bilingual education in Bangladesh. As the concluding discussions have pointed out, the types of activities conducted in the two schools studied in this project bear ample resemblance to dual-focused approach of CLIL. Further research can add more understanding concerning the relevance of CLIL and bilingual education in a Bangladeshi setting.

8. Svensk sammanfattning

I detta avsnitt ges en sammanfattning av avhandlingen på svenska. Sammanfattningen innehåller den teoretiska och metodologiska inramningen för avhandlingen, redogör för de analysverktyg och den analys som gjorts på datamaterialet, samt diskuterar de viktigaste resultaten. Eftersom det här avsnittet enbart sammanfattar huvudpunkterna i avhandlingen uppmuntras intresserade läsare att läsa de engelskspråkiga empiriska studierna (Studie 1, 2 och 3), för en fullständig förståelse av avhandlingens resultat. I sammanfattningen är begrepp och citat från den engelska delen i möjligaste mån översatta till svenska.

Bakgrund

Den nuvarande politiska gränsen för den sydasiatiska regionen Bangladesh ritades 1947 efter delningen av det då brittiskstyrda Indien. Regionen var först en del av Pakistan under namnet Östpakistan, men frigjorde sig 1971 från Pakistan och bildade den självständiga republiken Bangladesh året därpå (jfr. Riaz, 2015, 2016). Eftersom bengali (bangla) är modersmål för 98% av befolkningen i regionen (Akhter, 2018, s. 301) valdes det till både nationellt och officiellt språk, och 1972 inrättade konstitutionen bengali som Bangladeshs enda officiella språk (The State Language, 1972:3). För att säkerställa en strukturell ram för införandet av

bengali stiftades 1987 lagen *Bengali Language Introduction Act* (1987:2), som slår fast att bengali är det enda språk som får användas inom politiska och offentliga områden. Lagen har fått generöst stöd från alla statliga institutioner vilket har underlättat utvecklingen till att majoriteten av den obligatoriska utbildningen i landet, från årskurs 1 till 12, bedrivs på enbart bengaliska (jfr. BANBEIS, 2016).

Vilken roll och vilket utrymme engelskan ska ha i Bangladesh är omtvistat. Även om engelska fortfarande används som ett viktigt språk inom olika områden av det offentliga livet, till exempel rättsväsende, utbildning och offentlig förvaltning (jfr. Erling et al., 2012; Khan, 2019), har språket inte någon officiell status i Bangladesh. Utbildning med engelska som undervisningsspråk har ändå blomstrat, i både statliga som privata skolor, särskilt i landets storstadsområden.

För närvarande erbjuds skolor med engelska som undervisningsspråk vanligtvis som två varianter i Bangladesh: (a) *English-medium schools* och (b) *English-version schools* (se Imam, 2005). EM-skolor är privatägda institutioner som erbjuder utbildning på engelska i årskurs 1 till 12, under överinseende av utbildningsministeriet, men med antingen internationella eller lokalt utvecklade, icke statligt godkända läroplaner och bedömningsförfaranden (se Imam, 2005, ss. 477–479). Det officiella antal elever som är inskrivna i EM-skolor är 125 233 (BANBEIS, 2016, s. 279). EV-skolor däremot bedriver undervisning på engelska för årskurs 1–12 med ett dubbelt fokus. Skolorna följer regeringens läroplan och bedömningsförfarande samtidigt som de strävar efter att tillgodose elevernas behov av undervisning på engelska. Samtliga läromedel är engelska översättningar av samma läromedel som används i landets statliga skolor. EV-skolor finansieras delvis av statliga medel men är privata och drivs av en självständig ledning. Eftersom EV-skolor inte rapporteras som en särskild skolform är det befintliga antal institutioner som erbjuder undervisning av den nationella läroplanen på engelska okänt (jfr. Billah, 2011). Sammantaget är det faktiska

antal skolor, samt antal elever som deltar i obligatorisk undervisning i engelska mycket större än vad som rapporteras i regeringens register (se Hamid & Jahan, 2015; Mousumi & Kusakabe, 2017a, 2017b). Trots det relativt stora intresset för skolor med engelska som undervisningsspråk är kunskapen om dessa i allmänhet låg. I synnerhet gäller detta kunskapen om hur skolornas undervisning bedrivs i praktiken. Därför är analysen i den här avhandlingen fokuserad på dessa skolors vardagliga undervisningspraktik.

Syfte och frågeställningar

Eftersom engelska och bengali har förekommit sida vid sida i Bangladesh ett tag är tvåspråkighet en ganska vanlig samtalspraktik i landet (jfr. Banu & Sussex, 2001a, 2001b). De interaktionsorienterade studierna av detta är dock få. Särskilt gäller detta studiet av klassrumsinteraktioner (jfr. Akhter, 2018; Hamid, 2009, 2016; Hamid, Nguyen, & Baldauf, 2013; Hamid, Jahan, & Islam, 2013), och de studier som har gjorts har främst fokuserat på högre utbildning. Syftet med denna avhandling är därför att bidra till ökad förståelse för, och empiriskt grundad kunskap om, obligatorisk utbildning i Bangladesh, med engelska som undervisningsspråk. Forskningsfrågorna är:

- Hur organiseras klassrumsaktiviteter i närvaro av två språk – bengali och engelska – i bangladeshiska skolor med engelska som undervisningsspråk?
- Vilka, om några, är konsekvenserna av den institutionella språkpolicyn för deltagarnas interaktion med varandra, i olika klassrumsaktiviteter?

För att besvara dessa frågor har jag gjort videoinspelningar av lektioner i två bangladeshiska grundskolor med enbart engelska som undervisningsspråk. Det inspelade materialet har jag därefter undersökt med hjälp av multimodal konversationsanalys (CA). Avhandlingen består av tre empiriska studier som analyserar olika

pedagogiska aktiviteter med fokus på deltagarnas sociala interaktion, med ett särskilt intresse för språkval och språkalternering. Den lyfter också fram multimodal kommunikation som uttrycksmedel (se Goodwin, 2000; Mondada, 2007b, 2008, 2014, 2018) vilket visar hur förkroppsligat handlande (t.ex. mimik, gester, blickar) och materiella resurser (t.ex. klassrummet och fysiska objekt) används i vardaglig klassrumsinteraktion.

Tvåspråkighet i pedagogisk praxis

Kodväxling

Kodväxling, det vill säga användningen av två eller flera språk inom samma konversation, har genererat ett ökat forskningsintresse i studier av olika två- eller flerspråkiga miljöer, inklusive tvåspråkiga klassrum. Studierna kan delas in i huvudgrenar: grammatiskt och socio-funktionellt (se Gafaranga, 2018). Det sociofunktionella perspektivet inriktar sig på kodväxling som diskursfenomen, och behandlar frågor om kodväxlingens konsekvenser och kodväxling som meningsskapande process – det vill säga dess diskursiva funktioner. Den sociofunktionella metoden introducerades av Blom och Gumperz (1972; även Gumperz, 1982) men har senare utvecklats till två forskningsinriktningar, den som försöker förklara kodväxling i termer av talarnas sociala identitet, och den som främst ser kodväxling som en aspekt av samtalets organisation. Gafaranga (2018) kallar dessa förklaringar om orsaken till kodväxling för *identitetsrelaterade* kontra *organisatoriska* förklaringar till språkalternering. I denna avhandling har jag använt organisatoriska förklaringar för att förstå språkbruket i tvåspråkiga samtal, och särskilt den modell som utvecklats av Gafaranga (1998, 1999, 2000), och Gafaranga i samarbete med Torras och Bonacina (Gafaranga & Torras, 2001, 2002; Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011).

Gafaranga's övergripande förklaringsmodell

I enlighet med CA:s principer såg Auer (1984, 1988) kodväxling som en sekventiellt inbäddad, lokalt tillgänglig resurs i deltagarnas interaktion. En sådan förklaring är starkt påverkad av konversationsanalysens syn på samtalet som en strikt organiserad företeelse: "*order at all points*" (Sacks et al. 1974). Som en konsekvens av den synen, hävdade Auer, måste varje möjlig tolkning av kodväxling förstås i termer av dess sekventiella placering i det pågående samtalet. Genom att hävda detta menar Auer att varje inslag av kodväxling är ett exempel på växling från ett *basspråk* till ett annat *språk* (jfr. diskussion om basspråk i Auer, 2000).

Auer var dock väl medveten om att om fler än en samtalsdeltagare ofta växlar språk inom enskilda talturer blir det allt mindre relevant att tala om *ett* språk-i-interaktion (då själva baskoden består av flera lingvistiska system), vilket är själva bakgrunden mot vilken all kodväxling måste betraktas (Auer, 1984, s. 84; även Auer, 2007). Med andra ord, förekomsten av flera språk i ett samtal behöver inte innebära att kodväxling, som en diskursiv strategi, har ägt rum. Det konversationsanalytiska perspektivet måste således kunna skilja på när användandet av flera språk är relevant och funktionellt för deltagarna och när deltagarna bevisligen inte upplever användandet av flera språk som pragmatiskt funktionellt, utmärkande eller ens noterbart, vilket ofta är fallet när baskoden (eller *mediet*, se nedan) är tvåspråkig (se Gafaranga, 2000; även Bonacina, 2010; s. 96 för ytterligare diskussion om gränserna för Auers tillvägagångssätt).

Gafaranga och hans kollegor föreslår därför istället den s.k. övergripande förklaringsmodellen (*samtalet som välorganiserad aktivitet*), där det centrala begreppet är *medium* vilket ska förstås som samtalsdeltagarnas egen språkkod (Gafaranga, 1999, s. 216; även Gafaranga & Torras, 2001, ss. 195-196). Frågan om huruvida kodväxling har ägt rum i ett samtal måste således besvaras ur talarnas perspektiv (ibid.), snarare än avgöras genom analytikerns

identifiering av olika språk. Eftersom ett samtalsmedium mycket väl kan bestå av flera språkliga system såg Gafaranga (t.ex. 1999, 2000) ett behov av att omformulera Auers uppfattning om ”basspråk” (som antar lingvistens perspektiv) till ett ”för deltagarna gemensamt medium” (deltagarperspektiv). Det som för deltagarna utgör samtalsmediet kan alltså av lingvisten ses omfatta olika språkliga system – vilket reser viktiga frågor om vad som är ett språk, och för vem.

Genom att undersöka språkpraktiken hos elever inskrivna vid en fransk skola i Storbritannien observerade Bonacina och Gafaranga (2011) att det faktiska samspelet mellan deltagarna ibland genomfördes med ett annat interaktionsmedium än den obligatoriska användningen av franska som enda språk. De föreslog därför att det valda mediet – som de kallar *mediet för klassrumsinteraktion* – skulle avgränsas begreppsligt från det institutionellt godkända undervisningsmediet (2011, ss. 330–331). Deras analys visar att deltagarna rutinmässigt förhandlade om vilket medium som företrädesvis skulle användas inom varje enskild interaktionsepisod. Alternativen inkluderade två enspråkiga medier – enbart engelska eller enbart franska – tillsammans med ett tvåspråkigt medium där de båda språken blandades.

Med andra ord, ur skolans perspektiv är normen att välja ett franskt enspråkigt medium, medan att välja något av de andra två alternativen – vilka innehåller avvikelser från det föreskrivna mediet – kan uppfattas och hanteras som regelbrott. Det betyder dock inte att deltagarna själva är orienterade mot denna norm i sin interaktion. Istället fann Bonacina och Gafaranga (2011) grupper av deltagare som använde franska, och där växling till engelska för specifika kommunikativa ändamål uppfattades som avvikande och krävde medium-reparation. På liknande sätt hittade de även fall av engelska som enspråkigt medium, vilket möjliggjorde märkbart avvikande växling till franska. I båda fallen var det sättet på vilket deltagarna hanterade växlingen – antingen som reparerbar eller som

interaktionellt avvikande (d.v.s. som kodväxling) – som avslöjade deras förhållningssätt till det enspråkiga mediet. I en tredje kategori av fall som observerades kunde deltagarna växla till att använda båda språken utan att det varken upplevdes som avvikande eller främmande, eller påkallade reparation. I dessa fall talar man om att interaktion pågår genom ett tvåspråkigt medium. Här blir kodväxling normalt inte möjlig – såvida man inte tar in ett ytterligare språk, som inte är del av det tvåspråkiga mediet.

Distinktionen mellan undervisningsmedium och medium för klassrumsinteraktion är en viktig teoretisk utveckling i studier av språkpolicy. Distinktionen underlättar förståelsen av de normer som styr deltagarnas språkanvändning – eller för att citera Bonacina-Pugh (2012) – ”the practiced language policy” (jfr. språkutövning i Spolsky, 2004, 2005). Detta är särskilt relevant eftersom många tidigare studier till en början okritiskt antog uppfattningen att kodväxling självklart är en konversationsresurs. Som forskningen av konversationsmedier visar ovan kan detta både vara och inte vara fallet. Och i vilket fall som helst måste det bevisas analytiskt snarare än antas på förhand (jfr. Musk & Cromdal, 2018, s. 25-34). Samma sak gäller diskussionen om språkpolicy. Många studier har tidigare okritiskt behandlat det lagstadgade språket som standardmedium för klassrumsinteraktion, och betraktat alternativa språkval som politiska överträdelser, och har därmed antagit institutionernas perspektiv – snarare än deltagarnas. Som Bonacina-Pugh (2012) visar: att närma sig klassrumsinteraktion från deltagarnas perspektiv möjliggör en mer konstruktiv syn på språkpolitiken (se språket i Spolsky, 2004, 2005). Detta är också utgångspunkten i föreliggande avhandling.

Tvåspråkig utbildning: Språk och ämnesinnehåll

Tvåspråkig undervisning pågår runt om i världen med hjälp av olika pedagogiska metoder. En vanlig sådan metod går under namnet *Content and Language Integrated Learning* (se diskussion i kapitel

3), förkortat CLIL. På svenska talar man ibland om *integrerad innehålls- och språkinläring*. CLIL-verksamheter är pedagogiska miljöer som bedriver ämnesundervisning på främmande språk och har som huvudmål att skapa en sammansmältning av både ämnesinnehåll och språkinläring (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010, s. 6). Man vill dels skapa förståelse för det akademiska ämnesinnehållet, dels exponera eleverna för ett främmande språk i klassrummet. Det har begrepps som en ”dubbelfokuserad utbildning” (Marsh, 2006, s. 32; 2008), ”en gemensam inlärningspraxis av ämne och främmande språk” (Smit & Dafouz, 2012, s. 1), och en ”balansering” mellan läroplaner och språk (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012). Sammantaget är kärnan i CLIL att införliva det dubbla målet att bedriva klassrumsundervisning på ett främmande språk för att uppnå både förståelse av innehållet i det akademiska ämnet och språklig kompetens att uttrycka det. En rad studier har undersökt hur balansen mellan dessa dubbla mål kan uppnås.

Med motiveringen att de skolor som jag studerat erbjuder just ett sådant dubbelt fokus på klassrumsundervisningen, betraktar jag de pedagogiska verksamheter som studeras i denna avhandling som exempel på CLIL-miljöer.

Sammanfattning

Sammanfattningsvis har forskningen om språkval och kodväxling under de senaste decennierna använt CA-baserade förklaringsmodeller, byggda på de organisatoriska aspekterna av tvåspråkighet. Därmed har deltagarnas perspektiv på språkpolitiken fått stor uppmärksamhet, särskilt i Gafarangas och hans medarbetares arbete. Praktikorienterad forskning inom tvåspråkig utbildning i allmänhet, och CLIL-klassrum i synnerhet, har gett ytterligare förståelse för deltagarnas förhållningssätt till de dubbla målen – med fokus på både språkpolicy och språkpedagogik. Jag utforskar de interaktionsmetoder genom vilka lärare och elever på skolor i Bangladesh deltar i engelskspråkig CLIL-undervisning.

Teoretiska perspektiv

Denna avhandling använder konversationsanalys (CA) som metodologisk och analytisk ram. CA uppstod i en tid då en stor del av forskningen inom sociologi var inriktad på abstrakt teoretisering av storskaliga strukturella fenomen (jfr. Garfinkel, 1967/1984). CA:s grundare, Harvey Sacks, hävdade att den rådande vetenskapliga approachen inom sociologin (jfr. Parsons, 1937) antingen reducerade människors sociala handlingar till epifenomen av sociala strukturer, eller förkastade dem banala (Sacks, 1984). I motsats till denna determinism, utvecklade Sacks ett analytiskt intresse för de metoder människor använder sig av i det sociala livet (Sacks, 1984, s. 21) – så kallade *etno-metoder*.

Som verktyg för att analysera mänsklig interaktion antog CA utmaningen att redogöra för hur samtalet – som en generisk praktik i socialt liv – är organiserat. En grundläggande fråga blev att förklara den processuella logiken, eller motivationen, som ligger till grund för deltagarnas hantering av samtal och handlingar – människans strävan efter att förklara ”varför detta nu?” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Frågan fångar en strävan efter att förklara det sociala agerandet (”varför detta”) som manifesteras i den framväxande sekvensen (”just nu”), vilka förhåller sig till både kontexten och processen, och aktualiserar dessa i interaktionen. Därför är ett av målen för CA att kartlägga den sekventiella strukturen (Schegloff, 1972, 1988, 2007; Heritage, 1984, 2010) genom att beskriva hur deltagarna organiserar sitt handlande i samtal. Fundamentalt för detta är turtagning och hur turer bygger upp handlingssekvenser.

Deltagare i interaktion visar för sin omgivning hur de avser att bli förstådda samt hur de i sin tur förstår sin omgivning. För att beskriva interaktion, intar CA ett *emiskt* perspektiv (Pike, 1967; Psathas, 1990) som fångar deltagarnas egna förståelser av sitt eget och andras handlande, så som dessa förståelser manifesteras i samspelet (Sacks, 1992a, 1992b). Att anta ett emiskt tillvägagångssätt innebär att på

förhand antagna egenskaper eller relationer (t.ex. om deltagarnas etniska ursprung eller sociala tillhörighet), inte ges något analytiskt värde i att förklara deltagarnas handlande. Det som eftersöks istället är vad deltagarna själva *bevisligen* betraktar som relevant i samspelet (jfr. ”relevans” i Schegloff, 1992).

Multimodal konversationsanalys

I en senare utveckling av CA, började forskare intressera sig för, utöver samtal, även de multimodaliteter genom vilka människor gestaltar handlingar i gester, blickar, huvudrörelser, ansiktsuttryck, kroppshållning, kroppsrörelser, samt använder omgivande materiella föremål och platser (jfr. Goodwin, 2000, 2003; Mondada, 2018). Denna inriktning är idag känd som multimodal konversationsanalys.

Multimodal konversationsanalys är också användbart för att synliggöra hur deltagare organiserar sina handlingar i grupp. Ett klassrum är till exempel en typisk gruppverksamhet där deltagarna samordnar sina handlingar genom att mobilisera ett brett spektrum av kroppslig gestaltning och materiella resurser – som tavlor, projektorer, läroböcker och liknande – och därigenom erbjuder en fruktbar miljö för multimodal konversationsanalys. Detta gäller inte minst i tvåspråkiga- och L2-verksamheter (se kapitel 3). I den här avhandlingen används multimodal interaktionsanalys för att studera interaktionen i sådana klassrum, vilket kommer visa sig i de empiriska studierna.

Metod, datainsamling och deltagare

Materialet som används i denna avhandling är videoinspelningar av tre grupper av elever som deltar i engelskspråkig undervisning i skolor i Bangladesh. Inspelningarna gjordes i två skolor: i en *English version school* samt en i en *English medium school* (se kapitel 2). Jag

gjorde inspelningarna under två besök i Bangladesh 2013 (sommarterminen, två månader) och 2014 (vår- till sommarterminen, fyra månader). Totalt består korpusen av 44 timmars videoinspelning från 64 lektioner. EV-skolan som ingår i studien, ligger i huvudstaden Dhaka (i studien kallad Capital school) och EM-skolan (i studien kallad Provincial school) ligger i en medelstor stad. I avhandlingen används materialet från Capital school i studie 1 och 3, och materialet från Provincial school i studie 2.

Videoinspelningarna från huvudstadsskolan (EV) har samlats in från två klasser i årskurs 6. Båda klassrummen befann sig på samma våningsplan, i en byggnad med flera våningar. Deltagarnas ålder i huvudstadsskolan sträcker sig från 11–13 år. I båda grupperna deltog både pojkar och flickor tillsammans i lektionerna. Antalet deltagare varierar ofta under terminen men i allmänhet var det 45 elever per klass.

Provinsskolan (EM) bedriver obligatorisk utbildning från årskurs 1 till 10. Videoinspelningarna från provinsskolan samlades in från en grupp elever i årskurs 3. Totalt deltog 12 elever av båda könen. Deras ålder var 9-10 år.

Materialet samlades in enlighet med forskningsetiska riktlinjer för humaniora och samhällsstudier, för information, samtycke, sekretess och användning (Vetenskapsrådet, 2017). Materialinsamlingen gjordes med tillstånd från ledningen på båda skolorna, samt från deltagarna i videoinspelningarna (dvs. lärare och elever) och föräldrar till eleverna (på båda skolorna). Ett skriftligt samtycke (se bilaga 1-2) utfärdades till lärare, elevers föräldrar och skolmyndigheter. När det gäller etiska frågor förklarade jag, muntligt för varje grupp av deltagare vid olika tillfällen, och skriftligt i ett brev, att: (a) inspelningen kommer att bevaras säkert och arkiveras vid universitetet; (b) inspelningen är endast tillgänglig för mig och andra forskare i lämplig vetenskaplig verksamhet; (c) deltagarnas namn och referenser behandlas konfidentiellt; (d) data kommer

endast att användas för forskning. Deltagarna informerades också om rätten att inte delta (jfr. Bilaga 1 & 2), samt rätten att när som helst dra sig ur utan att behöva ange orsak. Deltagarna var också överens om och samtyckte till att kopior av deras originalbilder (men utan namn och plats) kommer att användas i forskningsresultaten. Alla deltagare var medvetna om – och informerades både muntligt och skriftligt – att detta projekt inte hanterar ”känsliga personuppgifter” (Vetenskapsrådet, 2017, ss. 30-31).

Resultat och diskussion

De empiriska studierna presenteras i tre enskilda vetenskapliga artiklar som läggs till i avhandlingens andra del. Resultaten från studie 1 visar hur genomgång av föregående lektioner, i olika skolämnen, genererar omfattande multimodalt och tvåspråkigt samspel mellan lärare och elever, ofta mycket tidigt under lektionstimmen. Studie 2 visar hur en lektion i läsning och diktanalys i årskurs 3 genomfördes med fokus på multimodal gestaltning av poetiska uttryck. Studie 3 visar hur undervisningen systematiskt fördelar sig på olika interaktionsmedium, beroende på aktivitet. I denna del diskuterar jag några viktiga resultat.

Flera interaktionsmedier i multimodalt samspel

Sammantaget (studie 1, 2 och 3) lyfter resultaten fram observationen att arrangemanget av undervisningsaktiviteter i dessa skolor utfördes med hjälp av tre typer av interaktionsmedium: enspråkigt-L2 (engelska), enspråkigt-L1 (bengali) och tvåspråkigt medium. Detta innebär att både bengali och engelska användes som resurs för olika pedagogiska ändamål under lektionerna. Dessutom användes tvåspråkiga resurser i form av kodväxling av både lärare och elever. Trots att skolornas policy var att endast engelska skulle tjäna som undervisningsspråk, visade det sig att lärarna i första hand är

orienterade mot sitt pedagogiska uppdrag, vilket stundtals underlättades genom att alternera mellan språken.

Studie 1 visar att varje lektion, oavsett ämne, börjar med en genomgång av vad man åstadkommit under föregående lektion. Dessa progressionsgenomgångar genomförs gemensamt mellan lärare och enstaka elever, ofta med hjälp av aktuella läromedel. Genom att spåra var man avslutade den föregående lektionen, blir ämnet för dagen uppenbart enligt den outtalade principen att man fortsätter där man sist slutade. I och med detta, börjar man öppnar man dagens lektion, men analysen visar att detta är en stegvis, ibland långdragen övergång. En empiriskt grundad slutsats blir således att progressionsgenomgångar, tillsammans med efterföljande övergångsfas, ingår i arbetet med att "samla" klassen, det vill säga partitionera eleverna till en enhet, eller "trupp" ("cohort", se Payne & Hustler, 1980) samt fänga och rikta dess uppmärksamhet mot undervisningen.

Ytterligare ett viktigt resultat pekar mot den språkliga organisationen av dessa aktiviteter. Studien visar att progressionsgenomgångar genomförs i samtliga tillgängliga interaktionsmedier: enspråkigt i undervisningsmediet, enspråkigt i L1 samt i tvåspråkigt medium. Analysen visar dock att efter att man har inlett övergången mot dagens lektion, övergår interaktionen till enbart undervisningsmediet. Det betyder inte att man endast talar engelska, men vi noterar att endast lärare växlar till bengali under denna fas samt att växlingarna visar sig vara diskursivt motiverade: det handlar om att avgränsa sidosekvenser (av olika slag) från omgivande tal som är fokuserat på undervisningstemat. Dessa resultat visar att även om skolans språkpolicy inte kan sägas reglera deltagarnas språkval fullt ut, visar analysen att deras handlande är tydligt orienterat mot dess filosofi – att undervisningen huvudsakligen ska ske på engelska.

Studie 2 visade bland annat att uppgiften att läsa och förklara en dikt för elever i årskurs 3, tjänade på att läraren utnyttjar olika

interaktionsmedier. Eleverna hölls engagerade genom lärarens kommentarer av dikten som stundtals levererades genom ett enspråkigt L2-medium men också ofta genom ett tvåspråkigt medium. Lärarens läsning av dikten var i sig en föreläsning i hur poesi ska reciteras. När läraren efter varje läst strof ställde frågor till klassen genom att växla till L1, förstärktes effekten av hans reciteringsteknik.

En del av undervisningen gick ut på att diskutera diktens vokabulär. Då poetiska verk ofta omfattar semantiskt rika ordabetydelser, visar studiens analys hur läraren ägnade mycket arbete åt att både visualisera, sjunga och på andra sätt gestalta till exempel ljudet av forsande vatten. Denna undervisningspraktik omfattar alltså mycket mer än enkel översättning – vilket man dock även genomförde ibland – och fokuserar på semantiska nyanser och variationer, men också på estetiska uttryck.

Studie 3 visade vidare att lärarna rutinmässigt åsidosatte språkpolicy till förmån för i stunden påkallade pedagogiska behov. En rad exempel från båda studierna visade att undervisningsaktiviteter, t.ex. föreläsningar, formella och improviserade fråge-svarssekvenser, instruktioner till elever, vanligtvis utfördes på engelska, det vill säga skolans undervisningsmedium. Lärarnas avvikelser från policyn yttrade sig genom kodväxling till bengali (L1), ofta för att exempelvis förklara eller klargöra lärandeinnehåll. I typfallet hanterades sådan användning av L1 som ”reparerbar” och deltagarna återvände rutinmässigt till mono-L2. Icke desto mindre visade studie 3 också att undervisningsmediet stundtals suspenderades till förmån för tvåspråkigt och eller enspråkigt L1 interaktionsmedium (se ”medium suspension” i Gafaranga & Torras, 2002; också kapitel 3.2.2), men även då skedde det i tydligt pedagogiskt syfte.

Sammantaget visade var och en av de empiriska studierna (Studie 1, 2 och 3) att lärarnas såväl som elevernas handlande var orienterat

mot skolans språkpolicy, vilket inte ska förstås som att endast engelska talades i undervisningen.

Tillämpning

Den här avhandlingen fyller en befintlig kunskapslucka i fältet och undersöker hur undervisning och lärande går till i skolor med engelska som undervisningsspråk i Bangladesh – ett eftersatt ämne. Även om ett fåtal studier diskuterar tvåspråkig skolgång i Bangladesh (se Hamid, Jahan & Islam, 2013; Akhter, 2018; Islam & Ahsan, 2011; Haider & Chowdhury, 2012), är de inte grundade i analyser av situerad pedagogisk praktik. Utöver implikationer för skolväsendet i Bangladesh bidrar denna avhandling också till ett bredare forskningsfält om tvåspråkig utbildning i allmänhet, och multimodala studier av undervisning med dubbelt fokus i synnerhet. Även om CLIL, som utbildning med dubbelt fokus har blomstrat genom åren, främst i Europa, finns det ett växande intresse för dess potentiella nytta i icke-europeiska länder. Därutöver bidrar avhandlingen också till studier av kodväxling, särskilt med de multimodala analyserna av flerspråkigt samspel, något som har efterlysts bland annat av Musk & Cromdal (2018).

För framtida studier i ämnet finns det flera vägar. Då denna studie har fokuserat på klassrumsinteraktion under undervisningsaktiviteter, har samspelet oftast rört sig mellan lärare och elever. Kunskapen om interaktion elever emellan i dessa sammanhang är fortfarande mycket begränsad. Dessutom visar den praktikbaserade förståelsen av skolorna som studeras i denna avhandling en likhet utbildning med dubbelt fokus, som CLIL. Resultaten är dock endast baserade på de två skolor som har studerats i avhandlingen. Ytterligare forskning om ämnet kommer att ge mer förståelse för relevansen i att diskutera CLIL när det gäller engelskspråkig utbildning i Bangladesh.

References

- Agence France-Presse. (2012, February 17). Bangladesh bans 'Banglish' to protect local tongue. *The Express Tribune*. Retrieved from <https://tribune.com.pk/story/337843/bangladesh-bans-banglish-to-protect-local-tongue>
- Ahmed, H. U. (2014, July 14). History. In S. Islam (Ed.), *Banglapedia: National encyclopedia of Bangladesh*. (2nd ed.). Retrieved from <http://en.banglapedia.org/index.php?title=History>
- Akhter, N. (2018). Role of English-Bangla code-switching in vocabulary retention: A case study at University of Dhaka. In R. Chowdhury, M. Sarkar, F. Mojumder, & M. M. Roshid (Eds.), *Engaging in educational research* (pp. 299–314). Springer: Singapore.
- Al-Quaderi, G. G., & Mahmud, A. A. (2010). English literature at English-medium schools of Bangladesh: The question of culture. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 18(2), 211–226.
- Alam, F. (2018, June 14). Bengali, English and the anxiety of influence. *The Asian Age*. Retrieved from <https://dailyasianage.com/news/126021/bengali-english-and-the-anxiety-of-influence>
- Alamgir, M. (2014, August 20). English medium schools charge fees at whim: No guidelines yet to regulate their functioning. *NEW Age*. Retrieved from <http://archive.newagebd.net/41781/english-medium-schools-charge-fees-at-whim/>
- Ali, M., & Walker, A. L. (2014). 'Bogged down' ELT in Bangladesh: Problems and policy: Investigating some problems

- that encumber ELT in an EFL context. *English Today*, 30(2), 33–38.
- Alvarez-Cáccamo, C. (1990, August). Rethinking conversational code-switching: Codes, speech varieties, and contextualization. In *Annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 16(1), 3–16.
- Alvarez-Cáccamo, C. (1998). From ‘switching code’ to ‘code-switching’: Towards a reconceptualisation of communicative codes. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 29–48). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Alvarez-Cáccamo, C. (1999). Codes. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 9(1–2), 28–31.
- Amir, A. (2013a). *Doing language policy: A micro-interactional study of policy practices in English as a foreign language classes*. (Doctoral dissertation, Linköping University).
- Amir, A. (2013b). Self-policing in the English as a foreign language classroom. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 7(2), 84–105.
- Amir, A., & Musk, N. (2013). Language policing: Micro-level language policy-in-process in the foreign language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, 4(2), 151–167.
- Arminen, I., Koskela, I., & Palukka, H. (2014). Multimodal production of second pair parts in air traffic control training. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 65, 46–62.
- Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Auer, P. (1988). A conversation analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 187–214). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Auer, P. (1992). Introduction: John Gumperz' Approach to contextualization. In P. Auer & A. D. Luzio (Eds.), *The contextualization of language* (pp. 1–37). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 115–135). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, P. (1998). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Auer, P. (2000). Why should we and how can we determine the “base language” of a bilingual conversation? *Estudios de Sociolingüística: Linguas, sociedades e culturas*, 1(1), 129–144.
- Auer, P. (2007). The monolingual bias in bilingualism research, or: Why bilingual talk is (still) a challenge for linguistics. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 319–339). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- aus der Wieschen, M. V., & Sert, O. (2018). Divergent language choices and maintenance of intersubjectivity: The case of Danish EFL young learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–17.
- Bangladesh Bureau of Education Information and Statistics (BANBEIS). (2016). *Bangladesh education statistics 2015*. (Pub. No. 440). Retrieved from <http://data.banbeis.gov.bd/Survey2015.pdf>
- Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS). (2017) *Bangladesh statistics 2017*. Retrieved from http://bbs.portal.gov.bd/sites/default/files/files/bbs.portal.gov.bd/page/a1d32f13_8553_44f1_92e6_8ff80a4ff82e/Bangladesh%20%20Statistics-2017.pdf
- Banu, R., & Sussex, R. (2001a). Code-switching in Bangladesh. *English Today*, 17(2), 51–61.
- Banu, R., & Sussex, R. (2001b). English in Bangladesh after independence: Dynamics of policy and practice. In B. Moore

- (Ed.), *Who's centric now: The present state of post-colonial Englishes* (pp. 122–147). South Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Basu, B. L. (2009). Attitudes and resistance to language variation and change: The case of 'Banglish' on FM radio in Bangladesh. (Unpublished MA dissertation). University of London.
- Basu, B. L. (2016). Ambiguities and tensions in the role and use of English in Bangladesh. *BRAC University Journal*, 11(1), 57–62.
- Bay, B. (2018, January 31). Banglish ban and our dangerous obsession with force. *The Daily Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thedailystar.net/opinion/perspective/banglish-ban-and-our-dangerous-obsession-force-1527367>
- Blatchford, C. H. (1974). Should literature be part of ESOL? *English Teaching Forum*, 12, 46–49.
- Bengali Language Introduction Act, 1987*. (1987:2). Retrieved from website of Coommonwealth Legal Information Institue: http://www.commonlii.org/bd/legis/num_act/blia1987274/http://www.commonlii.org/bd/legis/num_act/blia1987274/
- Bhattacharya, D., & Khan, S. S. (2018). Bangladesh becoming a middle-income country, ceasing to be a least developed country: Clarifying confusion. Dhaka: Centre for Policy Dialogue.
- Billah, M. M. (2011). How English version education going on? *Bangladesh Education Article*. Retrieved 2020 June 29 from <https://bbeduarticle.com/how-english-version-education-going-on/>
- Blom, J. P., & Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code-switching in Norway. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp. 407-434). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bonacina, F. (2010). *A conversation analytic approach to 'practiced language policy': The case of an induction*

- classroom for newly-arrived immigrant children in France*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Edinburgh).
- Bonacina-Pugh, F. (2012). Researching ‘practiced language policies’: Insights from conversation analysis. *Language Policy*, 11(3), 213–234.
- Bonacina, F. (2017). Legitimizing multilingual practices in the classroom: The role of the ‘practiced language policy’. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–15.
- Bonacina, F., & Gafaranga, J. (2011). ‘Medium of instruction’ vs. ‘medium of classroom interaction’: Language choice in a French complementary school classroom in Scotland. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(3), 319–334.
- Brown, H., & Bradford, A. (2016). EMI, CLIL & CBI: Differing approaches and goals. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *Transformation in language education* (pp. 328–334). Tokyo: JALT2016.
- Cammarata, L., & Tedick, D. J. (2012). Balancing content and language in instruction: The experience of immersion teachers. *The Modern Language Journal*, 96(2), 251–269.
- Cenoz, J. (2013). Discussion: Towards an educational perspective in CLIL language policy and pedagogical practice. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(3), 389–394.
- Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2013). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 243–262.
- Choudhury, G. W. (1972). Bangladesh: Why it happened. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*, 48(2), 242–249.
- Clayman, S. E., & Gill, V. T. (2004). Conversation analysis. In M. A. Hardy & A. Bryman (Eds.), *Handbook of data analysis* (pp. 589–606). London, UK: Sage.

- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cromdal, J. (2005). Bilingual order in collaborative word processing: On creating an English text in Swedish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(3), 329–353.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms* (Vol. 20). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 182–204.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2007). Introduction. In C. Dalton-Puffer & U. Smit (Eds.), *Empirical perspectives on CLIL classroom discourse* (pp. 7–23). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2013). Content and language integrated learning: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 46, 545–559.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., Llinares, A., Lorenzo, F., & Nikula, T. (2014). “You can stand under my umbrella”: Immersion, CLIL and bilingual education. A response to Cenoz, Genesee & Gorter (2013). *Applied Linguistics*, 35(2), 213–218.
- De Stefani, E., & Gazin, A. D. (2014). Instructional sequences in driving lessons: Mobile participants and the temporal and sequential organization of actions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 65, 63–79.
- Dearden, J. (2015). *English as a medium of instruction - A growing global phenomenon*. London, UK: British Council.
- Dearden, J., & Macaro, E. (2016). Higher education teachers’ attitudes towards English medium instruction: A three-country comparison. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(3), 455–486.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work*:

- Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 3–65). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Duran, D. (2017). *Student-initiated questions in English as a medium of instruction classrooms in a Turkish higher education setting*. (Doctoral dissertation, Hacettepe University, Ankara).
- Edmondson, W. (1995/96). The role of literature in foreign language learning and teaching: Some valid assumptions and invalid arguments. *AILA Review*, 12, 42–55.
- Ensure unitrack edn up to class VIII: Speakers tell discussion. (2009, October 13). *The Daily Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thedailystar.net/news-detail-109687>
- Erling, E., Seargeant, P., Solly, M., Chowdhury, Q. M., & Rahman, S. (2012). Attitudes to English as a language for international development in rural Bangladesh. London, UK: British Council.
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Wagner, J. (2013). Recurring and shared gestures in the L2 classroom: Resources for teaching and learning. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1, 139–161.
- Eurydice: Education Information Network in the European Union. [English]. (2006). *Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at school in Europe*. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission.
- Evnitskaya, N. (2012). *Talking science in a second language: The interactional co-construction of dialogic explanations in the CLIL science classroom*. (Doctoral dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona).
- Evnitskaya, N., & Berger, E. (2017). Learners’ multimodal displays of willingness to participate in classroom interaction in the L2 and CLIL contexts. *Classroom Discourse*, 8(1), 71–94.
- European Commission. (1995, November 29). *White paper on education and training – Teaching and learning – Towards the learning society*. (Pub. No. COM95:590). Retrieved from <http://aei.pitt.edu/1132/>

- Ferdousi, N. (2017, February 21). How far the use of ‘Bangla’ in the court of Bangladesh?. *The Daily Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thedailystar.net/law-our-rights/how-far-the-use-bangla-the-court-bangladesh-1364722>
- Ferguson, G. (2009). What next? Towards an agenda for classroom codeswitching research. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(2), 231–241.
- Gafaranga, J. (1998). *Elements of order in bilingual talk: Kinyarwanda-French language alternation* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Lancaster).
- Gafaranga, J. (1999). Language choice as a significant aspect of talk organization: The orderliness of language alternation. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 19(2), 201–226.
- Gafaranga, J. (2000). Medium repair vs. other-language repair: Telling the medium of a bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 4(3), 327–350.
- Gafaranga, J. (2005). Demythologising language alternation studies: Conversational structure vs. social structure in bilingual interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(3), 281–300.
- Gafaranga, J. (2007a). Code-switching as a conversational strategy. In P. Auer & Li Wei (Eds.), *Handbook of multilingualism and multilingual communication* (pp. 279–313). New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gafaranga, J. (2007b). *Talk in two languages*. Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gafaranga, J. (2018). Overall order versus local order in bilingual conversation: A conversation analytic perspective on language alternation. In A. Filipi & N. Markee (Eds.), *Conversation analysis and language alternation: Capturing transitions in the classroom* (pp. 35–60). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gafaranga, J., & Torras, M. C. (2001). Language versus medium in the study of bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5(2), 195–219.

- Gafaranga, J., & Torras, M. C. (2002). Interactional otherness: Towards a redefinition of codeswitching. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 6(1), 1–22.
- Gardner, R. (2004). Conversation analysis. In A. Davies & E. Catherine (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 262–284). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967/1984). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Garfinkel, H. (1974). The origins of the term ethnomethodology. In R. Turner (Ed.), *Ethnomethodology: Selected readings* (pp.15–18). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Gierlinger, E. (2015). ‘You can speak German, sir’: On the complexity of teachers’ L1 use in CLIL. *Language and education*, 29(4), 347–368.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Behavior in public places: Notes on the social organization of gatherings*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Goffman, E. (1983). The interaction order: American sociological association, 1982 presidential address. *American Sociological Review*, 48(1), 1–17.
- Goodwin, C. (1979). The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 97–121). New York, NY: Irvington Press.
- Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Goodwin, C. (1986). Gestures as a resource for the organization of mutual orientation. *Semiotica*, 62(1-2), 29–49.
- Goodwin, C. (1994). Professional vision. *American Anthropologist*, 96(3), 606–633.
- Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(10), 1489–1522.

- Goodwin, C. (2002). Time in action. *Current Anthropology*, 43(S4), S19–S35.
- Goodwin, C. (2003). The semiotic body in its environment. *Discourses of the Body*, 19–42.
- Goodwin, C. (2007). Participation, stance and affect in the organization of activities. *Discourse & Society*, 18(1), 53–73.
- Goodwin, C., & Duranti, A. (1992). Rethinking context: An introduction. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context* (pp. 1–42). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19(1), 283–307.
- Gottlieb, M., & G. Ernst-Slavit. (2014). *Academic language in diverse classrooms*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Griest, R. (2015, October 24). Pakistanis demand that their government recognize Bengali as an official language, 1947-1952. Retrieved from website of Global Nonviolent Action Database:
<https://nvdatabase.swarthmore.edu/content/pakistanis-demand-their-government-recognize-bengali-official-language-1947-1952> " \l "case-study-detail
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1992a). Contextualization and understanding. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 229–252). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1992b). Contextualization revisited. In P. Auer & A. D. Luzio (Eds.), *The contextualization of language* (pp.39–53). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Habib, W. B. (2018, July 20). 11-year low: HSC success rate keeps falling thanks to students’ poor performance in English, physics and ICT, strict evaluation. *The Daily Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thedailystar.net/frontpage/11-year-low-1608295>

- Haddington, P., Mondada, L., & Nevile, M. (Eds.). (2013). *Interaction and mobility: Language and the body in motion*. (Vol. 20). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Haider, M. Z., & Chowdhury, T. A. (2012). Repositioning of CLT from curriculum to classroom: A review of the English language instructions at Bangladeshi secondary schools. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(4), 12–22.
- Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own-language use in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 45(3), 271–308.
- Hamid, M. O. (2009). Language policy, culture, and identity in Asian contexts. In A. Tsui & J. Tollefson (Eds.), *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 8(1), 57–61.
- Hamid, M. O. (2010). Globalisation, English for everyone and English teacher capacity: Language policy discourses and realities in Bangladesh, *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 11(4), 289–310.
- Hamid, M. O. (2011). Planning for failure: English and language policy and planning in Bangladesh. In J. A. Fishman & O. Garcia (Eds.), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity: The success-failure continuum in language and ethnic identity efforts* (Vol. 2, pp. 192–203). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hamid, M. O. (2016). The linguistic market for English in Bangladesh. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 17(1), 36–55.
- Hamid, M. O., & Erling, E. J. (2016). English-in-education policy and planning in Bangladesh: A critical examination. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 25–48). Cham: Springer.
- Hamid, M. O., & Jahan, I. (2015). Language, identity, and social divides: Medium of instruction debates in Bangladeshi print media. *Comparative Education Review*, 59(1), 75–101.
- Hamid, M. O., Nguyen, H. T. M., & Baldauf, R. B. (2013). Medium of instruction in Asia: Context, processes and outcomes. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(1), 1–15.

- Hamid, M. O., Jahan, I. & Islam, M. M. (2013). Medium of instruction policies and language practices, ideologies and institutional divides: Voices of teachers and students in a private university in Bangladesh. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(1), 144–163.
- Hanauer, D. I. (2001). The task of poetry reading and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 22, 295–323.
- Hasmi, T. (2019, February 21). Great language movement: Some reflections. *New Age*. Retrieved from <http://www.newagebd.net/article/65465/great-language-movement-some-reflections>
- Hazel, S. (2015). Identities at odds: Embedded and implicit language policing in the internationalized workplace. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 15(1), 141–160.
- Hazel, S., Mortensen, K., & Rasmussen, G. (2014). Introduction: A body of resources – CA studies of social conduct. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 65, 1–9.
- HC refuses to recognise English as second language. (2019, April 21). *The Daily Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thedailystar.net/country/news/hc-refuses-recognise-english-second-language-1732939>
- HC rules on use of Bangla everywhere. (2014, February 17). *Dhaka Tribune*. Retrieved from <https://www.dhakatribune.com/uncategorized/2014/02/17/hc-rules-on-use-of-bangla-everywhere>
- Heap, J. L. (1997). Conversation analysis methods in researching language and education. In N. H. Hornberger & D. Corson (Eds), *Encyclopedia of language and education*. (Vol 8, pp. 217–225). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Heath, C. (1984). Talk and reciprocity: Sequential organization in speech and body movement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 247–265). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Heath, C. (1986). *Body movement and speech in medical interaction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, C. (1992). Gesture's discreet tasks: Multiple relevancies in visual conduct and in the contextualisation of language. In P. Auer & A. D. Luzio (Eds.), *The contextualization of language* (pp. 101–127). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London: Longman.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Heritage, J. (2009). Conversation analysis as social theory. In B. S. Turner (Ed.), *The new blackwell companion to social theory*, (2nd ed., pp. 300–320). New York, NY: Wiley Blackwell.
- Heritage, J. (2010). Conversation analysis: Practices and methods. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative sociology*, (3rd ed., pp. 208–230). New York, NY: Sage.
- Hoque, M. E. (2008). *English language teaching and learning at the alim level in the madrasahs in Bangladesh: Problems and possible solutions*. (Unpublished MA dissertation, Jahagirnagar University, Dhaka).
- Hossain, T., & Tollefson, J. W. (2007). Language policy in education in Bangladesh. In A. B. Tsui & J. W. Tollefson (Eds.), *Language policy, culture and identity in Asian contexts* (pp. 241–258). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Hutchins, E., & Nomura, S. (2011). Collaborative construction of multimodal utterances. In J. Streeck, C. Goodwin & C. LeBaron (Eds.), *Embodied Interaction. Language and body in the material world* (pp. 29–43). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1974/2003). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. London, UK: Routledge.

- Imam, S. R. (2005). English as a global language and the question of nation-building education in Bangladesh. *Comparative Education*, 41(4), 471–486.
- Islam, M. J., & Ahsan, S. (2011). Use of Bangla in EFL classes: The reaction of the secondary level students and the teachers in Bangladesh. *ASA University Review*, 5(2), 197–222.
- Islam, R. (2008). The Bengali Language Movement and emergence of Bangladesh. *Dhaka University Journal of Linguistics*, 1(1), 221–232.
- Islam, S. (2015, December 2). East India Company, The. In S. Islam (Ed.), *Banglapedia: National encyclopedia of Bangladesh*. (2nd ed.). Retrieved from http://en.banglapedia.org/index.php?title=East_India_Company,_The
- Jabeen, M., Chandio, A. A., & Qasim, Z. (2010). Language controversy: Impacts on national politics and secession of East Pakistan. *South Asian Studies*, 25(1), 99–124.
- Jakonen, T. (2016). Managing multiple normativities in classroom interaction: Student responses to teacher reproaches for inappropriate language choice in a bilingual classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 33, 14–27.
- Jakonen, T. (2018). The environment of a bilingual classroom as an interactional resource. *Linguistics and Education*, 44, 20–30.
- Jawhar, S. (2012). *Conceptualising CLIL in a Saudi context: A corpus linguistic and conversation analytic perspective*. (Doctoral dissertation, Newcastle University-upon-Tyne).
- Jefferson, G. (2004). A sketch of some orderly aspects of overlap in natural conversation. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 43–62). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kabir, N. (2019). Reviewing translation and L1 in language pedagogy from translanguaging lenses. *BELTA Journal*. 3(1), 32–46.
- Keevallik, L. (2014). Turn organization and bodily-vocal demonstrations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 65, 103–120.

- Khan, A. (2019, February 19). Towards creating an indigenous legal corpus in Bangla [Interview]. *The Daily Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thedailystar.net/law-our-rights/law-interview/news/towards-creating-indigenous-legal-corpus-bangla-1704238>
- Khan, M. H. (2015). Education commission. In S. Islam (Ed.), *Banglapedia: National encyclopedia of Bangladesh*. (2nd ed.). Retrieved from http://en.banglapedia.org/index.php?title=Education_Commission
- Kramsch, C., & Kramsch, O. (2000). The avatars of literature in language study. *Modern Language Journal*, 84, 553–573.
- Kunitz, S. (2015). Scriptlines as emergent artifacts in collaborative group planning. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 76, 135–149.
- Kääntä, L. (2010). *Teacher turn-allocation and repair practices in classroom interaction: A multisemiotic approach*. (Doctoral dissertation, Univeristy of Jyväskylä, Finland).
- Kääntä, L. (2012). Teachers’ embodied allocations in instructional interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 3(2), 166–186.
- Kääntä, L. (2014). From noticing to initiating correction: Students’ epistemic displays in instructional interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 66, 86–105.
- Kääntä, L. (2015). The multimodal organization of teacher-led classroom interaction. In C. Jenks & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *International perspectives on ELT classroom interaction* (pp. 64–83). Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kääntä, L., & Kasper, G. (2018). Clarification requests as a method of pursuing understanding in CLIL physics lectures. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(3), 205–226.
- Kääntä, L., & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (2013). Manual guiding in peer group interaction: A resource for organizing a practical classroom task. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 46(4), 322–343.

- Kääntä, L., Kasper, G., & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (2018). Explaining Hooke's law: Definitional practices in a CLIL physics classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(5), 694–717.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2013). The use of the L1 in CLIL classes: The teachers' perspective. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 6(2), 1–21.
- Laupenmühlen, J. (2012). Making the most of L1 in CL(1+2)IL. In D. Marsh & O. Meyer (Eds.), *Quality interfaces examining evidence & exploring solution in CLIL* (Vol. 4, pp. 237–251). Eichstaett, Germany: Eichstaett Academic Press.
- Lauzon, V. F., & Berger, E. (2015). The multimodal organization of speaker selection in classroom interaction. *Linguistics and Education*, 31, 14–29.
- Lazar, G. (1993). *Literature and language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lehti-Eklund, H. (2012). Code-switching to first language in repair - A resource for students' problem solving in a foreign language classroom. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 17(2), 132–152.
- Li Wei. (1998). The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 156–176). London, UK: Routledge.
- Li Wei. (2002). 'What do you want me to say?' On the conversation analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in Society*, 31(2), 159–180.
- Li Wei. (2005a). "How can you tell?" Towards a common sense explanation of conversational code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(3), 375–389.
- Li Wei. (2005b). Starting from the right place: Introduction to the special issue on conversational code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(3), 275–279.
- Lin, A. M. (1999). Doing-English-lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds? *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 393–412.

- Lin, A. M. (2013). Classroom code-switching: Three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4(1), 195–218.
- Lin, A. M. (2015). Conceptualising the potential role of L1 in CLIL. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(1), 74–89.
- Llinares, A. (2015). Integration in CLIL: A proposal to inform research and successful pedagogy. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(1), 58–73.
- Lo, Y. Y. (2015). How much L1 is too much? Teachers' language use in response to students' abilities and classroom interaction in content and language integrated learning. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(3), 270–288.
- Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (Vol. 5, pp. 63–84). Boston, MA: Springer.
- Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring 'optimal' use. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 35–49). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Macaro, E. (2019). Exploring the role of language in English medium instruction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 1–14.
- Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching*, 51(1), 36–76.
- Majlesi, A. R. (2014a). Finger dialogue: The embodied accomplishment of learnables in instructing grammar on a worksheet. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 64, 35–51.
- Majlesi, A. R. (2014b). *Learnables in action: The embodied achievement of opportunities for teaching and learning in Swedish as a second language classrooms*. (Doctoral dissertation; Linköping University).

- Majlesi, A. R. (2015). Matching gestures - Teachers' repetitions of students' gestures in second language learning classrooms. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 76, 30–45.
- Mandelbaum, J. (1990). Beyond mundane reason: Conversation analysis and context. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 24(1-4), 333–350.
- Marsh, D. (2006, March). English as medium of instruction in the new global linguistic order: Global characteristics, local consequences. In S. M. Stewart, J. E. Olearski & D. Thompson (Eds.), *METSMaC 2006: Making connections. Proceedings of the second annual conference for Middle East teachers of science, mathematics and computing* (pp. 29–38). Abu Dhabi: METSMaC.
- Marsh, D. (2008). Language awareness and CLIL. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 1986–1999). Boston, MA: Springer.
- Martin, P. W. (1999). Bilingual unpacking of monolingual texts in two primary classrooms in Brunei Darussalam. *Language and Education*, 13(1), 38–58.
- McKay, S. (1982). Literature in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 529–536.
- McMillan, B., & M. Turnbull. (2009). Teachers' use of the first language in French immersion: Revisiting a core principle. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp.15–34). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Mehisto, P. (2012). Excellence in bilingual education: A guide for school principals. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ministry of Education. (2007). Moniruzzaman Miah education commission (2003). Retrieved July 23, 2017 from http://old.moedu.gov.bd/old/edu_system__edu_commission_2003.htm
- Ministry of Education. (2010). *National education policy: 2010*. Retrieved from

- <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/02.National-Education-Policy-2010-English.pdf>
- Ministry of Primary and Mass Education. (2015, May). *Bangladesh: Education for all 2015 national review*. Retrieved from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000230507>
- Mondada L. (2007a). Bilingualism and the analysis of talk at work: Code-switching as a resource for the organization of action and interaction. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 297–318). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mondada, L. (2007b). Multimodal resources for turn-taking: Pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers. *Discourse Studies*, 9(2), 194–225.
- Mondada, L. (2008). Using video for a sequential and multimodal analysis of social interaction: Videotaping institutional telephone calls. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 9(3).
- Mondada, L. (2011). Understanding as an embodied, situated and sequential achievement in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(2), 542–552.
- Mondada, L. (2013). Video as a tool in sociology and anthropology. In C. Müller, A. Cienki, E. Fricke, S. Ladewig, D. McNeill & S. Tessendorf (Eds.), *Body, language, communication: An international handbook on multimodality in human interaction* (Vol. 1, pp. 978–988). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Mondada, L. (2014a). The local constitution of multimodal resources for social interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 65, 137–156.
- Mondada, L. (2014b). Pointing, talk, and the bodies: Reference and joint attention as embodied interactional achievements. In M. Seyfeddinipur & M. Gullberg (Eds.), *From gesture in conversation to visible action as utterance: Essays in honor of Adam Kendon* (pp. 95–124). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

- Mondada, L. (2016). Challenges of multimodality: Language and the body in social interaction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 20(3), 336–366.
- Mondada, L. (2018). The multimodal interactional organization of tasting: Practices of tasting cheese in gourmet shops. *Discourse Studies*, 20(6), 743–769.
- Mondada, L. (2019). Rethinking bodies and objects in social interaction: A multimodal and multisensorial approach to tasting. In U. T. Kissmann & J. van Loon (Eds.), *Discussing New Materialism* (pp. 109–134). Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer.
- Moore, E., & Dooly, M. (2010). “How do the apples reproduce (themselves)?” How teacher trainees negotiate language, content, and membership in a CLIL science education classroom at a multilingual university. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 9(1), 58–79.
- Mortensen, K. (2009). Establishing reciprocity in pre-beginning position in the second language classroom. *Discourse Processes*, 46(5), 491–515.
- Mortensen, K. (2011). Doing word explanation in interaction. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 135–162). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa.
- Mortensen, K. (2012). Conversation analysis and multimodality. In J. Wagner & K. Mortensen (Eds.), *Conversation analysis and applied linguistics. The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mott MacDonald. (2020). English in Action: Bringing Bangladesh into the global conversation. Retrieved from <https://www.camb-ed.com/article/215/english-in-action>
- Mousumi, M. A., & Kusakabe, T. (2017a). Proliferating English-medium schools in Bangladesh and their educational significance among the “Clientele”. *Journal of International Development and Cooperation*, 23(1&2), 1–13.

- Mousumi, M. A., & Kusakabe, T. (2017b) The dynamics of supply and demand chain of English-medium schools in Bangladesh, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 15(5), 679–693.
- Musk, N. (2006). *Performing bilingualism in Wales with the spotlight on Welsh: A study of language policy and the language practices of young people in bilingual education*. (Doctoral dissertation, Linköping University).
- Musk, N., & Cromdal, J. (2018) Analysing bilingual talk: Conversation analysis and language alternation. In A. Filipi & N. Markee (Eds.), *Conversation analysis and language alternation: Capturing transitions in the classroom* (Vol. 295, pp. 15–34). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993a). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993b). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C., & Bolonyai, A. (2001). Calculating speakers: Codeswitching in a rational choice model. *Language in Society*, 30(1), 1–28.
- Naik, P. N. R. (2018, February 22). The importance of learning English in Bangladesh. *The Daily Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thedailystar.net/opinion/society/news/the-importance-learning-english-bangladesh-1677028>
- Nasreen, M., Maleque, A., Chakraborti, E., & Akhter, S. (2018). *Bangladesh and global studies: Class 3*. (2nd ed). Dhaka: National Curriculum and Textbook Board [NCTB].
- Navés, T. (2009). Effective content and language integrated learning (CLIL) programmes. In Y. R. de Zarobe & R. M. Jiménez Catalán (Eds.), *Content and language integrated learning: Evidence from research in Europe* (pp. 22–40). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Nawaz, A. (2016, May 9). Tribal languages. In S. Islam (Ed.), *Banglapedia: National encyclopedia of Bangladesh*. (2nd ed.). Retrieved from http://en.banglapedia.org/index.php?title=Tribal_Languages

- Nevile, M. (2015). The embodied turn in research on language and social interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 48, 121–151.
- Nevile, M., Haddington, P., Heinemann, T., & Rauniomaa, M. (Eds.). (2014a). *Interacting with objects: Language, materiality, and social activity*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Nevile, M., Haddington, P., Heinemann, T., & Rauniomaa, M. (2014b). Towards an interactional ecology of objects. In M. Nevile, P. Haddington, T. Heinemann & M. Rauniomaa (Eds.), *Interacting with objects: Language, materiality, and social activity* (pp. 3–26). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Nikula, T. (2005). English as an object and tool of study in classrooms: Interactional effects and pragmatic implications. *Linguistics and Education*, 16(1), 27–58.
- Nikula, T. (2017). CLIL: A European approach to bilingual education. *Second and Foreign Language Education*, 111–124.
- Nikula, T., Dalton-Puffer, C., & García, A. L. (2013). CLIL classroom discourse: Research from Europe. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1(1), 70–100.
- Nilep, C. (2006). “Code switching” in sociocultural linguistics. *Colorado Research in Linguistics*, 19(1), 1–22.
- Outstanding success in PECE of a rural English version school. (2016, January 3). *The Daily Sun*. Retrieved from <https://www.daily-sun.com/arcprint/details/103882/2016/01/03/Outstanding-success-in-PECE-of-a-rural-English-version-school-/2016-01-03>
- Paran, A. (2008). The role of literature in instructed foreign language learning and teaching. *Language Teaching*, 41, 465–496.
- Parsons, T. (1937). *The structure of social action*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

- Parvez, S. (2009). Bangladesh (orthographic projection) [Stock image]. Wikimedia. Retrieved 2018, December 4 from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Bangladesh_%28orthographic_projection%29.svg
- Pekarek-Doehler, S., & Ziegler, G. (2007). Doing language, doing science and the sequential organization of the immersion classroom. In Z. Hua, P. Seedhouse, Li Wei & V. Cook (Eds.), *Language learning and teaching as social inter-action* (pp. 72–86). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pike, K. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behaviour*. The Hague: Mouton.
- PM urges judges to deliver verdicts in Bangla. (2019, February 22). *Daily Sun*. Retrieved from <https://www.daily-sun.com/post/373019/2019/02/22/PM-urges-judges-to-deliver-verdicts-in-Bangla>
- Policy for English medium schools a must. (2005, April 5). *bdnews24.com*. Retrieved from <https://bdnews24.com/bangladesh/2005/04/05/policy-for-english-medium-schools-a-must>
- Poor show in English does the damage: HSC pass rate drops to 66pc; number of GPA-5 achievers also falls. (2017, July 24). *The Daily Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thedailystar.net/frontpage/hsc-examination-result-2017-bd-new-method-english-behind-poor-show-1437694>
- Poplack, S. (1980). ‘Sometimes I’ll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL’: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18, 581–618.
- Probyn, M. (2009). ‘Smuggling the vernacular into the classroom’: Conflicts and tensions in classroom codeswitching in township/rural schools in South Africa. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(2), 123–136.
- Probyn, M. (2019). Pedagogical translanguaging and the construction of science knowledge in a multilingual South African classroom: Challenging monoglossic/post-colonial orthodoxies. *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3–4), 216–236.

- Psathas, G. (1990). *Interaction competence*. Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. London, UK: Sage.
- Qudrat-e-Khuda, M., Khan, M. F., Ahmed, M. U., Hossain, M. M., Safa, M. N., Sattar, M. A., ... Khan, M. A. (1974). *Bangladesh education comission report*. Dhaka: BANBEIS. Retrieved from http://lib.banbeis.gov.bd/BANBEIS_PDF/BANGLADESH%20EDUCATION%20COMMISSION%20REPORT%20%20-1974.pdf
- Rahman, A. (2000). *English language teacher education in Bangladesh: Towards an alternative paradigm*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of London).
- Rahman, A. (2015). Secondary English education in Bangladesh. In B. Spolsky & K. Sung (Eds.), *Secondary school English education in Asia: From policy to practice*. Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- Rahman, M. (2019a, April 17). HC moved to have second language status for English. *Dhaka Tribune*. Retrieved 29 June, 2020 from <https://www.dhakatribune.com/bangladesh/court/2019/04/17/hc-moved-to-have-second-language-status-for-english>
- Rahman, M. (2019b, April 21). HC scraps petition seeking second language status for English. *Dhaka Tribune*. Retrieved 29 June, 2020 from <https://www.dhakatribune.com/bangladesh/court/2019/04/21/hc-scraps-petition-seeking-second-language-status-for-english>
- Rahman, M. M., & Pandian, A. (2018). A critical investigation of English language teaching in Bangladesh: Unfulfilled expectations after two decades of communicative language teaching. *English Today*, 34(3), 43–49.
- Rahman, M. M., Islam, M. S., Karim, A., Chowdhury, T. A., Rahman, M. M., Seraj, P. M. I., & Singh, M. K. M. (2019). English language teaching in Bangladesh today: Issues,

- outcomes and implications. *Language Testing in Asia*, 9(9), 1–14.
- Rahman, M. O., & Islam, M. T. (2009). Universal primary education for all towards Millennium Development Goal 2: Bangladesh perspective. *Journal of Health Management*, 11(2), 405–418.
- Rahman, T. (1995). *Language planning and politics in Pakistan*. Islamabad, Pakistan: Sustainable Development Policy Institute.
- Raidió Teilifís Éireann. (2012, February 17). ‘Banglish’ banned on Bangladeshi broadcasts. *RTE*. Retrieved from <https://www.rte.ie/news/special-reports/2012/0217/312521-bangladesh/>
- Rawls, A. W. (2008). Harold Garfinkel, ethnomethodology and workplace studies. *Organization Studies*, 29(5), 701–732.
- Riaz, A. (2015). Bangladesh. In N. DeVatta (Ed.), *An introduction to South Asian politics*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Riaz, A. (2016). *Bangladesh: A political history since independence*. New York, NY: I. B. Tauris.
- Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Actions* (pp.21–27). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1992a). *Lectures on conversation*. Vol. 1. In G. Jefferson (Ed.), Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H. (1992b). *Lectures on conversation*. Vol. 2. In G. Jefferson (Ed.), Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. In *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 7–55). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Scarcella, R. (2003). *Academic English: A conceptual framework*. Retrieved from University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6pd082d4>

- Schegloff, E. A. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: Formulating place. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Syntax in social interaction*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1984). On some gesture's relation to talk. In J. Maxwell & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 266–296). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1988). Presequences and indirection: Applying speech act theory to ordinary conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12, 55–62.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). On talk and its institutional occasions. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp.101–134). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2006). Interaction: The infrastructure for social institutions, the natural ecological niche for language, and the arena in which culture is enacted. In N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction* (pp.70–96). Oxford, UK: Berg.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis* (Vol 1). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2010). Commentary on Stivers and Rossano: “Mobilizing response”. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43(1), 38–48.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289–327.
- Schiffman, H. F. (1996). *Linguistic culture and language policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sebba, M. (1998). A congruence approach to the syntax of codeswitching. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 2(1), 1–19.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*, 38(4), 165–187.
- Seedhouse, P. (2011). Conversation analytic research into language teaching and learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *The handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 345–363). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sert, O. (2013). ‘Epistemic status check’ as an interactional phenomenon in instructed learning settings. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 45(1), 13–28.
- Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Sert, O., & Jacknick, C. M. (2015). Student smiles and the negotiation of epistemics in L2 classrooms. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 77, 97–112.
- Sert, O., & Walsh, S. (2013). The interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. *Language and Education*, 27(6), 542–565.
- Shaon, A. I. (2018, February 21). Bangla still ignored in court. *Dhaka Tribune*. Retrieved from <https://www.dhakatribune.com/bangladesh/court/2018/02/21/bangla-still-ignored-court>
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Smit, U., & Dafouz, E. (2012). Integrating content and language in higher education: An introduction to English-medium policies, conceptual issues and research practices across Europe. *AILA Review*, 25, 1–12.
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2005) Language policy. In J. Cohen, K. T. McAlister, K. Rolstad, & J. MacSwan (Eds.), *ISB4: Proceedings of the 4th international symposium on bilingualism* (pp. 2152-2164). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

- Spolsky, B. (2007). Towards a theory of language policy. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 22(1), 1–14.
- Spolsky, B. (2008). Investigating language education policy. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., Vol.10, pp. 27–39). New York, NY: Springer.
- Spolsky, B. (2017) Language policy in education: Practices, ideology, and management. In T. McCarty & S. May (Eds.), *Language policy and political issues in education. Encyclopedia of language and education* (3rd ed., pp. 3–16). Cham: Springer.
- Spolsky, B. & Shohamy, E. (2000). Language practice, language ideology, and language policy. In R. D. Lambert & E. Shohamy (Eds.), *Language policy and pedagogy: Essays in honour of A. Ronald Walton* (pp.1–41). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- St. John, O. (2014). *Approaching classroom interaction dialogically: Studies of everyday encounters in a ‘bilingual’ secondary school*. (Doctoral dissertation, Örebro University).
- St. John, O., & Cromdal, J. (2016). Crafting instructions collaboratively: Student questions and dual addressivity in classroom task instructions. *Discourse Processes*, 53(4), 252–279.
- Stoewer, K. (2018a). *English Hemspråk: Language in interaction in English mother tongue instruction in Sweden*. (Doctoral dissertation, Linköping University).
- Stoewer, K. (2018b). What is it in Swedish? Translation requests as a resource for vocabulary explanation in English mother tongue instruction. In A. Filipi & N. Markee (Eds.), *Conversation analysis and language alternation: Capturing transitions in the classroom* (pp.83–106). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stoewer, K., & Cromdal, J. (in press). “Doing Spelling” in bilingual classroom interaction: The multimodal organization of spelling rounds in English mother tongue instruction.

- Stoewer, K., & Musk, N. (2018). Impromptu vocabulary work in English mother tongue instruction. *Classroom Discourse*, 1–28.
- Streeck, J., Goodwin, C., & LeBaron, C. (Eds.). (2011). *Embodied interaction, language and body in the material world*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Stukenbrock, A. (2014). Take the words out of my mouth: Verbal instructions as embodied practices. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 65, 80–102.
- Sultana, N. (2018). Test review of the English public examination at the secondary level in Bangladesh. *Language Testing in Asia*, 8(16), 1–9.
- Sultana, S. (2012a). Problematising the popular discourses about language and identity of young adults in Bangladesh. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 18(4).
- Sultana, S. (2012b). Young adults’ linguistic manipulation of English in Bangla in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 17(1), 74–89.
- Sultana, S. (2013). *Transglossic language practices: Young adults transgressing language and identity in Bangladesh*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Technology, Sydney).
- Sultana, S. (2014). English as a medium of instruction in Bangladesh’s higher education: Empowering or disadvantaging students? *Asian EFL Journal*. 16(1), 11–52.
- Swedish Research Council [Swedish: Vetenskapsrådet]. (2017). *Good research practice*. Stockholm: Swedish Research Council.
- Sylvén, L. K. (2004). *Teaching in English or English teaching? On the effects of content and language integrated learning on Swedish learners’ incidental vocabulary acquisition*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Gothenburg).
- Tahereen, T. (2016). Banglish: Code-switching and contact induced language change in a 143 Spoken variety of Bangla. *Spectrum*. 12. 143–164.

- Tavares, N. J. (2015). How strategic use of L1 in an L2-medium mathematics classroom facilitates L2 interaction and comprehension. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(3), 319–335.
- ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- The State Language*. (1972:3). Retrieved from website of Legislative and Parliamentary Affairs Division: <http://bdlaws.minlaw.gov.bd/act-367/section-24550.html>
- Ting, Y. L. T. (2010). CLIL appeals to how the brain likes its information: Examples from CLIL-(neuro)science. *International CLIL Research Journal* 1(3), 3–18.
- UNESCO Institute of Statistics. (2020) *Bangladesh: Education and literacy*. Retrieved from <http://uis.unesco.org/en/country/bd?theme=education-and-literacy>
- United News Bangladesh. (2018, September 15). Human dev index: Bangladesh 3 notches up. Still behind Sri Lanka, Maldives, India, Bhutan. *The Daily Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thedailystar.net/frontpage/news/human-dev-index-bangladesh-3-notches-1634152>
- Urmeneta, C. E., & Evnitskaya, N. (2013). Affording students opportunities for the integrated learning of content and language. A contrastive study on classroom interactional strategies deployed by two CLIL teachers. In J. Arnau (Ed.), *Reviving Catalan at school: Challenges and instructional approaches* (pp. 158–182). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Üstünel, E. (2004). *The sequential organisation of teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code-switching in a Turkish university EFL setting*. (Doctoral dissertation, Newcastle University-upon-Tyne).
- Üstünel, E. (2016). *EFL Classroom Code-Switching*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- Üstünel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(3), 302–325.
- van Schendel, W. (2006). Guns and gas in southeast asia: Transnational flows in the Burma-Bangladesh borderland. *Kyoto Review of Southeast Asia*. 7. Retrieved from https://pure.uva.nl/ws/files/4149088/153278_290482.pdf
- Vázquez, V.P., & Ordóñez, M. D. C. R. (2019). Describing the use of the L1 in CLIL: An analysis of L1 communication strategies in classroom interaction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(1), 35–48.
- Waring, H. Z., Creider, S. C., & Box, C. D. (2013). Explaining vocabulary in the second language classroom: A conversation analytic account. *Language, Culture and Social Interaction*, 2(4), 249–264.
- Watson, D. R. (1992). Ethnomethodology, conversation analysis and education: An overview. *International Review of Education*, 38(3), 257–274.
- Weinreich, U. (1953/1963). *Language in contact*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1981). The use of literature. In M. Hines & W. Rutherford (Eds.), *On TESOL '81*. Washington: TESOL.
- Yang, W. (2015). Content and language integrated learning next in Asia: Evidence of learners' achievement in CLIL education from a Taiwan tertiary degree programme. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(4), 361–382.
- Yasin, M. (2016, February 21). Bangla yet to be used in judicial work. *The Independent*. Retrieved from <http://www.theindependentbd.com/printversion/details/34714>
- Zimmerman, D. H. (1978). Ethnomethodology. *American Sociologist*, 13(1).

Studies Included in the Thesis

I. Study I

Huq, R., & Cromdal, J. (Submitted). *What topic we've been to?* Progress Reviews in English as Medium of Instruction Classrooms.

II. Study II

Huq, R., Barajas, K. E., & Cromdal, J. (2017). Sparkling, wrinkling, softly tinkling: On poetry and word meaning in a bilingual primary classroom. In A. Bateman & A. Church (Eds.), *Children's Knowledge-in-Interaction* (pp. 189-209). Springer, Singapore.

III. Study III

Huq, R. (2018). Doing English-Only Instructions: A Multimodal Account of Bilingual Bangladeshi Classrooms. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 33, 278-297.

Studies

The studies associated with this thesis have been removed for copyright reasons. For more details about these see:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:liu:diva-172149>

Appendix I: Information Letter to the Students' Parents

[place] [date] [year]

To the parents of pupils in [GRADE] at [SCHOOL] in [CITY], Bangladesh.

At The Department of Educational Practice, Linköping University, Sweden, research is done to increase our knowledge of educational practices, with a particular interest in everyday social interaction. One area of research at the department concerns bilingual educational practices in South Asian Classrooms.

With your due permission, I would like to conduct a study of children's classroom interactions. To gain insight into this, I intend to video-record some of the teaching sessions. The recorded material will be treated confidentially. This means, among other things, that no one outside the project will have access to the tapes, not now or in the future. Moreover, the results will be presented confidentially; all people's names and the school name will be changed when I write about the study, to secure participants' integrity so that it will be impossible to determine who said what. Also, I am bound to ethical guidelines of **Swedish Research Council**. The results will be presented in my doctoral thesis.

Participation in the study is **voluntary**. Participants can choose to discontinue participation at any time.

Notify the teacher or contact me if have questions concerning the study. The study will keep its integrity by maintaining the standard practice and it does not aim at any type of assessment or evaluation, rather an exploratory look into the practices. If you have questions about the study, you are also welcome to contact my academic advisor, **Prof. Jakob Cromdal** (jakob.cromdal@liu.se).

Please fill out the enclosed form and forward it to designated teacher.

Sincerely,

Rizwan-ul Huq
PhD student
Department of Social and Welfare Studies (ISV)
T: (+46) 011-XXX XXX (or) +88-01X XX XX XX XX |
Email: rizwan-ul.huq@liu.se |
Web: www.isv.liu.se
Linköping University 581 83 Sweden.

Appendix II: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I read and understand the letter of consent sent by Rizwan-ul Huq concerning the data collection. I understand that the data will be collected in video and audio format for the purpose of scientific study. I also understand that it will be used for scientific purposes without disclosing any information on child's name, age, place and location of the school. I also understand that the project does not deal with sensitive personal data and the results will be published in scientific papers with illustrations of images of the child. I understand that attending the project is **completely voluntary** and my child can withdraw from it any moment I/the child feel appropriate.

Please fill out the form and forward it to the teacher.

My child
(name) (class)

may/may not participate in the project.

(please circle/tick)

.....
(date)

.....
(signature)

Appendix III: Transcription Key

After Jefferson (2004)

(.)	Indicates elapsed time in speech less than 0.2 seconds.
(0.5)	Indicates elapsed time in speech in tenths of a second.
(xxx)	Crosses in single brackets: Inaccessible, unclear words, each cross representing one syllables.
(word)	Words in single brackets: Uncertain words, observer's guess.
:::	Colons: prolongation or stretching of the previous sound.
(())	Double parenthesis: note on contextual information, transcriber's comments.
w <u>ORd</u>	Underlining: speaker's emphasis on particular syllable by increased loudness or higher pitch.
WORD	All capital letters: exclusively loud sounds than surrounding utterances.
wor–	Dash: cut-off word.
[	Opening square brackets: Opening of overlapping utterances between speakers.
]	Closing square brackets: Closing of overlapping utterances between speakers.
°word°	Encompassing degree signs: quieter sounds than surrounding utterances.
>word<	Encompassing more than and less than signs: Noticeably quicker sound than surrounding utterances.
<word>	Encompassing less than and more than signs: Noticeably slower pace of utterance compared to surrounding utterances.
?	Question mark: rising intonation.
↑↓	Up and down arrows: sharper rise or fall in pitch.
,	Comma: continuing intonation.
.	Full stop: falling terminal intonation.
hhh.	Speaker's out-breath.
.hhh	Speaker's in-breath.
=	Equal sign: latching between utterances.
he he	Laughter.
→	Rightward arrow: marking a key point for analytical purpose.
<i>tahole ki</i>	Words in <i>italics</i> and bold : Code-switching in Bengali within turn.
then what	Literal word-by-word translation.
what's this?	Pragmatic English translation.

Multimodal notations

After Mondada (2018, 2019)

**	Asterisks: First speaker's gestures and multimodal actions showing exact place of initiations and terminations.
++	Plus signs: Second speaker's gestures and multimodal actions showing exact place of initiations and terminations.
*--->	Asterisk followed by dash signs and one more than sign: gesture continues across the line.
*-->>	Asterisk followed by dash signs and two more than signs: gesture continues until the end.
--->*	Dash signs followed by more than sign and asterisk: gesture continues until this end.
>>-	Two more than signs followed by a dash: Gesture begins before the beginning.
.....	Dots: gestures' preparation.
- - - -	Dash signs: gesture's apex reached and maintained.
,,,,,,,,,,	Comma: gesture's retraction.
kabir	Participant's name in small case: participant's multimodal actions.
fig/img	Denotes insertion of figures or image.
#	Hash tag sign: position of an image within a turn at talk.
WH	Whiteboard.

LINKÖPING STUDIES IN PEDAGOGIC PRACTICES

1. MARKSTRÖM, ANNE-MARIE. Förskolan som normaliseringspraktik. En etnografisk studie. 2005. ISBN 91-85297-70-4.
2. WEDIN ANN-SOFI, Lärares arbete och kunskapsbildning. Utmaningar och inviter i den vardagliga praktiken. 2007. ISBN 978-91-85715-63-3.
3. BRÜDE SUNDIN, JOSEFIN. En riktig rektor. Om ledarskap, genus och skolkulturer. 2007. ISBN 978-91-85715-62-6.
4. HELLBERG, KRISTINA. Elever på ett anpassat individuellt gymnasieprogram: skolvardag och vändpunkter. 2007. ISBN 978-91-85831-92-0.
5. SPARRLÖF, GÖRAN. Vi manliga lärare Folkskolans lärare och lärarinnor i kamp om löner och arbetsvillkor 1920-1963. 2007. ISBN 978-91-85831-38-8.
6. KARLSSON, YVONNE. Att inte vilja vara problem - social organisering och utvärdering av elever i en särskild undervisningsgrupp. 2008. ISBN 978-91-85895-28-1.
7. OLSON, MARIA. Från nationsbyggare till global marknadsnomad. Om medborgarskapet i svensk utbildningspolitik under 1990-talet. 2008. ISBN 978-91-7393-890-7.
8. AYTON, KATARINA. An ordinary school child: Agency and authority in children's schooling. 2008. ISBN 978-91-7393-834-1.
9. BOLANDER, EVA. Risk och bejakande. Sexualitet och genus i sexualupplysning och undervisning i TV. 2009. ISBN 978-91-7393-685-9.
10. JOHNSON HARRIE, ANNA. Staten och läromedlen. En studie av den svenska statliga förhandsgranskningen av läromedel 1938-1991. 2009. ISBN 978-91-7393-616-3.
11. HÖGBERG, RONNY. Motstånd och konformitet. Om manliga yrkeselevers liv och identitetsskapande i relation till kärnämnen. 2009. ISBN 978-91-7393-543-2.
12. HEGENDER, HENRIK. Mellan akademi och profession. Hur lärarkunskap formuleras och bedöms i verksamhetsförlagd lärarutbildning. 2010. ISBN 978-91-7393-526-5.
13. SEVERINSSON, SUSANNE. Unga i normalitetens gränsland: Undervisning och behandling i särskilda undervisningsgrupper och hem för vård eller boende. 2010. ISBN 978-91-7393-402-2.
14. WIDÉN, PÄR. Bedömningsmakten. Berättelser om stat, lärare och elev, 1960-1995. 2010. ISBN 978-91-7393-372-8.
15. SANDLUND, MONICA. Lärare med utländsk bakgrund. Sju yrkeslivsberättelser om möten med nya skolsammanhang. 2010. ISBN 978-91-7393-371-1.
16. LILJA, PATRIK. Contextualizing inquiry. Negotiations of tasks, tools and actions in an upper secondary classroom. 2012. ISBN 978-91-7346-735-3
17. FREDRIKSSON, KRISTINA (Licentiatavhandling). Drama som pedagogisk möjlighet. En intervjustudie med lärare i grundskolan. 2013. ISBN 978-91-7519-613-8

18. BENGTTSSON, JENNY. Jag sa att jag älskade han men jag har redan sagt förlåt för det. Ålder, genus och sexualitet i skolans tidigare år. 2013. ISBN 978-91-7519-560-5
19. SÖDERMAN LAGO, LINA. "Mellanklass kan man kalla det": Om tid och meningsskapande vid övergången från förskoleklass till årskurs ett. 2014. ISBN 978-91-7519-349-6
20. STENLIDEN, LINNÉA. Visual Storytelling Interacting in School. 2014. ISBN: 978-91-7519-338-0
21. ELFSTRÖM PETERSSON, KATARINA (Licentiatavhandling). Playing a part in preschool documentation – A study of how participation is enacted preschool documentation practices and how it is affected by material agents. 2014. ISBN: 978-91-7519-339-7
22. DALGREN, SARA (Licentiatavhandling). Förskolans pedagogiska praktik som interaktion. Frågor och svar i vardagliga förskoleaktiviteter. 2014. ISBN: 978-91-7519-262-8
23. HJORT, SIMON (Licentiatavhandling). Kritiskt tänkande i klassrummet. En studie av didaktiska val och manifesterat kritiskt tänkande i samhällskunskaps- och filosofiundervisning. 2014. ISBN: 978-91-7519-166-9
24. BOO, SOFIA (Licentiatavhandling). Lärares arbete med individanpassning. Strategier och dilemman i Klassrummet. 2014. ISBN: 978-91-7519-157-7
25. JOHANSSON, MARITHA. Läsa, förstå, analysera. En komparativ studie om svenska och franska gymnasieelevers reception av en narrativ text. 2015. ISBN: 978-91-7685-964-3
26. NORBURG, ULRIKA. Fängelse, skola uppfostringsanstalt eller skyddshem? Åkerbrukskolonien Hall för pojkar år 1876-1940. 2015. ISBN: 978-91-7685980-3
27. ALBINSSON, ANDERS. "De var svinhögt typ 250 kilo". Förskolebarns mätande av längd, volym och tid i legoleken. 2016. ISBN: 978-91-7685-828-8
28. WINZELL, HELEN (Licentiatavhandling). Svensklärares skrivdidaktiska kunskapsbildning: Blivande och tidigt verksamma gymnasie lärare i svenska talar om skrivundervisning. 2016. ISBN: 978-91-7685-788-5
29. BODÉN, LINNEA. Present absences. Exploring the posthumanist entanglements of school absenteeism. 2016. ISBN: 978-91-7685-722-9
30. DALGREN, SARA. Att göra pedagogisk praktik tillsammans: Socialt samspel i förskolans vardag. 2017. ISBN: 978-91-7685-593-5
31. ELFSTRÖM PETERSSON, KATARINA. Productions and Products of Preschool. Documentation. Entanglements of children, things, and templates. 2017. ISBN: 978-91-7685-553-9
32. HARLING, MARTIN. Välja vara. En studie om gymnasieval, mässor och kampen om framtiden. 2017. ISBN: 978-91-7685-549-2
33. MARTÍN-BYLUND, ANNA. Towards a minor bilingualism: Exploring variations of language and literacy with early childhood education. 2017. ISBN: 978-91-7685-478-5
34. WALLNER, LARS. Framing Education: Doing Comics Literacy in the Classroom. 2017. ISBN: 978-91-7685-419-8
35. WINZELL, HELEN. Lära för skrivundervisning. En studie om skrivdidaktisk kunskap i ämneslärautbildningen och läraryrket. 2018. ISBN: 978-91-7685-179-1
36. STOEWER, KIRSTEN. English Hemspråk. Language in Interaction in English Mother Tongue Instruction in Sweden. 2018. ISBN: 978-91-7685-182-1

37. ROSTEDT, JOSEFIN (Licentiatavhandling). Förskollärare planerar barns möten med matematik: Ett reflektivt skoldidaktiskt perspektiv. 2019. ISBN: 978-91-7685-035-0
38. SKILLERMARK, STINA-KARIN. Nya perspektiv på litteraturhistoria: Utbildningsprogram om antiken, romantiken och Strindberg 1960-2012 2020. ISBN: 978-91-7929-831-9
39. WIDHOLM, TOMAS (IKOS). Läromedel i praktiken. Läromedelsbruk i religionskunskap på gymnasieskolan. ISBN: 978-91-7929-781-7

LINKÖPING STUDIES IN EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

1. SUSANNE SEVERINSSON (2010). *Unga i normalitetens gränsländ: Undervisning och behandling i särskilda undervisningsgrupper och hem för vård eller boende.* (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7393-402-2
2. KRISTINA FREDRIKSSON (2013). *Drama som pedagogisk möjlighet. En intervjustudie med lärare i grundskolan.* (Lic) ISBN: 978-91-7519-613-8
3. JENNY BENGTTSSON (2013). *Jag sa att jag älskade han men jag har redan sagt förlåt för det. Ålder, genus och sexualitet i skolans tidigare år.* (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7519-560-5
4. KATARINA ELFSTRÖM PETERSSON (2013). *Playing a part in preschool documentation – A study of how participation is enacted in preschool documentation practices and how it is affected by material agents.* (Lic) ISBN: 978-91-7519-339-7
5. LINA LAGO (2014). *"Mellanklass kan man kalla det": Om tid och meningsskapande vid övergången från förskoleklass till årskurs ett.* (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7519-349-6
6. LINNEA STENLIDEN (2014). *Visual Storytelling Interacting in School. Learning Conditions in the Social Science Classroom.* (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7519-338-0
7. SARA DALGREN (2014). *Förskolans pedagogiska praktik som interaktion. Frågor och svar i vardagliga förskoleaktiviteter.* (Lic) ISBN: 978-91-7519-262-8
8. MATS BEVEMYR (2014). *Potentiella lärandesituationer och vardagliga matematiska begrepp. 4-5 åriga barns interaktion vid datorn under fri lek i förskolan.* (Lic) ISBN: 978-91-7519-259-8
9. ANDERS ALBINSSON (2015). *"De var svinhögt typ 250 kilo" Förskolebarns mätande av längd, volym och tid i legoleken.* (Lic) ISBN: 978-91-7685-828-8
10. LINNEA BODÉN (2016). *Present absences. Exploring the posthumanist entanglements of school absenteeism.* (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7685-722-9.

11. SARA DALGREN (2017). *Att göra pedagogisk praktik tillsammans: Socialt samspel i förskolans vardag*. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7685-593-5
12. KATARINA ELFSTRÖM PETTERSSON (2017). *Production and Products of Preschool Documentation. Entanglements of children, things, and templates*. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7685-553-9
13. MARTIN HARLING (2017). *Välja vara: En studie om gymnasieval, mässor och kampen om framtiden*. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7685-549-2
14. ANNA MARTIN-BYLUND (2017). *Towards a minor bilingualism: Exploring variations of language and literacy in early childhood education*. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7685-478-5
15. LARS WALLNER (2017). *Framing Education: Doing Comics Literacy in the Classroom*. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7685-419-8
16. KIRSTEN STOEWER (2018). *English Hemspråk. Language in Interaction in English Mother Tongue Instruction in Sweden*. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN 978-91-7685-182-1
17. JOSEFIN ROSTEDT (2019). *Förskollärare planerar barns möten med matematik: Ett reflektivt skoldidaktiskt perspektiv*. (Lic) ISBN
18. RIZWAN-UL HUQ (2021). *Monolingual Policy, Bilingual Interaction: English-taught Education in Bangladesh*. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7929-721-3

FACULTY OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

Linköping Studies in Pedagogic Practices No. 40
Linköping Studies in Education and Social Sciences No. 18
Department of Behavioural Sciences and Learning (IBL)

Linköping University
SE-581 83 Linköping, Sweden

www.liu.se