

Constructing and positioning oneself bilingual:

*Code-switching in classroom interactions of
two Turkish-Norwegian fifth-graders*

Svitlana Kucherenko



Master of Philosophy in Comparative and International
Education, Institute of Educational Research

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

October 2011

Constructing and positioning oneself bilingual:

Code-switching in classroom interactions
of two Turkish-Norwegian fifth-graders

Svitlana Kucherenko

© Svitlana Kucherenko

2011

Constructing and positioning oneself bilingual: *Code-switching in classroom interactions of two Turkish-Norwegian fifth-graders*

Svitlana Kucherenko

<http://www.duo.uio.no/>

Print: Reprosentralen, Universitetet i Oslo

Abstract

This case-study compares the language use of two Turkish-Norwegian fifth-graders, examining how they utilize their bilingual resources in order to position themselves as learning and social individuals. A common perception of bilingualism as a mental quality of an individual often results in measurement of the bilingual practices in accordance to monolingual criteria. Thus, the fact that bilinguals daily appear to be a part of a setting with two or more languages present, often remains ignored.

Building on a social constructivist perspective, with bilingualism perceived as a social feature of an individual, the in-depth analysis of 14 interactional episodes will provide a comparison of how the two target-children use code-switching as a valuable resource in subject related context and in informal peer interactions.

The video observations of the classroom interactions providing the basis for the discussion are a part of a large-scale study on reading comprehension, conducted in a number of Norwegian schools with a large share of minority students – “Classroom discourse and text comprehension”. The study comes to a conclusion that both target-children use code-switching as a functional and meaningful resource, which allows them to use the entire subject competence in their learning-related interactions and in social negotiation with the peers. Also, despite the similar background and linguistic resources, they tend to have different strategies of utilizing bilingualism in identity negotiation processes. Finally, the study concludes that both girls show flexibility and sensitivity to the context in their language use. The language alternation in their classroom interactions is purposeful, context- and content-dependent.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to acknowledge all the help of my supervisor, Veslemøy Rydland, in the process of preparation of the present thesis. I am extremely grateful for all the inspirational conversations, valuable advice and constructive criticism that guided me in my work. Thank you for being truly interested in my study and encouraging me all the way through it, this meant a whole lot to me!

I want to express my gratitude to Lene Buchert and Wim Hoppers, for their contribution to the course of Master in Comparative and International Education; it was great to be a part of the CIE-class. This learning process was an invaluable experience.

It is people who made the years at the University of Oslo truly great, so I want to say how much I appreciate to get to know all of my fellow peers, people from different countries, with diverse experiences and interests, who inspired me and made me proud to be a part of the group. Thank you for your friendship and your great personalities.

Finally and most importantly, enormous thanks goes to my family and friends for their constant encouragement and support. Thank you for your presence in my life!

Table of content

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Bilingualism as a social act	2
1.2	Why investigate bilinguals' conversations?	4
1.3	Background information on the Turkish immigrant group in Norway	5
1.4	The structure of the study	6
2	Conceptual framework	8
2.1	Introduction	8
2.2	Bilingualism and bilinguals	8
2.3	Double monolingualism or multilingual competence?.....	10
2.4	Language and identity	11
2.5	“Doing being bilingual”.....	13
2.5.1	Languaging.....	13
2.5.2	Alternational and insertional code-switching.....	15
2.5.3	Discourse related and participant related code-switching.....	15
2.5.1	“Footing”	18
2.5.2	“Language mode”.....	18
2.6	Bilingual behavior through the interactional perspective.....	20
2.7	Research questions	22
3	Methodological framework	24
3.1	Initial considerations.....	24
3.1.1	The source of data.	25
3.2	Methodological choices	26
3.2.1	Classroom observations.....	27
3.2.2	The rationale for comparison	28
3.3	Sampling and participants	29
3.3.1	Class 5A	30
3.4	Data-selection and analytic procedures	31
3.4.1	Manual quantifications of initiatives in the interaction.....	33
3.5	Reliability and validity	34
3.5.1	Construct validity	36
3.6	Limitations.....	37

3.7	Ethical considerations.....	37
3.8	Methods of analysis.....	38
3.8.1	Social Constructivist Theory and interaction.....	38
3.8.2	Garfinkel and ethnomethodology.....	39
3.8.3	Conversational Analysis.....	39
3.9	Approaching relevant literature.....	41
4	Analysis.....	43
4.1	The target children: Emine and Yesim.....	43
4.1.1	Yesim.....	44
4.1.2	Emine.....	46
4.1.3	Target children as social and learning individuals.....	48
4.2	How are the two girls similar and different in their relative use of Turkish and Norwegian?.....	50
4.3	What are the similarities and differences in the ways the two girls use their bilingual resources to position themselves in subject related discourse?.....	53
4.4	What are the similarities and differences in the ways the two girls use their bilingual resources to position themselves in informal peer interactions?.....	71
5	Discussion and Conclusions: Bilingual strategies across the contexts.....	91
5.1	Doing being a bilingual fifth-grader.....	91
5.1.1	Similarities and differences in the relative use of Turkish and Norwegian.....	91
5.1.2	Different strategies of using code-switching in the subject related discourse ...	93
5.1.3	Different strategies in the informal peer interactions.....	95
5.1.4	Yesim and Emine’s bilingual strategies across the contexts.....	96
5.2	Concluding remarks and recommendations.....	98
	Literature list.....	100
	Appendix.....	106

1 Introduction

The growth of immigration to Norway starting in the 1960s has contributed to increased linguistic diversity in the country; the number of pupils with a mother tongue other than Norwegian is rapidly increasing nowadays (Bakken, 2007). By January the 1st Statistics Norway (SSB) has registered around 133 000 children with minority background, constituting 12% of all the children and adolescents who are less than 20 years old (SSB, 2011). Many of those are growing up with other linguistic experience than the majority of the children in Norway (Bakken, 2007).

Despite the fact that proficiency in multiple languages is considered as a resource nowadays, certain problems often seem to be attached to the current perception of minority children. Significant differences in terms of academic achievement are reported to take place between pupils with minority background compared to those with a Norwegian background, which is keenly debated within media, academia and civil society (NOU, 2010: 7). Low levels of educational attainment may have significant implications for social cohesion and inclusion, argues Inglis, as they “limit students’ chances to use education as a means for social and economic integration and mobility” (Inglis, 2008: 70). There is a particular concern that the children of immigrants, the so-called “second-generation” are not succeeding as well as they and their families have hoped, and may therefore risk marginalization and social exclusion (Portes, Fernandez-Kelly and Haller, 2005). There is a possibility for increasing this risk if the education system would not be able to offer minority children proper conditions for their linguistic and academic development. The challenge lies then in the development of sound pedagogical conditions to handle this situation (Bakken, 2007). In this regards it is crucial to obtain knowledge about the lived experience of minority children, understand how it is to be growing up bilingual in the Norwegian school setting. The understanding of multilingual matters in school is needed.

This study looks at two Turkish-Norwegian fifth-graders’ everyday language use and compares how they extensively use the two languages available to them for positioning themselves as learning and social individuals in the Norwegian school context. More specifically, I explore how these two girls, who are in many ways similar with respect to their family background, the same multicultural school environment and same neighborhood with high co-ethnic concentration, negotiate their bilingual identities in the everyday classroom

interactions. Both target-children have Turkish as their mother tongue and home-language¹. Turkish is complemented by Norwegian, which mostly appears in conversations with siblings, younger family members and friends, as it is documented in parental questionnaires and interviews with target children. The school domain is dominated by Norwegian language, which is the official language of instruction at school. Additionally, Norwegian is the common language of communication with those classmates, who have the minority background other than Turkish and do not master the Turkish language. Mother tongue instruction and bilingual instruction was offered to all the Turkish-Norwegian pupils of the class throughout the first four years of schooling, meaning that Turkish was also present in the school domain, both in informal communication with other Turkish-speaking children in the class and in formal classroom interactions during mother tongue instruction classes.

The environment around the target-children of the present study suggests that they appear to be in daily contact with two languages, both at home and in the school arena. As Grosjean (1992) formulated, “bilinguals are those who need and use two (or more) languages in their everyday lives.” (p. 51). Thus, the girls are per definition active bilinguals and bilingualism constitutes a part of their ordinary day.

1.1 Bilingualism as a social act

Evaldsson (2003) in her “*Ett vardagsliv med flera språk*” (“An everyday life with multiple languages”) discusses a Swedish debate around bilingualism, referring to it as “integration and mother tongue debate”, which I believe is to a great extent relevant in the Norwegian context, as it is the most discussed current topic concerning minority children in Norway. There exist two polarized positions in this debate: on one side there exists a belief that school has to support and enhance the child’s proficiency in the majority language in order to be able to give equal chances to succeed at school to all the pupils; while on the other side of the debate it is argued for the importance of proper mother tongue instruction offered at school, which is necessary in order to maintain and support the development of the minority child’s personal and cultural identity (Evaldsson, 2003).

Despite the existing consensus among the majority of researchers on the importance of the mother tongue instruction for minority children and, not the least, the agreement on the

¹ The language that is dominating communication at home.

necessity of mother tongue learning for the development of the functional bilingualism among minority children, the role of mother tongue is mainly reserved to an instrumental one. Proficiency in the majority language is often presented as a key to success in the school arena, for future job opportunities and, generally, for the future of a minority child; while proficiency in mother tongue is there to support this child in his “transitional” phase to the aim of developing a native-like proficiency in the majority language. This is for example reflected in the Norwegian Official Report # 12 (1995): “a developed mother tongue is crucial for children’s knowledge acquisition until they can profit from learning in Norwegian. It has also a great significance as a tool for reading and writing comprehension, and as a support in developing proficiency in the second language, Norwegian. Further, mother tongue plays a role in identity formation and contact with the family.” (NOU 1995:12, my translation)

Mother tongue instruction is increasingly looked upon as a prerequisite for the effective acquisition of the majority language; this appears to be characteristic for the school and societal integration-debate, and is, consequently, framing the current research (Evaldsson, 2003). As Evaldsson (2003) fairly argues, the current focus of the research is aiming to fix the minority children’s lack of knowledge of the majority language, which often results in a tendency of ignoring the fact that minority children often live in a context where they can (and are expected to) use multiple languages at the same time. The result is that everyday bilingualism of minority children is often being “overshadowed” (Evaldsson, 2003: 20).

I will elaborate further on these perceptions in section 2.2, as I consider them to be of high relevance for the Norwegian context. Instead of viewing bilingualism through the monolingual perspective, and measuring it against monolingual standards of language use and language proficiency, I choose to employ an alternative research paradigm – a dialogical perspective on language. Dialogical perspective is characterized by viewing participants of interaction as active co-constructors of social situations, whose actions and utterances are custom-made for the particular context and percipient. In accordance with this perspective, bilingualism is looked upon more as a social feature, rather than a mental one. For Evaldsson, the dialogical perspective appears to be a precondition for studying bilingualism as it comes to expression in the everyday life (Evaldsson, 2003).

As Auer fairly stated: “being bilingual becomes an achieved status”, meaning that bilingual is considered to be something one does rather than something one is (Auer, 1984:7). So what needs to be investigated then, is how exactly bilingualism is achieved by different people?

Thus, approaching how the target children achieve bilingualism in their daily school interactions is the central focus of the present study. Investigating this question may bring me a step closer to answering the question I have been asking myself for the last couple of years: how is it to be a bilingual child in one of the multicultural classrooms in a Norwegian city? And as Auer (1984:7) would have put it, how are the bilinguals “*doing being bilinguals*”?

1.2 Why investigate bilinguals’ conversations?

In this study I aim to investigate everyday school practices of two Turkish-Norwegian schoolgirls from a multicultural class in a Norwegian big city. Statistics Norway reports that at the beginning of 2009 there were 5400 Norwegian-born children with both parents born in Turkey; out of which 980 pupils at primary school have been receiving mother tongue/bilingual instruction that year (Henriksen, 2010). That makes Turkish-Norwegian children the fourth largest minority group with immigrant-parents; they are also among the largest minority groups in Norwegian classrooms. There is little research conducted to investigate the language practices of this group, but there are some studies that have to be mentioned: Özerk (1992) studied the academic development of bilingual immigrant children in Norwegian schools and Türker (2000) conducted a linguistic analysis of code-switching among Turkish first- and second-generation immigrants in Norway.

There are three main reasons for why I consider it important to investigate bilingual language use and its’ role in young immigrant students’ identity construction:

- The evidence-based research on bilingual language use can potentially contribute to understand what it means to be a user of two languages. Providing an insight into complexity of being a bilingual minority student in a Norwegian school may contribute to the increase of the multicultural understanding in the school arena and possibility to suggest potential areas for change in order to increase school inclusion.
- Research on the ways bilinguals utilize their resources in everyday talk may improve a simplistic view on bilinguals as potentially problematic double-monolinguals, who alternate between languages due to insufficient language competence;
- As it is also argued by Aarsæther (2004), this kind of research may give an insight into different (and maybe new) ways of using Norwegian, and also new meaning of being Norwegian.

Particularly, Aarsæther (2004) points out the existing lack of knowledge about code-switching - a practice of alternatively using two languages in the same utterance - as an everyday practice among bilingual schoolchildren. He also argues for the necessity of improving knowledge of its' socio-pragmatic functions: the functions code-switching fulfills in the bilingual interaction as a communicative strategy (Aarsæther, 2004). Identity-construction is one of them. Besides, two or more languages being in daily contact make a part of everyday life of Norwegian bilingual schoolchildren and, as an everyday practice, require a place in the teaching aids and curricula.

1.3 Background information on the Turkish immigrant group in Norway

In the beginning of 2009 the Turkish group formed the eleventh largest group among immigrants and Norwegian-born to immigrant parents, according to Statistics Norway (Henriksen, 2010). The first immigrants from Turkey came among other labour workers towards the end of 1960s, before Norway imposed a ban on immigration in 1975. After the ban and until now it is mostly family reunion and asylum seeking that appears to be the basis for immigration of Turkish to Norway.

Statistics Norway reports that it is relatively common among Turkish immigrants to settle in the eastern part of Norway – *Østlandet* (Henriksen, 2010). Turkish also form the second largest immigrant group in Trondheim and the third largest in Stavanger. It is quite common for Turkish immigrant families to live in a block, since most of them are settled in Norway's largest cities. Turkish households appear to be relatively large, with average of 2.8 persons, according to Statistics Norway (Henriksen, 2010).²

It is characteristic for Turkish immigrants as a group to be more religious than average, with 93 per cent raised as Muslims (Henriksen, 2010). Another characteristic feature of Turkish in Norway is that no other minority group has as low educated fathers as the ones from Turkey; and only Pakistani group appears to have the same low level of education among mothers. Particularly, only 15% of men and 5% of Turkish women appear to have high-school and university education from the home country, as contrasted to the immigrant population in Norway as a whole. Among Turkish women who came to Norway as grown-ups, around half

² Relatively large household means that there are more people to share the income with, which results in the lower income per person for Turkish families in Norway.

is reported to have completed primary school in Turkey. The low numbers may be explained by the fact that the majority of Turkish immigrants in Norway grew up in the Turkish countryside (Henriksen, 2010).

It is common among immigrants with Turkish background to have plans of moving back to their home country, reports Statistics Norway (Henriksen, 2010). 35% of Turkish immigrants in Norway reported that they own real estate back in their home country. It seems reasonable to invest in real estate in Turkey or to keep ones property from selling if one has plans to move back. It is, according to the report, quite common to keep housing in Turkey and to have the possibility to spend vacation there or, eventually, to move back there, when people grow older. Turkish immigrants as a whole tend to mention good relationship with their family and relatives back in Turkey. They are among the groups that visit their land of origin most frequently and often have parabolic antennas receiving Turkish TV-channels at home. All that leads to a conclusion that Turkish immigrants as a group appear to have close connections with their home-country and Turkish language.

1.4 The structure of the study

Understanding bilingualism as a social feature is central in the present study, finding its reflection in theoretical as well as methodological parts. After the introduction of the existing perceptions of bilingualism and motivation behind conducting this particular thesis, I briefly introduced the background information on the Turkish group in Norway.

In chapter 2 I present the conceptual framework of the present thesis with elaboration on the theoretical approaches to bilingualism, followed by a presentation of ethnomethodological perspective to bilingualism and relation between language and identity. Further, I introduce code-switching, which is one of the central concepts of the study, and its categories, based on the functional model of Auer (1984). I finish the chapter with a brief presentation of existing empirical studies on the topic and conclude with the presentation of my research questions.

In chapter 3 I discuss the methodological choices I have made: I explain the motivation behind the decision to conduct research using the data collected by another researcher, discuss the process of data-selection and sampling, and elaborate on the issues of validity and reliability. Further in this chapter I present my methodological approaches to the literature review and data-analysis.

Chapter 4 forms the analytical part of the study, where the in-depth analysis of 14 interactional episodes is presented. The chapter is divided into three parts, each one of which represents a relative research question.

In the final chapter 5 of the present thesis I draw my conclusion by summarizing and discussing the results of the study in relation to the research questions and elaborate on the limitations and possibilities for further research.

2 Conceptual framework

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the central concepts of the study and place it within the interactional perspective on bilingualism. I start with presenting a short discussion of what bilingualism is and who we call bilinguals, based on a view of Appel and Muysken (1987). Further, I elaborate on the relations between language and identity, seen from the ethnomethodological perspective.

Code-switching as a part of bilingual behavior is the next central concept of this study. I explain the theoretical perspective I rely on, and showcase Auer's (1984) functional typology of code-switching based on its pragmatic functions in the interaction. The typology communicates the allocation of the code-switching that occurs in the classroom interactions of the target-children. Then, I present the concept of *footing* (Goffman 1981) which, in line with dialogical perspective that I place my study in, refers to code-switching as a result of social processes.

I conclude my theoretical approaches to bilingual behavior by briefly going through the relevant empirical studies of bilingualism, focusing specifically on the classroom discourse being actively co-constructed by bilinguals.

2.2 Bilingualism and bilinguals

Bilingualism appears to be an inter-disciplinary field for researchers: in order to understand this phenomenon, exploration from various fields is required. Existing literature on bilingualism includes a wide spectrum of scientific works within not only linguistics, but also psychology, pedagogy and sociology. The perspectives of viewing bilingualism and bilingual persons are many and different. But who can we call a bilingual and what are the characteristics of a bilingual person? Before answering this question I intend to look closer on what we call bilingualism.

Defining bilingualism is no easy task. The notion appears to be broad and complex and the definitions seem as diverse and contradictory, as the scientific studies of this phenomenon itself.

Bloomfield considered bilingualism to be “the native-like control of two languages” (Bloomfield 1933: 56). Weinrich (1968) suggested that the practice of alternately usage of two languages should be called bilingualism; and later Mackey incorporated Weinreich’s alternate use of two languages into Bloomfield’s reservations with regard to the degree of proficiency (Wei, 2000).

When it comes to language proficiency though, it is somewhat difficult to be absolute in this regard: how should one define “the native-like proficiency” and what measures should be used in order to measure ones language proficiency in the two or more languages the person uses? Ways how a bilingual person incorporates the languages in his or her everyday life may also be quite different; the practice varies much in this regard.

In accordance with that, it is the definition of bilingualism given by Appel and Muysken (1987) that in a best way corresponds with the purposes of this study:

Somebody who regularly uses two or more languages in alternation is a bilingual. Within this definition speakers may still differ widely in their actual linguistic skills, of course, but we should be careful not to impose standards for bilinguals that go much beyond those for monolinguals. The very fact that bilinguals use various languages in different circumstances suggests that it is their *overall* linguistic competence that should be compared to that of monolinguals. All too often imposing Bloomfield’s criteria on bilinguals has led to their stigmatization as being somehow deficient in their language capacities (Appel & Muysken, 1987:3).

This given definition allows more individual and group variation; also when it comes to variation within linguistic competence. The present study focuses on minority children, whose competence in their mother tongue (which often differs to a great extend from the dominant language) and majority language represents a wide variation. An explanation for that may be the fact that language proficiency of those children is being formed under the influence of a number of factors, such as linguistic patterns at home, status of languages at school and in the wider society, or personal language preferences, just to name a few.

Some scholars also consider the aspect of attitude when describing bilingual practices. For example, Engen and Kulbrandstadt (2004), and Skutnabb-Kangas (1981) define bilingualism by considering one’s own and other’s attitudes towards a person’s bilingual practice. How a

person looks at himself as bilingual is often to a great extent dependent on how she identifies herself with both languages. Identification is influenced by a number of factors, where the attitudes of society towards the languages, especially towards minority languages, are playing an important role. I will now draw on the attitudes and beliefs formed about bilinguals and the way they function in the society, in the context of modern Scandinavia.

2.3 Double monolingualism or multilingual competence?

Minority children and their performance in Scandinavian schools are nowadays in the middle of the debate about integration and mother tongue instruction. According to Cromdal and Evaldsson (2003), the research on bilingualism could be characterized by employing somewhat simplistic beliefs about multilingualism:

- 1) A belief about bilinguals to be resourceful but potentially problematic individuals;
- 2) A perception of multilingualism as a mental quality of an individual;
- 3) A normative vision of multilingualism rooted in monolingual ideology (Cromdal & Evaldsson 2003).

The last assumption is anchored in usual measuring of bilinguals both in public and research-debates according to monolingual criteria. For his/her successful functioning in a society, a bilingual individual is expected to be equally proficient in both languages and to use their languages in the same way as monolinguals, which means using one language at a time. Using more than one language at a time could be perceived as an indicator of poor language proficiency. Cromdal and Evaldsson argue that Scandinavian debate around minority children concentrates much on their well-functioning in the monolingual setting, and often ignore the fact that a number of bilingual individuals daily take part in multilingual settings (which for schoolchildren could be both at home and at school) (Cromdal & Evaldsson, 2003).

What is central in viewing bilinguals from a monolingual perspective is that one assumes that bilingual individuals develop separate competences in the languages they acquire and that there exists a clean separation between the first and the second languages in the learning processes. Cook (2003) with his multi-competence model challenges this idealized perception. What Cook points to with his model, is that “linguistic competence is not stored in the mind in neat compartments with clear boundaries; rather, a more appropriate image is that

of a mass with no clear divisions among parts” (Cook, cited in Block, 2003:39). He suggests that linguistic competence in various languages is not fixed and there is a constant “bleeding” between the languages, complemented by additions and losses in linguistic repertoire of a person. This idea is gaining credibility in line with the studies of how bilingual individuals engage in communication: studies of language alternation, borrowing and language attrition.

The perspective Cook employs in his multi-competence model is in line with the dialogical paradigm, accounting for the mixed linguistic competence of bilinguals, who tend to apply it on a daily basis in their everyday interaction. I consider this perspective to be relevant for the present study as it confirms the theoretical perception I undertake: that the linguistic competence of bilinguals constitutes itself as integrity of language resources that bilinguals access whenever they need to accomplish any interactional aims.

2.4 Language and identity

The process of globalization, influencing and shaping the world we live in, have brought together people who have previously had no or little contact with each other. Geographical and cultural borders have been moved and the issue of identity has made itself central in focus of many researchers throughout the world. Cultural contacts between people have resulted in the “social map” not fitting into the “social landscape” of today’s world anymore (Jenkins, 1996).

Identification of oneself is as much about defining who a person is and who he or she is not, as identifying what one has in common with whom (Jenkins, 1996). In other words, identity is both about individual distinctiveness and collective similarities.

Identity is never static; it is shaped and reshaped in constant and ongoing negotiation and renegotiation with oneself, significant others and society as a whole. In our daily life while establishing and re-establishing our identity we categorise ourselves and appear to be categorized by others. In my study I therefore refer to the notion of identity being in an ongoing dynamic process, where the differences and similarities are in a constant interdependence.

Østberg employs the term of “plural identity” in order to describe Norwegian-Pakistani youngsters’ identity (Østberg, 2003). These young people develop their multicultural competence within a complex social context, where cultural diversity occupies a meaningful

part. This diversity in cultural meaning is a part of youth's identity. Young people are negotiating identity within the complex cultural discourse that surrounds them.

Eriksen (1997) differentiates three notions when describing minority identity: 1) those, who associate themselves with either majority culture or minority culture exclusively, and employ "pure identity"; 2) those, who choose a bit from each culture, may have a "hyphen identity" type – they often keep majority and minority culture separated for school and home domain respectively; 3) while those, who do not keep those identities separated, have a "creole identity": they create a mixed identity by identifying themselves with both minority and majority identity at the same time.

The types presented here, appear to be rather clear-cut; I have nevertheless certain doubts that this distinction would be enough to embrace and understand the identities of target children in the present study. Taking into account the complex linguistic behaviour of these young bilinguals, through which I expect them to reveal and mirror their identities, I assume that their identities therefore might be at least not less complex.

Languages are constructive, according to Linell; they constitute the way we act and think in the world, and how we perceive the world and form an idea of the world (Linell, 1998). In other words, languages are inseparable from the process of identity construction. Linguistic items are the means by which individuals identify themselves and identify with others; through linguistic "acts of identity" individuals may claim their group membership or attach to a particular group. In bilingual practices the values of the languages used by bilingual individuals are in constant processes of negotiation and rearrangement. In this light the language choice or language alternation also becomes an act of identity. Identity is considered as a dynamic variable, which is formed in the process of negotiation with others. Linguistic behaviour of the target children in this study appears to differ in accordance with the context they find themselves in; hence, children's identification differs in unison with the context. The way they employ their linguistic resources, how they switch the languages in order to colour their linguistic behaviour, has a clear interdependence with the context.

In this study I employ the ethnomethodological perspective of identity, eloquently described by Widdicombe as "something that people do which is embedded in some other social activity, and not something that they "are" (Widdicombe 1998: 191). In line with Cashman (2005) and Gafaranga (2005) I intend to demonstrate bilingual interaction as a part of social

activity by analyzing how social identities are negotiated by bilingual speakers with the help of such linguistic resources as language alternation and language preference.

2.5 “Doing being bilingual”

2.5.1 Linguaging

In line with the above-discussed Cook’s multi-competence model, Jørgensen (2003) introduced a concept of *linguaging* when describing multi-faceted behaviour of Turkish-Danish bilingual children. What he argues by this term, is that it is meaningless to view bilingualism from the position that it involves two separate units of what monolingualism only involves one unit. From his point of view, it is irrelevant that bilingual children use not one, but multiple languages and varieties. The practice of using two or multiple languages does not make them different from other children, they just happened to have more linguistic resources in their disposition than non-bilingual ones. He argues that we are all “*linguagers*”, and bilingual linguistic behaviour is *linguaging* – which is just the same as all human beings do (Jørgensen, 2003).

How do bilinguals keep the languages available to them apart, or how do they mix the two languages, and what are the conditions of doing so? Such linguistic behaviour is called language-alternation. Alternating languages in the same interactional episode is known as **code-switching** (CS), where codes are used in the meaning of different languages.

Gumperz in 1982 defined conversational CS as “the juxtaposition within the same exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems” (Gumperz, 1982:59).

This definition was used by Auer (1998) in a somewhat deeper specification, when he stressed that “CS will be reserved for those cases in which juxtaposition of two codes (languages) is perceived and interpreted as a locally meaningful event by participants.” (p. 310). Meaning is central in Auer’s notion of code-switching: code-switching becomes meaningful when the switch to another language appears to be a deviation from the language of interaction in a given situation.

What seems to be significant here is that Auer is separating code-switching from other types of language contact, such as, for example, code-mixing, in which the speaker transfers some elements or rules from another language. According to Auer (1998), this separation is achieved by the stress on the meaningfulness of the code-switch to interlocutors. Thereby CS may appear to be a form for colouring one's language: it could either be for the purpose of stressing some particular points of the utterance, or changing its mood, or simply for the purpose of closing the conversation from others by means of changing the language. As Jørgensen (2003) fairly states, there is a stable relationship between the language choice and the circumstances under which the language is used: different languages may appear for interlocutor to be more appropriate in the light of different situational circumstances.

Early research of code-switching had a tendency of linking language choice directly to social structure, basing on the assumption that societal structures are to be reflected in a rather straightforward way on the division of work between languages in a linguistic repertoire of a bilingual person (Cashman, 2005).

Gumperz (1982) was the one to document that minority speakers tend to use the minority language/dialect in order to communicate with other members of their ethnic community, while for communication with outsiders they appear to choose majority/standard language. The tendency was explained through a division of "we-code" (in-group) and "they-code" (out-group) languages in the linguistic repertoire of minority speakers. Additionally, the cases of CS that turned out to be difficult to explain through this dichotomy were referred to as "metaphorical code-switching" (Bloom & Gumperz, 1972).

Nevertheless, the dichotomy turned out to be rather limited in order to account for all the cases of code-switching; as it was shown by further empirical research of the matter, bilingual behaviour is too complex to fit in any straightforward dichotomy. Later empirical research has proved among others that the switch appears to be first and foremost a meaningful linguistic resource in itself, regardless of its direction (Cromdal, 2000, Aarsæther 2004). The meaningfulness of CS in itself also finds reflection in my data-material, which gave me a sense that in the situation when the CS occurs it is not the direction of the switch that happens to carry meaning for the ongoing interaction, but rather the act of switching itself; it frames the whole linguistic situation and draws attention of the analyst to interpret this situation differently from the rest of the discourse.

In line with Li Wei's (1998) argumentation for the importance of investigating the "how"-question before the "why"-question, my intention is to improve understanding of *how* do bilingual children use the linguistic resources available for them, in the situation of interaction. I also want to place my analysis of their linguistic behaviour within a particular context, a concrete interactional case; by doing so I aim to limit the explanations of motives behind a particular action, as advocated by Stroud and Li Wei (Stroud, 1992; Li Wei, 2002).

As I base my perspective on code-switching to a large extent on the understanding developed by Auer, an important starting point for the analysis has played Auer's (1998) categorization of code-switching. He divides code-switching in two categories that differ from each other structurally: *alternational* and *insertional*.

2.5.2 Alternational and insertional code-switching

According to Auer, the category of *alternational* CS is characteristic by non-predictability of its duration. It is not limited structurally; it welcomes another interlocutor to the possibility of also alternating to another code. At the same time, it does not presuppose this possibility: the code-switch that took place does not necessary invite interlocutor to answer in the same code.

Insertional switching, on the contrary, presupposes that the language user would turn back to the "base" code after having used a single word or a sentence in another code. The duration of the switch is therefore predictable; the switch itself appears to be limited by the structure of interaction.

Further Auer elaborates the categorization by differentiating between such categories as discourse related and participant related switching.

2.5.3 Discourse related and participant related code-switching

The *discourse-related code-switching* is defined by Auer as "language alternation providing cues for the organization of the ongoing interaction" (Auer 1984), which corresponds also with Gumperz's consideration of CS as a contextualization cue (Gumperz 1982). Auer states here that CS has a function of organizing the conversation.

Later Auer expands his understanding of discourse-related code-switching by inclusion of conversational structure:

“[...] the use of code-switching to organise the conversation by contributing to the interactional meaning of a particular utterance” (Auer 1998:4).

By employing the pragmatic function CS might have in the interaction, Aarsæther comes up with a set of subcategories for discourse related CS:

- CS at unanswered requests: observed in the situations, where bilinguals draw in another language if they are not getting answer from another participant.
- CS at rivalry or conflict: code-switching is used as a tool when competing with each other or being in conflict. This subcategory may be further divided into:
 - CS and rival overlapping;
 - CS in the open conflict;
 - CS that contextualizes exclusion.
- CS at topic change (Aarsæther 2004).

In the situations of rivalry or conflict bilingual children use two languages to establish themselves within the group; hence language choice and code-switching are tools in the establishment of hierarchy. Therefore, both languages and alternation between them appear to be a part of negotiations, used as power resources in a social interplay within the group.

As Esdahl states it, power in conversation is about gaining control of the conversation: every participant in the conversation might at a certain moment be interested in influencing other interlocutors and promote own interests by doing so. The most important way to gain power in conversation is through language (Esdahl, in Jørgensen 2003); hence bilinguals get a special tool in this regard – language choice. The choice of language may base on either principle of ethics or power principles: when a bilingual is choosing the language in consideration with the languages spoken by interlocutors, intending to be less offending in the language choice; or manipulating the conversation by language choice in order to show one’s power.

Participant related CS is, according to Auer, a type of language alternation that indicates the speaker’s preference for using one language rather than another. This preference can either express lack of knowledge in the language that is opted out or, on the contrary, competence in the chosen language. This is definitely not always that clear-cut with regards to motivation behind the language choice: one could as well be equally proficient in both languages, but still make a clear preference for one of the languages. As we will see in forthcoming examples of

analysis, there may be a variety of other reasons behind the language switch: identification with the language, acting according to social norms, or an intention to include another speaker in the interaction. The code-switch might as well be a deliberate and conscious act.

What it all leads us to is that there is not always a clear boundary between discourse related and participant related code-switching. Participant related language alternation may also have a discourse related function, or vice versa. These two functions may appear to be interwoven, according to Aarsæther (2004).

Aarsæther, basing on Auer's distinction between CS explained by language competence or by bilingual preference of language, distinguishes two subcategories in participant related CS:

- Competence related code-switching
- Preference related code-switching.

The central feature of participant related CS is that it can not be understood out of the situation of interaction, but in the context of participant's individual characteristics. As we can see, the categories presented above have different functions in the interaction: discourse-related CS tends to organize the on-going talk, while participant-related CS involves alternation from one code to another in order to communicate something to other participants about the speaker's language preference or language proficiency (Cashman, 2005). Language preference appears to be a very important device in bilingual interaction, according to Gafaranga (2001), who states that "in order to talk, bilingual speakers categorize themselves and one another either as monolingual or as bilingual in which language(s)" (Gafaranga 2001: 219). Cashman, exploring further Gafaranga's perspective, suggests that language preference functions as "membership categorization device", which serves for bilingual speakers as a resource for either ascribing and accepting, or rejecting the group membership (Cashman 2005).

The code-switching of the target-bilinguals in the present study find its place mainly within Auer's typological frame of categories, which together with Goffman's (1981) "footing" and Grosjean's (2010) "language mode" form the starting point for my approach to the bilingual practices of the target-children in the data-material.

2.5.1 “Footing”

“Footing” is an understanding of how languages and social processes are interwoven with each other, according to Aarsæther (Aarsæther, 2004). It is the way how interlocutors, while taking part in the interaction, understand each other’s and their own role in it; their position and relation to each other. Therefore “footing” influences the tone and manner of the ongoing interaction; when the participant’s “footing” changes, the whole character of interaction changes.

As Goffman puts it, “[...] changing footing means changing the ground, or having the ground changed for you, during the interaction” (Goffman, 1981:125). “Footing”, therefore, describes the position in which each participant of interaction places himself, and also positions in which he places other interlocutors. Goffman points out that CS often appears to be a marker for change in “footing”, and is therefore serving discourse functions in the interaction of bilingual children. In Goffman’s communication model, the notion of “footing” is refining the concepts of speaker and listener in his “*production format*” and “*participation framework*”. “Production format” refers to the role of speaker, while “participation framework” regards to the role of listener. The switch of code signals to the listener a change in a context, or a change of a framework in the interaction. From this perspective it is possible to see how children accommodate their language preferences with other participants and, at the same time contextualize the features of the situation of interaction itself: by, for example, making it possible for another interlocutor to join the interaction, which was closed for them because of their lack of linguistic competence (Aarsæther 2004). Goffman’s communication model is useful in seeking understanding of the way speakers accommodate themselves to listeners, including changing of the code.

2.5.2 “Language mode”

Grosjean (2010), who has been studying bilinguals for twenty-five years, states that bilinguals who have been reflecting on their linguistic behaviour report to be changing the way of speaking when they are with monolinguals, in comparison to that with bilinguals (Grosjean 2010). Moreover, they also report to be caught by surprise as listeners when being spoken to in a language they did not expect. What Grosjean points to here, is what he calls a phenomenon of “language mode”. In 1982 Grosjean introduced the notion of situational continuum, ranging from monolingual mode to bilingual mode (Grosjean 1982). In

monolingual speech mode the speaker partly deactivates one language, and in bilingual mode he chooses a base language, activates another language and from time to time turns to this other language by employing code-switching or borrowings. In the process of interaction speakers may find themselves in different parts of language continuum. The base language can also change several times during one and the same situation of interaction.

Grosjean comes to a conclusion that a variety of factors influences the language mode the speaker finds himself in. In 1999/2000 he studied how topic of interaction and other interlocutor are influencing the place of language continuum. He also found out that these factors were influencing whether bilinguals were in bilingual or monolingual modus: for instance, if a monolingual interlocutor does not understand one of the languages, this language would be deactivated by a bilingual person, often unconsciously. The language mode would become monolingual. If the interlocutor understands both languages, but is not comfortable with one of them or with code-switching, the language that is not a base language would be only partly activated. What Grosjean describes here, is in line with what Auer (1984) calls “preference for the same language talk”: if one of the interlocutors makes a switch to the language he masters better, it may end in another interlocutor switching to this language as well. Bilingual mode is when both languages are activated in the interaction, with one of them being a base language and being used to a somewhat greater extend. A variety of factors influence where exactly in language continuum interlocutors find themselves: social status, language attitudes and patterns, type of relation and presence or absence of other persons. Grosjean also states that form, content and function of interaction are all important for the form of language modus.

Grosjean’s “language mode”-theory seems to be in line with viewing bilinguals not as “double-monolinguals”, but as persons with unique linguistic resources, multilingual competence. In forthcoming analysis of the present study I will try to give examples for bilinguals using code-switching as a creative resource, and see if bilingual modus is present in classroom interaction of target children.

2.6 Bilingual behavior through the interactional perspective

As early as 1982 Gumperz introduces in his work “Discourse strategies” the notion of conversational code-switching, which considers language alternation to be a functional feature of interaction. In his contextualization theory language alternation is associated with social identity: alternation between the “we-code”, which is used in the closest social circle, and “they-code” – language that is marking social distance, usually used in the formal context. Code-switching is perceived as an identity-contextualization medium, bounded to particular situations (Gumperz, 1982).

In 1984 Auer reveals in his fundamental work “Bilingual conversation” the functionality of code-switching: being used by bilinguals for the purpose of relating themselves to the existing discourse or other participants. On this basis he introduced the division of code-switching by its functions - discourse and/or participant related.

A new perspective on the bilingualism emerged in the field: a social and contextual understanding of language alternation, and an interest in understanding the complex interactional processes between the participants with different mother tongues. Interest towards interaction in bilingual environment had risen significantly in the middle of the nineties, and so did the number of publications and articles on this matter in Nordic countries, discussing many aspects about the functionality of bilingualism (Slotte-Lüttge, 2005).

A number of Scandinavian scholars have documented in their works how bilingual children employ the languages available and make the language alternation serve different interactional goals: creating and dissolving alliances (Aarsæther 2003, Cromdal 2001, Evaldsson 2003), getting attention and positioning oneself in the group interaction (Aarsæther 2004, Evaldsson 2003, Jørgensen 2003), employing CS as a tool in their power-play and for escalating the social position (Aarsæther 2004, Cromdal 2000, Jørgensen 1998).

Evaldsson in her study in 2003 employs social perspective in order to show how bilingual first-graders in one of the Swedish schools appear to be active co-constructors of the existing monolingual order, and use it as an opportunity for contrasting their multilingual resources against it (Evaldsson 2003). She bases her investigation on approximately 200 hours of video-taped observations of two groups of pupils and their conversational routines in the classroom and in the school-yard. Evaldsson comes to a conclusion that the existing monolingual order

of an ordinary classroom makes it possible for bilingual pupils to organize their informal bilingual side-conversations and by doing so they use the emerging contrast for positioning themselves in the interaction.

A number of studies investigating the bilingual behaviour of the second generation Turkish descendants in Denmark stems from the Køge project. A group of Turkish-Danish bilinguals have been followed over a period of nine years – the entire period of schooling in one of the Danish schools; their conversations have been filmed, there were conducted tests and interviews with this group of children. The aim of the study was to investigate how bilingual children and youth develop their two languages, how they are able to switch between the languages, and how these abilities coordinate their learning process in general, with identity-building etc. The findings of the Køge project have been discussed in a series of reports and articles. For example, Jørgensen (1998) using data from the Køge project, documented how bilingual children employ the minority/majority language distinctions in their local power-negotiations: namely, using code-switching as a resource in their “power-wielding” practice (Jørgensen, 1998).

Cromdal (2000b) demonstrates how a group of children from the Køge project work on a joint production of a comic strip, by extensively using all available languages for various interactional purposes. One of the central findings of his research is the conclusion that the children establish a norm for the story-telling – the storyline was narrated exclusively in Danish. Cromdal uses this review as a back-drop and investigates this finding further, conducting a study in a 4th grade classroom of an English school in Sweden (Cromdal 2000a). In his in-depth analysis of a 55-minute videotaped collaborative work of two bilinguals on a production of a written report he finds a distinct division between the two languages. English is used for the purpose of production, while Swedish is employed in all the other forms of interaction.

Slotte-Lüttge (2005) conducted a study in a Swedish speaking school in a Finnish dominated neighbourhood of the South of Finland. Her study aimed to improve the understanding of interactional learning possibilities and constrains in relation to a bilingual context; for this purpose she analyzed video recorded lessons from three classes (1st, 2nd and 3rd grade) with 54 pupils in the age range 7-9 years. She, in line with Evaldsson, documented that bilingual pupils were active co-constructors of the monolingual discourse. The monolingual discourse is functioning as a norm in the classroom, but it is possible for both teachers and pupils to use

bilingualism as a functional resource against the background of this monolingual norm. By investigation of teacher-pupil interaction in the class, Slotte-Lüttge comes to a conclusion that not only pupils, but the teachers as well have the possibility of making code-switching a meaningful activity: by making pupils' bilingualism relevant in the classroom talk, they make it a non-preferred but functional resource in the interaction.

The present study aims to contribute to the understanding of how bilingual students in elementary school use their linguistic resources within the everyday classroom context in Norway. While Slotte-Lüttge's focus on teacher-student interaction, I choose to concentrate mainly on student-to-student conversations between bilinguals, with a "close-to-participant" perspective on the interactional activities taking place between them. Moreover, while a number of other researchers observed code-switching as a phenomenon, I choose to concentrate on cases of two girls, attending the same fifth grade classroom, and at how these girls use their bilingual resources in everyday classroom conversation. By doing so I wanted to explore how first- and second language use are related to identity processes of bilingual students. My focus is therefore on children as cases and their bilingual strategies across the contexts.

2.7 Research questions

Based on this theoretical and empirical literature I have formulated one overall research question:

- How do the two Turkish-Norwegian speaking girls utilize their bilingual resources in order to constitute themselves in the classroom context as learning and social individuals?

More specifically, I have derived at three sub-questions to shed light on this overall research question:

1. How are the two girls similar and different in their relative use of Turkish and Norwegian?
2. What are the similarities and differences in the ways the two girls use their bilingual resources to position themselves in subject related discourse?

3. What are the similarities and differences in the ways the two girls use their bilingual resources to position themselves in informal peer interactions?

3 Methodological framework

In this chapter I will describe the methodological choices I have made and discuss the motivation behind them. A crucial fact for my methodological considerations is that I base my research upon the raw data that I have borrowed from the large-scale study “Classroom discourse and text comprehension”. Hence, all the methodological considerations I intend to present below are marked by this fact.

I will start with the presentation of my initial methodological considerations: where did my research idea start and how did I arrive to the final decision of how the study should be conducted. In the next section I will talk about the origin of the data I have gained access to, and discuss my further methodological choices in the data-processing.

Further, I draw on the motivation behind the choice of cases for my study and the rationale for comparison. This is followed by the presentation of reflections around the trustworthiness and validity of the present study.

In the last sections of the methodological chapter I will elaborate on my approach to the data-analysis and explain my methodological choices. Finally, I conclude my methodological presentation by discussing the ethical issues and limitations of the present study.

3.1 Initial considerations

This investigation has the aim of investigating bilingual pupils’ use of the languages available to them in their everyday school setting in Norway. Initially, my primary intention was to investigate issues related to minority children’s mastering the dominant language and their process of integrating into majority society. For this purpose I intended to look at Norwegian “*mottaksklasse*” (an immersion class for minority children who are newcomers in the Norwegian educational system, have no or limited knowledge of Norwegian and cannot follow ordinary teaching). As I have been working as an auxiliary bilingual teacher in one of these classes, I was acquainted with the program from the inside. I wanted to observe daily interactions inside and outside the classroom, but this is where I realized that I would face major challenge. Students in immersion classroom have a variety of language backgrounds, which in my case causes a difficulty in communication with students. Challenges of communicating effectively with the children with various mother tongues, as well as

limitations of time and resources made the plan difficult to fit in the frame of a master thesis project. Hence, I realized that in order to construct a realistic research I had to focus on a micro-perspective to a given problem. My supervisor and I therefore discussed different perspectives on bilingualism in the context of Scandinavian schools, and I came to the decision that it would be interesting to look at the everyday life of a bilingual child in a Norwegian school setting, where children would be more proficient in the school language.

The choice of qualitative research approach seemed reasonable to me. Bilingualism is a reality minority children live in, and qualitative research as descriptive and explanatory may contribute to the understanding of their lived experiences of being bilingual. Qualitative methods give a researcher the possibility of capturing the setting and context the situation occurs in, as well as the participants' frame of reference (Thomas, 1949).

In the present study I put videotaped observations in focus as primary data, and employ interviews as following-up, secondary inquiry means, serving the purpose of giving me background information. For my purpose of revealing how code-switching is functionally used for constructing and positioning of bilingual identities, it is logical to use micro-analysis through which one can record and analyze the speech events and interactions. As Marshall and Rossman (1999) state it, microanalyses often bring about more from the complexities of context, relying on some form of observation often complemented by interviews.

3.1.1 The source of data.

Due to my micro-perspective on minority children' identity construction through the bilingual interaction, I would have to gain the needed data-material by vast amount of videotaped observations of target children, who would make the cases for my research. Since the basis for the research would be the interactions in which target children take part, in order to find peculiarities in their linguistic behavior, the amount of videotaped lessons, and, if possible, school breaks should be as long as possible. At that point I faced the time limitations for my master thesis; and, therefore, limited time for my presence on the field and data-proceeding. When I was offered by my supervisor, Veslemøy Rydland, to use the data in form of video observations from a multicultural Norwegian classroom, it coincided with my research strategy and the data fit my research aims. Borrowing this data gave me the advantage of working with observations of bilingual conversations, where all the interactions in Turkish were transcribed and translated to Norwegian.

3.2 Methodological choices

The rich data, based on observations and interviews with bilingual schoolchildren and their parents, could have suited a wide variety of investigation aims. The target classroom was a multicultural one, with all the children, except one, having a non-Norwegian ethnical background. By borrowing the data I gained access to both videotaped classroom observations, in-depth interviews with some of the children and questionnaires filled out by their parents, focusing mainly on children's linguistic behavior. I realized that I had to choose between either observations or interviews as a primary data in accordance with my research question.

Both methods are fundamental and highly important in all qualitative inquiry, but they also yield different types of information about the participants. Interview is by some authors described as "a conversation with a purpose"; where the researcher explores some general topics to help the participant uncover his view. Otherwise it is all about how the participant frames and structures his responses (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). According to Marshall and Rossman, interviews help the researcher understand the meanings that people hold of their everyday activities. At the same time, interviewees might be unwilling or uncomfortable sharing the type of information the interviewer is hoping to explore; or they may be unaware of some patterns in their lives (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Interviews to a great extent reflect the interviewee as the kind of person she perceives herself to be (and wants to be perceived as).

Observation, on the other hand, is a method which assumes that human behavior is purposeful and expressive of deeper values and beliefs. Observations may help to discover the recurring patterns of behavior and relationships (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). The method of observation is used to discover complex interactions in natural social settings. It provides the insight into the daily life. The visual information, conveyed by video-records, opens up the possibility to capture not only the verbal interaction in the classroom, but also non-verbal communication between interlocutors. This raised my chances to reconstruct the interaction to the largest possible extent and be able to interpret conversations.

Because I was interested in reconstruction and understanding of the daily life of bilingual children, I decided to choose video-recorded observations as my central data-source.

3.2.1 Classroom observations

The next stage for me was to get acquainted with the data. I started looking through the video-material that was made available to me and engaged myself in the process of open coding, or hypothesis generation. Strauss and Corbin (1990) refer to open coding as “the process of breaking down, examining, conceptualizing and categorizing data” (1990: 61). In this way I started my reflections upon the data and primary attempts to interpret what was happening in the classroom, and at the same time trying to discover particular cases to look at.

The video material I gained access to consisted of 7 videotaped schooldays - approximately 31 hour of video observations in the 5th grade classroom site with 26 pupils (age range 9-10 years). The recordings of the class have been made as a part of a large-scale study on reading comprehension, conducted in a number of Norwegian schools with a large share of minority pupils – “Classroom discourse and text comprehension”, led by Veslemøy Rydland.

In addition, some of the pupils that participated in the above-mentioned study had also been followed from the kindergarten, being part of a longitudinal study “Language minority students’ text comprehension”, led by V. Rydland. The class was chosen as a case-study, being a class with a significant share of minority-speaking and Turkish-speaking pupils. Among these there were three Turkish-speaking pupils who have been chosen as target children. Two of them constitute the cases for my study; the sampling procedure will be presented in the section 3.3.

Both parents and teachers gave their consent for video filming inside the classroom and the target-children of the project were informed that they were to be wearing a microphone during the whole period of filming. The researchers told the participants and teachers that the knowledge gained in the field would contribute to better understanding of their life as fifth-graders who speak Turkish and Norwegian, and help in gaining knowledge of how do the schooldays of a bilingual pupil look like.

The classroom observations were supplemented by interviews with target-children concerning their language use, and questionnaires with the same focus, filled out by their parents. I have used the interviews and questionnaire for providing background information about the target-children and find out how the speak of themselves as bilinguals. The interviews with the two target-children are used to contribute to the understanding of their self-perception as bilinguals, as well as to describe their everyday life.

Following Rydland's interest in the bilingual behavior of the target-children within the classroom context, the focus of the recording was to document their use of two languages in all kinds of classroom activities: one-to-one side-interactions with neighbours at pupils' desks, during the breaks, when eating lunch or while going on a class-trip.

Moreover, apart from the voices of target-children that appear to be the clearest on the tape, it is also possible to hear the entire official classroom talk, carried out by the form teachers, aiming that everybody in the class would be able to hear it. Apart from the target-children, the conversations between other pupils are nevertheless not possible to hear on the tape.

3.2.2 The rationale for comparison

There were two dimensions for comparison that seemed interesting and applicable while I was looking through the video-material: ethnicity- and gender-dimensions. There were two major ethnic groups on the multicultural arena of the class - Turkish and Pakistani. The idea of comparing how Turkish and Pakistani children tend to express their identity through their language use seemed to be an interesting perspective, but that is where I faced a dilemma: Pakistani children were not wearing microphones and the quality of the data on these two groups' language use differed significantly in terms of quality and extend. Besides, it turned out that the Turkish group of the class was constituted by many girls, while the Pakistani group was represented mostly by boys. Comparison by the rationale of ethnicity had to be done between two different ethnic groups, but of the same gender – otherwise, there is more than one dimension that might possibly influence linguistic behavior of the target-children.

The second option for comparison was the gender-dimension. Hypothetically, I would have to compare how children from the same ethnic group construct their bilingual identities through their linguistic behavior, having the same set of languages, but different gender. But once again, in the ideal research situation I would have to have the same amount of data on all the target-children, and this data would give me enough material to conduct a subtle comparison and draw on the conclusions. In reality, the linguistic repertoire of the three Turkish children that I had the richest data on, turned out to differ drastically: in the interactions of the two girls both languages were to a certain extend present all the time, while the boy was talking only Turkish in all informal conversations according to what I saw.

But after spending some time looking through the video-material and listening to some of the interviews while conducting initial data-analysis, there were two cases that would draw my attention: two Turkish girls, Yesim and Emine, who were good friends and also had the same languages in their disposition; but nevertheless spoke of themselves as bilinguals in a very different way in their interviews. Hence, assuming that the surroundings in the cases of these two children are the same: neighborhood, school, teachers and peers; the fact that they spoke about themselves differently made me curious of how they negotiated their bilingual identities and whether there were similarities and differences in how they did this.

3.3 Sampling and participants

The sampling strategy I employed is purposeful sampling, which Patton describes as a strategy of selecting information rich cases, “those from which one can learn a big deal about issues of central importance to the issue of inquiry” (Patton 2002: 230). I decided that the cases of these two girls and comparison of their cases would help me illuminate on the issues of code-switching and identity construction of bilingual children in Norway. Besides, these girls were among the children I had the richest data on: they were among the three focus-children of the project I was borrowing data from, and they had been wearing microphones through the whole period of video filming. As a result, I was able to hear all the interactions the girls were taking part in very well. Hence, the present study is a case-study of the two Turkish-Norwegian fifth-graders. Yin (2009) refers to a case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context” (p. 18).

Both girls were 10 years old when the recording took place; they went to the same class in a multiethnic Norwegian school in a big city. Both grew up with Turkish as their “home language” and Norwegian dominating the school arena. In the following sections I will describe the cases and draw on the difference between them; for this kind of background information I used interviews with both girls, conducted when they were in first and fifth grade, and questionnaires with their parents. Both types of inquiry were conducted with particular focus on their language use. I support my assumptions on linguistic behavior of target children by drawing examples from interviews with them.

Now we can take a look at the particular cases: two girls, who were born and grew up in Norway, with both parents been born in Turkey. Both girls lived in urban multiethnic neighbourhood with a relatively high concentration of Turkish immigrants. In this town Turkish immigrants constituted more than 1/3 of the immigrant population, making it the largest in the area (Rydland, Aukrust & Fulland, submitted).

3.3.1 Class 5A

The class attended by the two target girls was a multicultural one, with all the children, except one, having mother tongue other than Norwegian. The only monolingual Norwegian-speaking in this class was Adriana. The other children represented a variety of backgrounds: a major group, including both girls and boys, from Turkey; along with a couple of boys and one girl from Pakistan, a girl from Sri-Lanka, a few girls from different African countries and a girl from Iran. As for the seating arrangements, the classroom was divided in two halves, where boys occupied one part and girls another. The seating patterns also reveal the friendship patterns in the class, as most of the children have a friend sitting next to them: Yesim is sitting between Emine, who she introduces as her best friend, and Hanni, a good friend of Yesim since the kindergarten; while Emine seems to have a good contact with Iranian Nazilla, sitting on her right-hand side. Nazilla's mother tongue is Farsi; Emine and Yesim communicate with her in Norwegian. As Emine tells in her interview, she has occasionally taught Nazilla some Turkish words "just for fun" (interview with Emine, 5th grade). Both Yesim and Emine seem to prefer speaking Norwegian with other girls around the table.

Across the table another Turkish-speaking girl, Nur, is sitting, and the fourth Turkish-speaking girl, Semra, sits at another table together with monolingual Adriana. Nur and Semra are good friends and the observations show that they speak Turkish together to a large extent. These four Turkish-speaking girls and monolingual Adriana will appear together in a dancing episode, giving material for several examples of analysis.

The two form teachers of the class, both in their fifties, expressed a great satisfaction with the possibility of working together. Their classroom is well-organized, with high emphasis on individual tasks and few whole class-discussions. The video material reveals also that the whole-class discussions are noticeably few during these two weeks of filming, while individual work is prevailing.

Both teachers express a positive attitude towards the role of mother tongue in the learning process, and pupils in the class are not in the slightest hindered from using their home languages in class. At the same time, the video material shows that mother tongue is present mainly in the one-to-one interactions of target children, and is hardly present in the interactions with other Turkish-speaking children in the class. It is interesting to note that in their conversations with the researchers during the data-collection, the teachers stated that Yesim and Emine spoke only Norwegian to each other, while both girls in their interviews told that they do speak Turkish in the class, but “only to each other” (interviews with Yesim and Emine, 5th grade).

Minority speaking children in the school of Emine and Yesim were offered mother tongue instruction for up to four first years of schooling. Demet, form assistant and auxiliary bilingual teacher, taught some of the Turkish-Norwegian children in the class (as well as in other classes). She was responsible for giving special tuition to those children who had Turkish as mother tongue and whose Norwegian needed additional support. Demet was present in the 5A class for a couple of hours per week, in order to give a few additional support-lessons to those who still had some troubles following the normal learning pace, and to give all the Turkish-speaking children the opportunity to discuss learning-related topics in their mother tongue.

3.4 Data-selection and analytic procedures

Once I narrowed the focus of my study down to two focus-children, I also had to select the parts for analyzing relevant for the research objectives. As mentioned earlier, I had approximately 31 hour of classroom observations, and due to the limited scope of the project and time limitations, I could not make use of all of them. The Turkish part of conversational material was transcribed and translated into Norwegian. Thus, I had to do the transcription of conversational material in Norwegian, and as doing the transcription of the whole Norwegian video-material would be too time consuming, I decided to start looking through the video material in order to narrow down my focus even more and select the parts for transcribing and analyzing.

The early stage of my analysis-work comprised looking through the whole range of video material, and trying to be as open as it was possible at that stage. Therefore I was not looking

for any categories constructed in advance. The first thing that struck me in the data I have been looking through was that both languages were present in the interactions of the target children practically speaking all the time.

Out of practical concerns, I decided to leave out the first day of observations from analysis: children in the class seemed to be rather conscious of the camera and presence of the researchers in the field, and there was a possibility that this fact might have an influence on target children's linguistic behavior that day. After some considerations and discussions with the supervisor had been made, I decided to direct my focus towards day 3 of the observations. By that time I would expect children to get used to the camera and be more or less back to their daily routines in terms of linguistic behavior. The video-observations of day 3 showed that even though the girls were probably still aware of the camera, they act relaxed and seem to have a normal day at school.

The first lesson of day 3 of observations was a lesson of Norwegian, where children worked individually on their computers. The class was going through a range of spelling exercises of the "right-or-wrong"-type. On the next lesson the children got a task of making up and writing down on the computer a story of their own. There were very little whole-class interactions during these two lessons due to high amount of individual work. Instead, there occurred a number of one-to-one subject-related interactions between Emine and Yesim. The role of other children in these interactions was reserved to the passive audience.

The lunch-break was coming next, with children sitting around the table, eating their lunch and talking. The lunch-break was followed by a dancing routine including Yesim, Emine, Semra, Nur and Adriana. It has to be mentioned here that dancing appeared as a typical activity for the girls; they liked dancing a lot and even got the teacher's permission to dance inside during the breaks, while all the other children were outside. The participants of the dancing group varied from time to time. The dancing routine of day 3 seemed particularly interesting because of the presence of both Turkish-Norwegian girls and monolingual Adriana.

On the last lesson of day 3 – Norwegian again – the teacher was going through different exercises on the blackboard. It was also the only lesson of the day where whole-class conversations took place.

In order to answer the first research question I attempted to describe the girls' general use of Turkish and Norwegian during the whole day, which resulted in manual counting of the initiatives in each language. It is important to note here that I was counting how many times Yesim/Emine used Turkish/Norwegian to start a conversation, and not the total number of utterances in each language.

3.4.1 Manual quantifications of initiatives in the interaction

Manual quantifications of interactional initiatives intent to form a backdrop for the forthcoming analysis by documenting the frequencies of each language used separately and alternating from one language to another.

The main focus of the present study is not on attempting to quantify the presence of Turkish and Norwegian in a bilingual's everyday life, but trying to show how they organize their linguistic resources for achieving various interactional purposes. Therefore I did not quantify the words said in each language, which would be necessary in order to reveal the share of languages in the daily interaction. Instead, I chose a simpler way of quantifying initiatives, taken by each target child, and directed either towards another target child, or towards other children in class.

Initiative here is meant as an utterance, which intends to start an interaction with the other partner. Its meaning is to draw interlocutor's attention, welcome to a dialogue. Linell, Gustavson and Juvonen (1988) refer to initiative as an utterance which points forward towards the next turn, and carries on the dialogue by requesting a response from the interlocutor or introducing a new substance to the ongoing interaction. The utterance as a syntactical unit is often formed as a phrase or a sentence. In the tables of sequence, presented in the section 4.2, initiatives are counted per participant (in the meaning of a target child) and per language.

Needless to say that counting the initiatives is a rather simple way of viewing the language use, as the examples will show later that the girls often alternate in the middle of the utterance, which started in another code. However, it is also interesting to see how exactly they initiate their conversations, what strategies they use and how these strategies differ.

The selection of relevant linguistic episodes that would be speaking to my research interests (sub-questions 2 and 3) still were to be made, and I ended up with selecting 14 excerpts with a

starting point in the linguistic situations where code-switching was reflecting identity-related issues. The Turkish transcriptions helped in the selection-process, functioning as an indicator and a key to understanding the situations where two languages were present. When I was in the process of selecting examples that illustrated language use in the subject related discourse, the few whole-class interactions lead me to the choice of the examples where the girls talk to each other and often helping each other with the exercises they were working on individually. I therefore selected episodes from the first two lessons.

The lunch- and dancing-situations seemed to be exemplifying well the use of languages in the informal peer-conversations, as both activities were parts of the girls' daily routine. The dancing situation seemed especially interesting since both bi- and monolingual parts of Yesim and Emine's classroom environment were represented there. Day 3 was a rather normal day for the girls, consisting of rather normal school activities – which made it to a certain degree representative of their everyday interaction.

3.5 Reliability and validity

As any kind of research must respond to quality criteria, I was conscious of my study to be able to speak to the criteria of trustworthiness, through which the “truth value” of the research is to be evaluated.

Marshall and Rossman (1999) suggest that the criteria of trustworthiness can be reflected in form of following questions a researcher needs to answer:

- How transferable and applicable are the findings to another setting or group of people?
How can we be sure that the findings would be replicated if the study would be conducted with the same participants in the same context?

These questions parallel reliability in quantitative research and show whether the findings are likely to be applied at other times. The qualitative assumption is, nevertheless, rather different: the social world is constantly being constructed and changed; therefore it is almost impossible to replicate qualitative studies (Bryman, 2008; Marshall & Rossman, 1999).

There is a possibility of conducting a study similar to mine in another setting with other participants, but I expect the results to be different. What is particularly interesting in my case-study is the uniqueness of the cases.

- How can we be sure that the findings reflect the participants rather than a fabrication from the researcher's biases and prejudice? (Marshall & Rossman, 1999)

The fact that I was borrowing the data collected by another researcher instead of being present in the field myself might have both positive and negative sides in its' possible influence on the "true value" of the research findings.

Among the disadvantages of such a choice was my "remoteness" from the field: I did not experience myself everything that happened in the field, and I was not able to ask questions in the field, collect additional information if needed, etc. But my "remoteness" had also its' positive sides in terms of reducing biases: I was not the one who had been following the target-children from the kindergarten and I was not acquainted with them personally, which also means that I did not have any expectations towards their linguistic behavior. I did not have any prejudice towards them – simply because I did not know them. I also had an agreement with my supervisor that the background information about the cases would be provided to me gradually, in order to limit the prejudice that may occur in the process of analyzing the observations of linguistic practices.

Also, once I started the analyses of the selected excerpts, I faced the challenge of remaining neutral in my interpretations, which brings us to another question of trustworthiness that researchers need to answer:

- How credible are the particular findings of the study? (Marshall & Rossman, 1999)

My primary attempts of analyzing the data-material proved to me that it is indeed a challenge to differentiate between one's own interpretations and the actual intentions of the participants in the interaction. This is where it is important to keep in mind the "how" before "why"-perspective³: describing *how* the phenomenon is constituted locally before looking for answers *why* does it appear. It is important to remain descriptive and not over-interpret the local linguistic actions. In the process of analysis I tried all the time to keep the focus on revealing the natural complexity of the situational context and discussed my findings with my supervisor in order to question critically and confirm what I was seeing. Nevertheless, this study is an interpretive study and I am fully conscious about the fact that other researchers may have interpreted the results of this study in a completely different way. I by no means

³ More on that in section 3.9.2.

tend to claim my findings to be a universal truth; I perceive them more as my own interpretation, which I have been discussing with Veslemøy Rydland for the purpose of testing the soundness of my findings. As Kleven (2008) fairly stated, the inferences we draw have to be logically derived from sound arguments. I would also expect the trustworthiness of the findings to be higher if I could have the opportunity of cross-checking my findings with other researchers.

My validity and reliability discussion needs to speak to the particular circumstances of the investigation I have conducted. Therefore it has to reflect the fact that as I was not present in the field and could not influence the conditions under which the observations took place; so it is the data-proceeding and the process of analysis that I am accountable for. One of the important issues in this regards is to discuss how theoretical concepts of the present study were investigated – namely, discuss the construct validity.

3.5.1 Construct validity

The issue of construct validity is about attempting to evaluate “to what extend are the constructs of theoretical interest successfully operationalized in the research” (Judd, Smith & Kidder, 1991, p. 29). As Kleven (2008) fairly argues, qualitative research indicators are often first observed, and then the constructs are “constructed” through the process of analysis. In other words, there occurs an inference from indicators to the construct (Kleven, 2008). Each inference has to be valid in order to assure construct validity. The question a researcher needs to ask himself then, is: How well is the concept represented? (Kleven, 2008)

There are two major threats to construct validity that may occur in the process of analysis: systematic measurement errors and random measurement errors (Crocker & Algina, 1986). Systematic measurement errors include construct underrepresentation and construct irrelevance (Messick, 1995). Moreover, Kleven (2008) states that we cannot claim that our indicators give a complete representation of the construct. The question is then to what extent may we consider the indicators used as representative? Here Kleven draws on a so-called Hanson’s thesis, which considers all observations to be theory-laden, which is the main reason why our knowledge claims can only be considered as constructions and never as “final facts” (Kleven, 2008). That is why one should be always concerned about the possibility of an error occurring in the process of inferring and do one’s best to evaluate the construct validity.

Concepts of the present study are all theoretical abstractions that have been operationalized. The operationalization process included a thorough examination of the definitions existing in the previous research in combination with exploration of the particular qualities of the interactions in the video material. The inferences I made from the observations to abstract concepts, were validated with Veslemøy Rydland on the matter of representativeness.

3.6 Limitations

Discussing the methodological framework of my study, I find it important to reflect on the limitations of my research. I want to point out that the analysis process, the process of breaking down, categorizing data and selecting the parts which seem interesting to investigate and ground my further discussion on, is influenced by my own values, expectations and personal judgment. By making this fact visible I try to show my awareness about it and my consciousness about own subjectivity in this investigation. Nevertheless, knowing that subjectivity is one of the usual challenges a qualitative researcher has to face (Bryman, 2008), I intend to have it in mind during my discussion of findings.

Another challenge that I want to focus on, is the lack of competence in Turkish language, which I consider to be one of the central limitations for my study. Since the data-material I have gained access to, is partly in Turkish, of which I have no knowledge, there is a danger of missing some details or contexts that might be important for the soundness of the image I want to convey. It is therefore important to point out that the Turkish utterances in the interactions of target children are transcribed and translated by a Turkish-speaking assistant.

Finally, the fact that data is video-taped, makes it possible for me to capture non-verbal communication in the interactions, which to some extent can help me understand the context and the way how Turkish utterances are charged emotionally. This is somewhat helpful in my interpretations and analyses, taking into account my inability of understanding Turkish. At the same time, I face a significant limitation by my inability to get to the field and pose follow-up questions to the participants or cross-check the soundness of my findings.

3.7 Ethical considerations

For the quality of any research, ethical issues should be addressed and carefully thought through. Even though I was not present in the field and, consequently, did not need to handle

entry negotiation and the reciprocity issue, I still need to be very well aware of other ethical dilemmas. For this purpose, only fictive names of persons and places are mentioned in my study, together with all the personal characteristics and descriptions of places. Some parts of the interviews that appear to be too personal were not used. The video recordings and all the other material used for the forthcoming analysis are carefully collected and stored by my supervisor, Veslemøy Rydland. All the notes, transcriptions and other materials which I produced during the analysis process, are kept and stored by myself.

3.8 Methods of analysis

3.8.1 Social Constructivist Theory and interaction

Classroom interaction in a bilingual context stands central in the present thesis. The process of learning is therefore viewed through the perspective of interaction, which means that by investigating interaction I aim to improve understanding of different possibilities for learning in bilingual classroom. As Slotte-Lüttge (2005) fairly states, learning in the classroom is not all about learning particular topics, but it is also about managing social relations and roles. She also argues that when schoolchildren participate in the classroom, they do it by relating to the classroom discourse: experiencing and constructing it. Through their participation in the interaction they make a relevant discourse visible. Through following this process of discourse-visualization we, as researchers, can improve our understanding of what does classroom discourse mean for schoolchildren (Slotte-Lüttge 2005).

Linguistic aspects of classroom discourse are in focus of the present study. In this regards I anchor my work in social constructivist theory and its understanding of reality is being constructed in a frequent dialectic movement between people and social world. In other words, reality is born while participants construct it in the interaction, modify and reconstruct. Since it emerges in the interaction, it is linguistic tools that are used in the process of construction; among others, alternating between codes in order to make a particular context relevant. Context is created through interaction; it is also modified and reconstructed. A row of small-scaled interactional events, which might seem meaningless, are also a source for context-generation. Therefore I find microanalysis to be productive for understanding the reality of a multicultural classroom constructed by monolingual children.

3.8.2 Garfinkel and ethnomethodology

In Garfinkel's "Studies on Ethnomethodology" (1967) interaction and culture are in a socio-constructivist sense also seen as non-static phenomena that are produced and determined by people on a regular basis. The main point in ethnomethodology is the investigation of *common-sense knowledge*, which is people's understanding of various principles of how one act in different situations. As Aarsæther (2004) explains, this approach considers meaning of using a particular linguistic code, which could not be defined in beforehand, but is locally generated through the acts of bilinguals. To say it with Aarsæther, this interactional perspective is sceptical towards a researcher who brings in meaning "from the outside", from his own standpoint. But that is when a dilemma appears: can we as researchers really state that meaning in language alternation is really intended by the speaker, or may it be something we ourselves assign to the switch? (Aarsæther 2004)

Li Wei answers the question in the following way:

"...any interpretation of the meaning of CS, or what might be called the broad *why* questions, must come *after* we have fully examined the ways in which the participants are locally constituting the phenomena, i.e. the *how* questions" (1998: 163).

Aarsæther argues that in accordance with ethnomethodological perspective researchers of bilingualism should change their perspective "from outside and in" to "from inside and out" (Aarsæther 2004). I used this method in my work with data, approaching it with a starting point in an assumption that phenomena that I am looking at are already meaningful by themselves, they are not being meaningful because I, as an analyst, ascribe them my analyst's meaning. Therefore it was important for me to focus on the procedures participants use in order to produce phenomena I am interested in, as well as the context they were produced in. In order to do so one has to display how interaction is produced locally and it is the tools of Conversational Analysis may be used in this regard.

3.8.3 Conversational Analysis

Ethnomethodological understanding is developed further through conversational analysis. At the stage of literature review I found it necessary to consult with a wide number of sources that focus on this approach. I used this approach as a source of inspiration for analyzing the bilingual conversations, attempting to be attentive to the ways how the structural features of the interaction may have an interactional importance for the conversations. In conversational

analysis (CA) one expects participants to achieve common understanding in interaction by giving each other “contextualization cues”: using verbal and non-verbal conversational techniques in order to show in which context their messages should be understood in. Contextualization cues are central in Gumperz’s “Contextualization theory” (1982) that have been mentioned earlier.

Garfinkel and ethnomethodology finds its place within explicit interpretive sociology, in a hermeneutic part of social theory (Aarsæther 2004). CA emerged from ethnomethodological understanding and developed as a tool for forming a naturalistic, observable sociology, where the aim of a researcher is to reveal and systematize an already existing order.

One of the characteristic features of CA is that it creates theory; and all the theoretical assumptions a researcher might come up with, should be anchored empirically (Aarsæther, 2004). Hence, the nature of this research analysis is inductive.

In order to describe CA in a practical sense, I employ Aarsæther’s (2004) understanding of CA as a way to analyze language by describing how participants organize their contributions in the interaction. This description is made with form in focus: how do participants interact, whether there appear pauses, overlapping, etc. A researcher’s task is to reveal those structural features of the interaction that are significant for emerging meaning of the interaction.

What is specific for CA is that each line in the interaction is bound to what precedes it and follows; to so-called *inner context*. Therefore interaction turns are analyzed in order or *sequence*.

Li Wei (2005) argues that language alternation, or code-switching, is first and foremost a conversational activity, and it happens in a specific conversational context; therefore analyzing location of CS in particular conversational context should serve as a starting point in revealing its meaning.

In his article “How can you tell?” Towards common sense explanation of conversational code-switching” Li Wei (2005) draws on the contrast of two approaches to code-switching analysis: the Rational Choice (RC) model and the Conversational Analysis (CA) approach. He contrasts these two approaches by their view of the function of language, where the RC approach is grounded on the assumption that language is a medium for expressing intentions, motives, or interests, which are indexed through speech acts such as code-switching. The

main assumption in CA approach is that people are viewed as social individuals, who actively create the context while interacting with each other. The interlocutor's primary task, viewed from the CA perspective, is to achieve coherence in interactional talk, while RC approach is orienting towards speaker's ability to behave rationally and determine his/her linguistic behaviour in accordance with a "cost-benefit analysis" (Wei 2005). Li Wei is somewhat critical to the RC approach, taking into account that this approach says nothing about the speaker's deliberations and takes the rationalism of a speaker for granted. He suggests that this method should be complemented by CA approach exactly because of the fact that code-switching never occurs in an "interactional vacuum". What he suggests is a dual-level approach, which would be able to link the analysis of sequence in code switching with the analysis of rational choice of code-switching based on social motivation.

This suggestion has inspired me for developing a method of analyzing my material: I intend to look at the data with this dual-level approach in mind. My interest in the form of interaction is limited; therefore pauses and overlapping and other non-verbal conversational techniques do not appear to be my primary analytical focus. This is also to some extent prescribed by the transcriptions of the conversational material in Turkish: transcriptions have been made without particular interest in non-verbal forms of conversational techniques; hence, they were documented to a rather limited extent. I place the main focus of my research on the verbal techniques, and not on the form and structure of the interaction, considering structural features of interaction rather as an auxiliary tool to uncover the meaning of verbal actions.

3.9 Approaching relevant literature

Since the topic of my interest appears to be in the cross-zone of various fields, such as educational science, linguistics and sociology, I have been able to draw on many sources that seemed to be relevant to a different degree and in various ways.

I started to approach literature on the topic by getting acquainted with the classical studies on bilingualism and second language acquisition; many of these are present in the theory chapter of the present thesis. Once I had an understanding of the general phenomena, and approaches to bilingualism, I started to look for relevant literature on the various existing models for educating linguistic minorities and studies that have been assessing the successfulness of these models and concentrating on the academic performance of minorities at school. In this

regards, the longitudinal study of bilinguals in USA, conducted by Thomas and Collier (1997), helped me make a better sense of reality by presenting the macroscopic effects of the school strategies on the long-term achievement of language-minority students.

As my focus was on the context of Scandinavia and, more specifically, Norway, I started to look for the recent studies on bilingualism conducted in the region. While searching in the library database, I used such key-words as “bilingualism”, “classroom research”, “minority children in Norway”, “language alternation”, “bilingual behavior”, “code-switching” etc. That is how I came across such relevant studies as Danish Kjøge-project and various studies conducted on its’ data-material; “Journal of Pragmatics” with relevant language-issues focusing on language-alternation and code-switching, where I got acquainted with the knowledge on the topic shared by Auer (2005), Cashman (2005), Cromdal (2005) and Li Wei (2005), among others.

When my focus narrowed down to code-switching as an act of identity, I realized that my knowledge on that issue was rather limited at that point, since linguistics never happened to be my field of studies; nevertheless, I had to gain some essential knowledge on the phenomenon from the field of linguistics. I have to admit the challenges I faced while acquiring this knowledge: a wide scope of terminology used in the related articles describing code-switching was new to me. At that point my supervisor’s suggestions of literature were more than helpful: with her help I discovered such relevant sources as Linell (1998), Evaldsson (2003, 2000), Aarsæther (2004), and Slotte-Lüttge (2005), to name the few. By the help of all above mentioned authors I managed to build a primary understanding of the phenomenon and develop a strategy for approaching data.

As a starting point for main categories for analyzing the material I took Auer’s (1984) division of CS as alternational, insertional, participant related and preference related CS. This division turned out to be fundamental for my data, so it formed an appropriate starting point for further development of subcategories that appear to be characteristic and explanatory for the data. My main concern while developing subcategories was to make sure that it would in a best possible way reflect common features of social dynamics in the interaction: common features and interactional criteria in the filmed situations of interaction.

4 Analysis

4.1 The target children: Emine and Yesim

At the time of data-collection Yesim and Emine were 10 years old and attended the fifth grade of *Myrsletta School*. Both were born in Norway and grew up in the same multicultural neighbourhood, living in an apartment block. As mentioned earlier, the neighbourhood was densely populated by Turkish immigrants, giving the target children an opportunity of easily utilizing their native language at the school arena, as well as in their spare time: in stores, on the bus etc. (for description, see Rydland et al., submitted). Yesim and Emine got to know each other already in preschool and became close friends. Many of the children in their preschool were Turkish-speaking and were from the same neighbourhood. Some of the children from the preschool got enrolled in *Myrsletta School*, together with Yesim and Emine.

If we compare the life-styles of the girls, they appear to be very much alike: they are enrolled in the same multicultural class with Norwegian as the official language of instruction; both spend their leisure time in a Turkish-dominated neighbourhood. As it is known from parental questionnaires, the girls also appear to have similar family background: their parents were born in Turkey, but have been living in Norway for the past twenty years. In each family both parents work fulltime: Emine's parents are taxi-drivers, while Yesim's mother is a cook in a cafeteria, and her father is a plumber.

Emine stated in her interview that she often meets some of the children she knows in the mosque, where her family goes every Saturday and Sunday; while Yesim's family is a member of a Turkish association and Yesim is taking a traditional dancing-course there. Yesim tells that sometimes her family and relatives may gather all together in a cabin – as she reports they did last year during Christmas holidays.

Both Yesim and Emine tell in their interviews as fifth-graders that they have close connections to their family members back in Turkey, where they spend their vacations from time to time. Both girls tell the interviewer that they go to Turkey almost every year, and they like to spend their vacation among their relatives and people they know. Yesim seems to refer to her vacations in Turkey as a good memory and is pleased with the opportunity of keeping in touch with family and friends there. The same counts for Emine, who tells with admiration

about a new house being built back in Turkey for her family; and shares proudly that she will have her own room there.

When it comes to the language patterns of the girls, they seem to be considerably similar: both girls express that Norwegian is a language reserved for the school domain and school-related activities (including homework), while Turkish is the main language of communication with parents and, generally, as Yesim herself puts it, the language of “*fritiden*” (Norw. free time, interview with Yesim, 5th grade). There is however a difference in their language choice in their conversations with parents: Emine reports to prefer speaking Turkish with her parents, while Yesim reports that she can use both Turkish and Norwegian with her mother: “*when she (mother) comes home she forgets that I came home – then we speak a little Norwegian because at her job they always speak Norwegian*” (interview with Emine, 5th grade).

As for conversations at the school arena, Norwegian is a common language of communication for children with different mother tongues and various cultural backgrounds: according to Yesim, they “*speak Norwegian because we sit round a big table, so everyone should understand*” (interview with Yesim, 5th grade). But when it comes to one-to-one conversations between Emine and Yesim, they prefer to speak Turkish, as Emine tells in her interview. Both girls stated that it is easier to do homework in Norwegian, with Turkish as a helping tool in case they have difficulties in understanding or fail to explain something.

4.1.1 Yesim

Regardless all the many similarities between the two girls, there were some significant differences between these two girls, that caught my attention. First of all, they seem to relate themselves to Turkish and Norwegian in different ways.

Yesim is explicitly stating that she uses Norwegian as well as Turkish in her everyday life, and mentions several times that she has equal attitude to both. She switches between languages strategically according to the appropriateness of the language in a definite situation with a definite speaker.

In first grade Yesim tells that she speaks both Turkish and Norwegian at home:

1. Researcher: *when you talk to your mom and dad#*

2. Yesim: *sometimes I speak Norwegian with my mom and sometimes I use Turkish.*
3. Researcher: *when is that you use to speak Norwegian with your mom?*
4. Yesim: *I don't know – we just speak it – watch TV and things like that.*
(interview with Yesim, 1st grade).

When telling about her language use at home as a fifth-grader, Yesim mentions that although she speaks mostly Turkish to her parents, sometimes her mother forgets that she is already not at work and goes on talking to Yesim in Norwegian.

To the question whether she watches Turkish TV, Yesim answers that she does sometimes - there are some Turkish series that are fun, but she prefers Norwegian ones. As for reading in her leisure time, Yesim states that she reads only in Norwegian. If she is going on a holiday to Turkey it is Norwegian books she is bringing along.

She also tells that she has pen-pals in Turkey and sometimes chats via MSN or e-mail with her Turkish friends while in Norway, but considers it to be hard to write and sometimes also understand written and spoken Turkish. It is especially difficult to understand the type of language that is written or spoken by native Turkish speakers: Yesim makes a clear difference between what she calls “*Norwegian-like Turkish*” (Norw. “*norsk-aktig tyrkisk*”, interview with Yesim, 5th grade), that they speak in Norway, and the type of Turkish language they speak in Turkey. She points out the main difference between the language variants that occurs to her: intonation. Turkish people in Norway speak Turkish with Norwegian intonation, according to Yesim. Besides that, she states that the sounds in “*Norwegian-like Turkish*” are somehow simplified to suit the user, who is used to Norwegian sounds.

Other Turkish-speaking children in the class received four full years of reading and writing education in the mother tongue, while Yesim followed the mother tongue instruction classes just for one year. She considers this to be the reason for why it is “*a bit difficult to write in Turkish*” (interview with Yesim, 5th grade). As she states it in her interview, after the first year of mother tongue instruction her mother decided she should not follow the lessons and withdrew her from the classes. Instead, she taught Yesim the Turkish alphabet herself.

Yesim reports to be using Norwegian when she does her homework: the reason for that is lacking knowledge of Turkish terminology for this purpose. She tells, for instance, that she does not know how to say “plus” and “minus” in Turkish. Besides, she considers it to be more

difficult to write in Turkish, than in Norwegian: *“It is a bit difficult to write in Turkish for me because I’ve had mother tongue instruction for one year, but I didn’t learn the letters there”* (interview with Yesim, 5th grade).

Yesim reserves the future role of Turkish in her life to a language of communication with her relatives back in Turkey: *“talk to my grandmother (...) or those who are in Turkey – my cousins, uncles, aunts, grandparents”* (interview with Yesim, 5th grade). Yesim seems to be satisfied with her writing skills in Turkish, which are just enough for being understood by her Turkish relatives. This scenario makes sense: using Turkish as a tool which enables communication with those family members back in Turkey who can’t speak Norwegian.

4.1.2 Emine

In her interview as a first-grader, Emine tells that it is easier for her to speak Turkish: *“Because I am from Turkey # then then I understand more to talk in Turkish”* (interview with Emine, 1st grade). The logic of her language choice is simple for Emine: since she is from Turkey, she understands better while speaking Turkish. Emine grew up in the same multicultural neighbourhood with many co-ethnics as Yesim, but before the school-start her parents decided to move out of the minority-dominated area to another part of the city, which was almost entirely Norwegian-speaking. Emine entered the first grade of *Tunet School*, where she was the only Turkish-speaking pupil, and one of the few minority students – the whole school was majority-dominated. Emine and her family spent two years in the *Tunet*-area and then her parents decided to move back to *Myrsletta*, back to their Turkish relatives and friends. Consequently, by her third year of school Emine was enrolled in the same class Yesim and some other kindergarten friends were attending. Being interviewed as a fifth-grader, she stressed several times that the only person she talked Turkish to at school was Yesim. When she had to move to another part of the city, she temporarily lost this part, and the only possible language of communication in the school arena for her was Norwegian. In her interview as a first-grader in *Tunet School*, Emine mentions that it was hard for her to *“play in Norwegian”* with monolingual peers (interview with Emine, 1st grade). As a fifth-grader at *Myrsletta School* she gets back the possibility of choosing the language of interaction again, and she chooses to speak Turkish to Yesim.

In the 5th grade Emine reports that her reading habits involve both Norwegian and Turkish – she is fond of Norwegian books based on facts that she can borrow at the school library, but

she also has a lot of Turkish adventure books at home that she likes to read. Her favourite magazine is Turkish, and she had to subscribe to it in order to get it every month. Emine tells that she buys Turkish books every time she and her family are on vacation in Turkey.

She explains that she is well aware why they have so many Turkish books at home, and she also knows why her mother wants her to read those books in order to improve her Turkish language skills. Emine tells in her interview as a fifth-grader that her mother, who had limited schooling when she herself was a girl, insists that Emine should buy Turkish books and read them. As Emine states it herself, “she always wants that I will learn a lot of Turkish” (interview with Emine, 5th grade).

Emine has a perspective on how she might use Turkish in her future, which appears to be different from Yesim’s: besides using it as a tool of communication with Turkish relatives, she is considering that it may help her become a teacher of mother tongue or a researcher (interview with Emine, 5th grade). Both as a first-grader and a fifth-grader she refers to herself as Turkish in the interviews to the researcher.

Interview with Emine, 1st grade:

1. Researcher: *if somebody would ask you – “where are you from, Emine?” What would you answer?*
2. Emine: *from Turkey*
3. Researcher: *why do you think you would answer this way?*
4. Emine: *I am from Turkey.*

Interview with Emine, 5th grade:

1. Emine: *See myself more as Turkish*
2. Researcher: *more as Turkish? Yes?*
3. Researcher: *a bit or a lot like those who look at themselves as Turkish?*
4. Emine: *a lot*
5. Researcher: *a lot like them yeah? Can you explain why? Do you know why do you think this way?*
6. Emine: *I # don’t know I am just Turkish.*

Growing up in a similar environment and having the same languages at their disposition, the girls seem to have different linguistic patterns and different attitudes towards the roles these

languages are playing. The strategies they use for utilizing their bilingualism in their everyday life do not seem to be similar either.

4.1.3 Target children as social and learning individuals

Yesim and Emine are each other's "bestest" friends; this is verbalized by both of them in the interviews and also visible through the video-material. Both of them seem to appreciate the friendship they have together, but probably in slightly different ways. Yesim has been friends with a couple of girls from class (among those are Nur, Semra, Adriana and Hanni) since they went to the same kindergarten; they know each other well and Yesim has her own tone and her own friendship with each of them. The observations suggest that Yesim is an easy-going, yet responsible person, appears to be liked by many and have a certain authority among other Turkish-speaking girls.

Emine, as seen in the observations, appears to be friendly and outgoing person, who feels comfortable among her classmates. She tends to stick to Yesim most of the time though, as Yesim seem to appreciate Emine as a person and a school-friend. But since Yesim has been friends with a couple of other girls in class over a longer period of time and also in the period when Emine was attending another school, Emine seems to be more dependent on Yesim's attention and support.

Both girls are described by their teacher as responsible and dutiful learners, which is also visible through their attitude to school-related tasks in the video-material. They are concerned about the grades for the test, they discuss possible mistakes they could have made, and they seem to be genuinely interested and motivated in their day-to-day school-work. The video-material suggests that both girls have positive attitude towards school-related activities.

At the same time, Yesim and Emine are witty and critical towards their classmates and teachers; they have developed common sense of humor and share their humoristic observations with each other willingly. Among others, they use their linguistic resources to create a witty comment.

Yesim and Emine are not only learning individuals, but Turkish-Norwegian 10-year-olds, whose identities are influenced by modern pop-culture. And they seem to know a lot about both American and Turkish pop-culture. Both girls show excitement about what is happening to the heroes of "High School Musical" at the same time as being completely into playing

“their own” role of the character from a well-known Turkish girl-band called “Hepsi”. “Hepsi” was a teenage soap-opera starring members from the girls-band named respectively, consisting of four members: Erin, Cemre, Yasemin and Gülçin. Each of the four Turkish-speaking girls in the class has her own role from the girl-band, where Emine identifies herself with Yasemin, while Yesim with Gülçin. They seem to be very into their roles, especially while dancing – and dancing appears to be a favorite activity for Emine, Yesim, Nur and Semra.

Emine tells in her interview that she goes to the mosque with her family every Saturday, where she reads the Koran and meets other children. Yesim does not go to the same mosque, but she and her family does not seem to be less connected with Turkish community for that reason: they are members of the Turkish association in Norway and Yesim regularly attends various cultural events they provide for Turkish adolescents.

For the purpose of constructing a detailed picture of the target children, I was made acquainted with the test results from the vocabulary tests with Yesim and Emine in both the first and the fifth grade. In the first grade Emine’s and Yesim’s Turkish and Norwegian vocabulary skills were assessed with translated versions of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III (PPVT-III, Dunn & Dunn, 1997). In fifth grade, the girls’ vocabulary skills in Norwegian were assessed with the same translated versions of the PPVT-III into Norwegian, while their Turkish vocabulary skills were assessed with a translated version of the British Picture Vocabulary Scale-II (BPVS-II, Dunn, Dunn, Whetton & Burley, 1997). Both in the PPVT-III and BPVS-II children are shown successive panels of four pictures and asked to point to the picture that match a word said by the assessor. As these tests have not been standardized for Norwegian or for a sample of Turkish-Norwegian speakers, only raw scores were used in the overall study. As a result, children’s vocabulary scores in Turkish and Norwegian are not directly comparable.

Looking only at the raw scores of the PPVT III, an interesting picture emerges from these results: when tested in first grade, Emine and Yesim show relatively even results in both Turkish and Norwegian vocabulary, which in comparison to others in the class, are rather high. In fifth grade, however, the situation had changed: while the girls show even results in Turkish vocabulary, Yesim scores much higher in PPVT-III, compared to Emine.

4.2 How are the two girls similar and different in their relative use of Turkish and Norwegian?

The aim of this section is to answer the first research-question: how are Yesim and Emine different and alike in their use of Turkish and Norwegian? For this purpose the manual quantifications of the initiatives in both languages have been made for both target children in order to reveal their language patterns (more on that in section 3.11). The analysis of the initiatives distributed between the two languages revealed that the target children are active users of both languages. Nevertheless, there are some differences in the ways Yesim and Emine used Norwegian and Turkish to start the interactions. Tables 1 and 2 given below reveal the distribution of the initiatives between Turkish and Norwegian languages and show the directions of these initiatives. This quantification is based on the initiatives that were taken by Emine and Yesim during day 3 of filming. With “initiative” I mean an utterance that is functioning as a conversation-starter, welcoming the other interlocutor to engage in the dialogue and develop it further.

Emine

Table 1 Initiatives formulated by Emine (Day 3)

Direction of the initiative	Initiatives per language						
	Turkish		Norwegian		Unidentified		Total per direction
Emine→Yesim	65	64%	36	36%			101
Emine→others	6	19%	26	81%			32
Total per language	71	53%	62	47%			133

As we can see from table 1, Emine used more Turkish during day 3 in her attempts of initiating a dialogue with Yesim: 65 initiatives were taken in Turkish and 36 in Norwegian. When it comes to the initiatives directed towards other pupils in the class (Turkish-speaking as well as non-Turkish-speaking children), Norwegian was prevailing: 26 initiatives taken in

Norwegian with only 6 taken in Turkish. The 6 initiatives produced in Turkish were directed towards Semra or/and Nur, who seem to prefer talking Turkish with Turkish-speaking classmates and each-other.

Yesim

Table 2 Initiatives formulated by Yesim (Day 3)

Amount of initiatives per language	Language						Total per direction
	Turkish		Norwegian		Unidentified		
Yesim→Emine	13	30%	29	68%	1	2%	43
Yesim→others	1	2%	48	98%			49
Total per language	14	15%	77	84%	1	1%	92

A rather different pattern appears in Yesim's language use when it comes to one-to-one conversations with Emine: Norwegian is dominating the initiatives directed towards the best friend, with 29 initiatives taken in Norwegian and 13 in Turkish. There also appears a significant difference between Emine and Yesim in terms of general frequency of initiating a conversation with each other. It seems that Emine was taking the initiative and starting conversation with Yesim generally more often than Yesim did. At the same time, we can see that Yesim was more active than Emine in initiating conversations with other neighbors. When it comes to the language of Yesim's initiatives directed towards other children in the class, the dominance of Norwegian appears to be even more evident – 48 initiatives taken in Norwegian and 1 in Turkish. The overwhelming dominance of Norwegian in inquiries to other children may be influenced by the fact that Hanni, who is good friend with Yesim, is sitting next to her, and she does not speak Turkish. The observations reveal frequent interactions between Hanni and Yesim during the whole day 3.

In general, the video-material from day 3 reveals permanent presence of both languages in the interactions, which implies that the girls engaged in bilingual as well as monolingual classroom discourse on a daily basis.

Mixed code is often present in the target children's classroom interactions, and code-switching appears to have a rather large share in the interactions. The alternational type of CS, characteristic by the non-predictability of its duration and not having structural limits, was prevailing in the data-material (for the distinction between alternational and insertional code-switching, see section 2.5.2). Insertional code-switching, with a predictable duration and limited by structure, was also present in the video-material of the day 3: it was especially visible in the subject-related side-conversations between the target children while they are working on the various individual tasks. Insertional CS often appeared in form of "content words" – words describing qualities, subjects, states and events. Rather frequently this type of CS appeared in the video-material in form of a Norwegian noun or number, inserted in otherwise Turkish utterance: e.g. *passord* (password), *tegneserie* (cartoon), *overskrift* (headline), *oversvømmelse* (flood), *feil* (wrong).

Summing up

Comparison of the distribution of the languages used by the target children in addressing each other, and initiating conversations with other children in the class draws on the significant differences in the way Emine and Yesim use the two languages. Emine appears to have a generally higher amount of inquiries directed to Yesim, than Yesim had in Emine's direction; Yesim also seemed to be addressing other children more often, than Emine.

Emine seems to employ Turkish when addressing Yesim more often than Norwegian; while in her inquiries directed towards other children in the class, including the Turkish-speaking ones, Norwegian is prevailing. Yesim shows a different pattern in her language use, having a tendency of often choosing Norwegian both in her inquiries directed towards Emine and other children. One of the reasons for this high share of Norwegian in inquiries directed towards others may be that Yesim often talked to her neighbor, the non-Turkish speaker Hanni. Emine also has a non-Turkish speaking neighbor Nazilla, but she addresses her rather seldom, compared to the amount of inquiries Yesim addresses to Hanni.

4.3 What are the similarities and differences in the ways the two girls use their bilingual resources to position themselves in subject related discourse?

In this section I present examples of situations where the target-children position themselves as bilinguals in the subject-related discourse. I introduce each example with a short description of the context the interaction occurred in. Each utterance in the examples is given a new main tier. The speaker is introduced by the first name, and then follows the transcribed utterance in the original language. Thereafter follows my translation of the utterance into English. The transcription key with the explanation is given in Appendix 1.

As the forthcoming examples will show, access to multiple languages enriches the techniques one may use in content related learning. Code-switching appears to be a linguistic resource capable of serving a variety of purposes in the learning discourse. Learning activities in this classroom were characterized by a large share of individual work, which was carried out by pupils at their own desks; therefore all the conversations in the following examples occurred as by-play or one-to-one conversations between Yesim and Emine aside the official classroom talk.

Excerpt 1. In this excerpt we can see an example of a typical one-to-one interaction between the target-children that occurs while they are working on their individual tasks. The class is about to write a story on the computer.

1. Emine: *iki tane 'n' oluyor demi* vennen *de?*
there is two n's in friend right? ((starts writing))
2. Yesim: jeg skal snakke om snakkende hunden.
((nods)) I will talk about the talking dog.
3. Emine: *he?*
what?
4. Yesim: snakkende hunden.

talking dog. ((proudly))

5. Emine: *bi çocuk xxx kullanmaya gidiyor adada kalıyor #sonra adam icine dustu bi balik geliyor xxx kocaman bi balik arkadas oluyor xxx.*

((thinks for a moment, then turns to Yesim and starts to tell)) *a child xxx goes to use stays on the island# and a man falls down into there comes a fish xxx a giant fish becomes friends with xxx*

6. Yesim: <ben> [>] +...

<I> [>] +...

7. Emine: <xxx> [<].

8. Yesim: det var en gutt ## den gutten # kunne trylle # også nei den gutten kunne ønske den gutten #det var bursdagen til gutten *sonra o* bursdag ende hun han ønsket en snakkende hund så den også skal jeg ja finne på noe.

there was a boy ## this boy ((thoughtfully)) # could work magic # also no this boy could wish this boy # it was birthday of the boy *later* have on his birthday she he made a wish a talking dog so it also shall I yes invent something.

In the beginning of the excerpt Emine addresses Yesim in Turkish in order to ask if there is a double “n” in the word “vennen” (Norw. friend). Yesim nods and says in Norwegian that she will write about a talking dog (line 2). Emine is occupied with a story she herself is about to write and starts to fantasize about a child who becomes friends with a giant fish, saying it out loud to Yesim in Turkish (line 6). Yesim’s next utterance cannot count for an independent one, but this attempt to say something is clearly produced in Turkish: “<ben>” (Turkish “I”), which is overlapping with an inaudible utterance from Emine. Next turn is Yesim’s, where she starts off her narrative about a boy who wished for a talking dog (line 9). The whole utterance is produced in Norwegian, with a single alternational switching – Turkish “*sonra*” (later/afterwards).

Emine starts the conversation with Yesim by asking her a learning related question in Turkish. Yesim answers with a nod and announces to Emine the topic of her future story in Norwegian, signaling that she wants to talk about her story and she wants to do it in Norwegian. Emine responds in Turkish, which may be signaling Emine’s wish to speak

Turkish to Yesim. But Yesim once again repeats the topic of her future story in Norwegian. Emine responds by choosing Turkish to tell the plot of her own story, signaling her preference of talking about it in Turkish. The next pair of utterances appears to be inaudible, but it seems that Yesim makes an attempt of alternating to Turkish, which may signalize her preference for the same language talk. But then again, Yesim continues to narrate her story to Emine in Norwegian, and signals to Emine repeatedly that it is Norwegian she wants to narrate her story in. The overlapping and several code-switches the girls do during the conversation may contextualize “the track-changing” in the conversation and suggest that each girl seems to be eager to share *her own* story.

It is possible that the code-switching occurring here may also reflect a competence-issue, in line with the perception of code-switching as an ambiguous and polyvalent phenomenon (Cromdal & Aronsson, 2000; Aarsæther, 2004). Code-switches in the given example may as well be due to language proficiency in one language and lack of words in another language. The way Yesim and Emine tell their stories in Norwegian and Turkish respectively, suggests that their language choice is not only determined by their intentions to put their stories in the centre of interaction, but also by a preference for telling narrative in one language. It seems that Emine finds it more convenient to tell her story in Turkish, while Yesim prefers Norwegian. This interpretation is supported by the finding that Emine generally initiates more utterances in Turkish (abstract 4.2).

Excerpt 1 is an example of how Yesim uses Norwegian in order to convey her story to Emine. There occurs only one attempt to switch to Turkish, but the utterance cannot count as an independent utterance. One can explain that Yesim uses the language contrasting to Emine’s language choice for the purpose of drawing attention to her own story. At the same time, the use of contrasting language in this interaction may also be signaling that it is Norwegian Yesim feels more comfortable with when conveying the story.

Emine, to the difference with Yesim, uses Turkish when trying to convey her own story in excerpt 1. From my point of view, there are two possible explanations of the contrasting languages the girls are using in this interaction: a) using a code contrasting with the previous utterance in order to draw attention to one’s story; b) particular languages may be more suitable for narrating story – as Turkish for Emine and Norwegian for Yesim. It is noticeable that in the interviews on the language use (discussed in the methodological chapter) Emine stated that she liked to read in Turkish and, according to her, reads a lot; while Yesim stated

that she read only in Norwegian as she did not know the Turkish alphabet. As reading is often the main source for acquiring linguistic vocabulary, assuming that one language may be more suitable for story-telling than another may be correct.

Excerpt 2. The excerpt is drawn from the same lesson as excerpt 1: the children got a task of making up a story and writing it down on their computers. Emine is thinking of the plot of her story.

1. Emine: ***atanin turkcesi ne?***
how to say "ancestors" in Turkish? ((looks at Yesim))
2. Yesim: hva da?
what?
3. Emine: ***ata xxx eder böyle ata olur ya.***
ancestors xxx you know there are like ancestors.
4. Yesim: ***ata # ne atasi?***
ancestors # ancestors what?
5. Emine: ***bøyle+...***
like +...
6. Yesim: øy?
island?
7. Emine: ***he # böyle gemiyle giderler bi yere xxx gezerler xxx.***
yes ((Emine seems to be insecure)) # you take a boat to a place xxx go for a walk xxx
8. Yesim: øy xxx ***issiz ada.***
island xxx deserted island.
9. Emine: ***he*** ((meaning yes)).
yes
10. Yesim: ***ada turkce xxx øy.***
it is "ada" in Turkish xxx island. ((confident tone))

11. Emine: er du sikker # *xxx sorayim ben* xxx jeg kan spørre om # jeg kan se på
en bok xxx på biblioteket #
are you sure # *xxx I'll ask xxx* I can ask if # I can look up in the book
xxx at the library#
12. Yesim: jeg vet det men#
I know but#
13. Emine: skal jeg spørre det?
should I ask about it?
14. Yesim: det er øy>
it is island> ((nods confidently))
15. Emine: <er du sikker?
16. Yesim: *ada* er øy.

ada is island.

In the first line Emine addresses Yesim in Turkish asking her how to say “ancestors” in Turkish. Since she actually says the word “ancestors” in Turkish herself, I assume that she confuses Turkish *atanin* (ancestors) with *ada* (island). What she really wants to ask Yesim, is how to say “island”, but probably cannot recall the word neither in Turkish, nor in Norwegian. From the following utterances we can see that she struggles to explain what she means. Yesim, naturally, does not understand and asks her in Norwegian what she means (line 2). Emine responds in Turkish, trying to explain that it is ancestors she is talking about (line 3). Yesim switches to Turkish as well in line 4: she still cannot understand what Emine wants with ancestors. Emine struggles to explain, so Yesim asks her in Norwegian if it is actually island she is trying to say (line 6). Emine confirms this and goes on explaining in Turkish that it is a place where one can go for a walk (line 7). Yesim confirms that the place Emine is talking about is called “øya” in Norwegian. Emine confirms it with short “yes” and Yesim tells her in Turkish that the Turkish word for that is “*ada*” (line 10). Emine is still in doubt and asks her in Norwegian if she is sure, adding then in Turkish that she wants to ask the teacher. Yesim responds convincingly in Norwegian that it is island, “*ada*” means island in Turkish (line 12).

This excerpt exemplifies the way bilingual students may discuss a school task having two languages in their disposition. It starts off with Emine asking Yesim in Turkish if she knows a

Turkish name for “ancestors”, while Yesim’s question “what?” is nevertheless produced in Norwegian. When Emine starts explaining what she means, also in Turkish, Yesim also alternates to Turkish for her next question in line 4. All Emine’s inputs in the given excerpt are produced in Turkish, except for a single insertional switch to Norwegian in line 11 – this fact suggests that she is more comfortable with employing this language in order to achieve her aim of finding out a Turkish word for “island”. Emine’s language choice appears several times to be contrasting to Yesim’s, who alternates to Norwegian in line 2, 6 and 12.

What seems to be particularly interesting in the given example is that Yesim first replies in Norwegian to Emine’s introductory input in Turkish, but then switches to Turkish in order to ask Emine a clarifying question. Seeing that Emine struggles to explain which word she cannot recall, Yesim alternates to Turkish, probably knowing that Emine finds it easier to deal with this task in Turkish. Further, trying to help Emine finding the right word for “island” in both Turkish and Norwegian, she uses Turkish as a base language (lines 8 and 10).

This excerpt exemplifies how a learning related conversation may be carried out in a bilingual modus, reflecting the language preferences and language competence of both interlocutors. Emine seems to find it difficult recalling the word “island” in both Turkish and Norwegian – she turns to Turkish in order to seek help from Yesim. It is interesting that even when Yesim suggests both Turkish and Norwegian variants of the word for her, Emine is still not sure and wants to check it with the teacher. Seeing that Yesim is confident about it, Emine accepts her answer and decides not to ask the teacher.

Excerpt 3. During the next lesson the class is working on individual tasks online. Emine and Yesim are working on the same dictation-exercise where the task is to spell the words correctly. It is a right/wrong type of exercise, where a new word appears on the screen once the previous one is spelled correctly. There appears a characteristic sound if the word is spelled wrong, with no additional information where exactly the mistake has been made. The pupils have to try different ways of spelling until they finally succeed to spell the word correctly and the next word appears on the screen. In the given example both Emine and Yesim are struggling with the spelling of the word “dessaerve” (Norw. unfortunately).

1. Yesim: *ha des #belki æ ile dir* dessaerve
*oh yeah des # maybe it is with æ dessaerve+ ((is trying to find out how to spell
”dessaerve”))*

2. Yesim: nei ## feil svar.
no ## wrong answer. ((the computer gives feedback that the answer is wrong, Yesim keeps on trying))
3. Yesim: ja!
yes! ((manages to spell the word correctly))
4. Emine: ***buldun?***
did you find? ((to Yesim))
5. Yesim: to "s" og "e" # nei dessverre # des#
two "s" and "e" # no dessverre # des# ((Yesim turns to Emine and tries to help her spell the word))
6. Yesim: ***dene bi ne yaptigimi hatirlamiyorum.***
try once more I don't know what I did. ((both are looking at Emine's screen))
7. Emine: med to r`er?
with two r's?
8. Yesim: ja ***onu dene bi.***
yes try this.

In the first line of the excerpt Yesim is making attempts to spell the word "dessverre", commenting her attempt in Turkish. In line 2 she switches to Norwegian to comment that her attempt has failed. But one of the next attempt seems to have been successful since she comments it with crying out "yes!" in Norwegian (line 3). She is using Norwegian in line 4 as well, when she tries to find out exactly how she managed to spell the word. Emine asks her in Turkish if she has found it (line 5), and Yesim tries to help Emine spell the word on her computer. Yesim does not remember how she spelled it though, and asks Emine in Turkish to try and do it herself (once the word is typed in correctly, it disappears from the screen, and a word "right answer" appears there instead). Emine suggests in Norwegian to spell the word with double "r" (line 7); while Yesim switches to Norwegian and agrees that it is worth trying (line 8).

As we can see from line 1, Yesim addresses Emine first in Turkish; the utterance she produces is mostly descriptive of her actions and does not necessarily require Emine's

answer. Therefore, when it remains unanswered no notable pause occurs; and Yesim continues commenting her own actions. The three next utterances are produced by her in Norwegian.

When Yesim finally manages to spell the word correctly, she turns to Emine in order to help her with the spelling. It is clearly easier for Yesim to do it in Norwegian, since the word is Norwegian, and the letters are Norwegian too, but she alternates back to Turkish in her next utterance where she asks Emine to try to solve the task herself. Emine tries and announces in Norwegian that she is going to try writing it with double “r”, and Yesim alternates to Turkish to approve her idea.

The excerpt is rich on code-switches performed by both girls, and some of the patterns in their language use seem to be common for both. Both Emine and Yesim alternate to Norwegian when they deal with school-task directly and switch to Turkish for the purpose of producing more general utterances, e. g. “did you find?” (line 4), “try once again I don’t know what I did” (line 6), “yes try this” (line 8).

The above-presented example also depicts how Yesim and Emine identify themselves to a larger or smaller degree with one or the other language; and how they convey this identification through code-switching. Also, they show how language proficiency and relation of a particular language to a particular domain influence language choice in their everyday interactions. The opening utterance of excerpt 3 draws attention to Yesim’s unusual language choice – she comments her own spelling-attempt in Turkish, and not Norwegian, which she often uses when dealing with school related tasks. Since the utterance is in Turkish, it signals that it is directed towards Emine. Turkish here may also function as the language of “disclosure”, informing Emine that she is struggling with the exercise. It is interesting that when Yesim finally succeeds with the task, she switches to Norwegian to comment that and give Emine advice about the spelling. But, when Emine asks her in Turkish whether she found the right way of spelling, Yesim switches to Turkish again. She proceeds with her Turkish explanation despite Emine’s alternation back to Norwegian in line 7. As is also reflected in excerpt 2, Turkish seems to function as the language Yesim chooses when she intends to help Emine with the school tasks.

The girls may appear to switch to Norwegian when the conversation relates directly to school-work and requires school vocabulary. It is possible that Yesim and Emine’s school vocabulary

in Turkish may be limited and therefore hinder them from employing their mother tongue when discussing school-related tasks.

Excerpt 4. The excerpt is taken from the same lesson as the previous one, where the class was working on individual tasks online on their computers. Yesim discovers something on her screen and shows it to Emine.

1. Yesim: se der da! ((finds something at her own screen and points on Emine's screen))

look here!

2. Emine: å ja hihi # xxx yesim xxx.

oh yeah ((looks at her screen)) hihi # xxx yesim xxx

3. Yesim: *deyom diyom* jeg skal se at de skal finne # også ser dere ikke det som er der # skam.

((smiling)) *I say I say* I will see if they will find # and you don't see what is there # shame.

((both girls turn to their exercises for a short while))

4. Emine: *seninki* hvit *mi*?

is yours white? ((looks at Yesim's screen))

5. Yesim: nei.

no.

6. Emine: *sey yazi.*

the font.

7. Yesim: *hangi yazi?*

which font?

8. Emine: *su* hvit *degilmi?*

isn't this white?

9. Yesim: nei hvit ***degil o*** gul.

no it's not white it's yellow.

10. Emine: å ja.

oh yeah.

11. Yesim: ***seninkimi*** hvit ## ***burdan øyle gøzukuyor.***

is it yours that is white ## it looks like that from here.

The excerpt starts with Yesim showing Emine something on her screen, following it with Norwegian “look here”. Emine chuckles and responds in Norwegian, while Yesim starts line 3 with insertional CS to Turkish - “I say I say” – and then alternates back to Norwegian to continue her explanation about what she discovered on her screen. In the next utterance Emine alternates to Turkish and asks Yesim if something on her screen is white, saying “white” in Norwegian. Yesim’s answer is in Norwegian: “no”. Emine’s next input is still in Turkish: she specifies that it is the font she is talking about (line 6). This time Yesim also switches to Turkish to produce her question of clarification – “which font?” (line 7). Emine asks her whether “it” (apparently talking about something on her screen) is white, once again using Norwegian only to say the name of the color. In line 9 Yesim states that it is not white but yellow – she also names the colors in Norwegian. Emine alternates to Norwegian to agree with Yesim. In the last utterance of this conversation Yesim alternates to Turkish again – with another insertional CS to name the white color.

As we can see from the first three lines, Yesim starts the interaction in Norwegian - except for her insertional CS to Turkish (“I say”) In line 4 Emine alternates to Turkish, but employs Norwegian to say “white”. Emine’s sudden code-switching to Turkish is in contrast with the rest of the interaction that took place so far. Further, we can see that Yesim’s answer is still in Norwegian; while Emine in line 6, where she contextualizes to Yesim that she is talking about the font, is once again contrasting her choice of language to Yesim’s and producing her utterance in Turkish. This time Yesim follows Emine’s language choice and switches to Turkish as well (line 7). In line 8 we can see that Emine continues establishing Turkish as a language of interaction, only switching to Norwegian to name the colors. Yesim’s answer

includes both languages: Norwegian for the names of the colors and for the particle “no”, Turkish for the rest (line 9). Emine responds in Norwegian (“oh yeah”), while Yesim in her last interactional input alternates to Turkish with a single insertional switch to Norwegian in order to name the color. In this excerpt it appears as if Emine is implicitly conveying a wish of speaking Turkish to Yesim and there occurs negotiation of the language of interaction.

There also appears a common feature in the language use of both target children, as both of them always use Norwegian in the given excerpt in order to name the colors. Their choice of language here maybe bounded with the issue of language competence, as colors may relate to the part of vocabulary under the label of “school-related content words”. It is likely that the girls often operate with the Norwegian names of colors in the context of official classroom talk. In this case it may be natural for the girls to code-switch to Norwegian in order to rapidly express themselves in their private conversations with each other during the deskwork.

In the given excerpt Yesim starts the interaction in Norwegian, but after a short while code-switches to Turkish in line with what Auer (1984) labels as *preference for the same language talk*: Emine initiates a switch to Turkish and explicitly demonstrates her preference of Turkish in the given conversation, which ends in Yesim switching to Turkish as well. Despite the fact that interaction is carried out mainly in Turkish now, Yesim code-switches to Norwegian when she has to say the names of the colors.

As for Emine, she seems to be conveying a wish of speaking Turkish to Yesim. This appears to be in line with Auer and Aarsæther, who claim it to be rather usual among bilinguals to show one’s preference for a particular language by stating it implicitly in the language use (Auer 1984; Aarsæther 2004). It also becomes rather clear from this example that both girls tend to use Norwegian for the content-words (such as names of the colors, for example) – regardless of the code the utterance is otherwise produced in.

Excerpt 5. This conversational situation takes place towards the end of the lesson. The class is still working on spelling-exercises on their computers. At the beginning of the lesson the teacher gave instructions on what type of exercises they are supposed to be working on and where to find them online. The children seem to have an opportunity to choose the exercises they want to work on and to be able to try out different exercises without necessarily completing them – the teachers are there in order to help out those who ask for help, but they do not go around controlling what children do. In this excerpt Emine turns away from her

computer, she seems to be either tired or bored. She stretches sitting in her chair and looks at Yesim, who is busy with doing her exercise. Yesim notices that Emine is looking at her and starts to stretch as well.

1. Emine: */yoruldum su deli kizida sevmedim eh canim baska biseylere girmek istiyor* ”matte og sånt”

/I am tired I didn't manage to like this crazy girl ((talking about the animated voice spelling the words in her exercise)) eh I want to go to mathematics and so.

2. Emine: jeg vil gå inn på matte eller noe sånt# geografi.

I want to go to mathematics or something like that# geography.
((Emine's voice sounds as if she is bored by the excercise)).

The teacher gives instructions to pupils to check the power level on their laptops.

3. Emine: *nerde* ”strøm” *kerzi # su seyde mi # burdami?*

kerzi where is power # is it here # here? ((Emine is looking at Yesim, while Yesim seems to be listening the teacher's instructions))

4. Emine: bare sitter.

just sitting. ((Emine is sitting without doing anything, probably waiting for the end of the lesson.

The excerpt starts with Emine addressing Yesim in Turkish, where she complains about being tired. She wants to change the activity to solving an assignment in mathematics instead of the spelling one. Yesim is not responding to Emine's attempt to initiate an interaction. Without Yesim's input to the interaction, it does not develop any further and there appears a long pause. After a while Emine takes the initiative again and informs Yesim that she wants to work on an exercise in mathematics or geography, and this time the input is produced in Norwegian (line 2). Once again there appears a full stop of interaction: the class gets an order from the teacher to check the battery-level on their computers, so Yesim's attention is directed towards the teacher and she does not respond this time either. There appears a new pause until Emine addresses Yesim in Turkish asking her about how to check the battery level (line 3). Yesim seems to be occupied with her own computer and there follows no answer to

Emine's question. Emine reacts with informing in Norwegian that she is just sitting – without doing anything, probably waiting for the end of the lesson.

The excerpt shows irregular turn-taking in this interaction; with Emine who is the only one who initiates the conversation and tries to keep it going. She starts off with a sequence in Turkish, addressing Yesim directly with her complain that she is tired and wants to change the activity. Emine, naturally, expects a response to her inquiry, but it does not follow. The absence of an answer produces a silent pause, which is long enough to be noticeable for the rhythm of the interaction.

Emine is not giving up the topic yet, but she switches to Norwegian to produce a phrase with almost the same message: she wants to change the activity. It is almost the end of the lesson; Emine's voice suggests that she is probably bored by the exercise she was doing and that is why she wants to get her friend's attention so much. The fact that she repeats her inquiry – now in different language - signals that she is interested in developing the topic further, for this reason she tries to get Yesim's attention by code-switching to Norwegian. Code-switching to Norwegian contrasts with her previous utterance and functions as a contextualization-cue.

Transition of the turn and the topic development does not happen: the teacher gives order to check the battery level, and all the attention is directed towards the teacher and computers. Emine addresses Yesim once again to ask her where to check the battery level. The utterance is in Turkish with a single alternational code-switch to Norwegian for saying the word "strøm" (power). My guessing is that the word is either absent in Emine's Turkish vocabulary, or she code-switches here for the purpose of saving time to produce the utterance: it's easier than trying to recall the correspondent word in Turkish. Anyway, this switch is not very meaningful for the interaction as a whole. Yesim is silent (or maybe occupied with something else - she is not visible for camera), so the turn-transition does not take place. Emine initiates another code-switch to Norwegian, but this time it sounds more like a comment "in the air": she verbalizes her absence of activity, probably waiting for the end of the lesson. This type of comment does not presuppose or necessarily require any kind of response from others, but the fact that Emine code-switches, indicates nevertheless that she is probably expecting the comment to be noticed by Yesim.

In this excerpt Emine is the only one talking: she is trying to gain Yesim's attention while Yesim is busy talking to her neighbor. All in all, we have 3 code-switches in this excerpt; in each utterance Emine is subsequently using a code contrasting to the one used in the previous utterance, which suggests that code-switching here may signal the turn-taking problem in the interaction and function for Emine as means of gaining attention. This interpretation is also supported by fact that Emine not only switches from one language to another, but also uses Yesim's name in order to get her response (line 3). According to Goffman (1979) and Gumperz (1982), code-switching is among the contextualization-cues used by interlocutors to contextualize a problem in turn transition by building up a contrast (Aarsæther 2004). This excerpt provides an example of how Emine uses her bilingual resources alongside another conversation-organizing technique - using name to point out the receiver.

Excerpt 6. The excerpt is taken from the same lesson as excerpt 1 - children are writing compositions. It is silent in the class, Yesim and Emine are also concentrated on their stories, and the work is only seldom interrupted by quick task-related conversations with neighbors. Pupils have been writing for a while already, some of them are almost done with their stories.

1. Emine: ***ben bundan sonra yazmadım önceki benimki çok uzundu artık uzunlari sevmiyorum*** ((to Yesim, talking about the length of her story)).

I haven't been writing after that my first one was too long I don't like long ones anymore.

2. Yesim: ((she is not visible for the camera, but we can hear her whisper, she is talking to her neighbor))
3. Emine: ***ben daha birinci sayfanin yarisini yazdim # bitirdim.***

I have written half of a page # done.

4. Yesim: ((we can hear Yesim talk to her neighbor))

5. Emine: jeg har skrevet to sider#

I have written two pages#

6. Yesim: jeg tar seksten xxx

I am taking sixteen xxx ((talks with her neighbour about the font size))

7. Emine: *onalti niye ettin onsekiz onalti?*
sixteen why did you take eighteen sixteen?
8. Yesim: fordi når det er åtte så er det to sider når det er seksten så er det +/.
because when it is eight it is two pages when it is sixteen it is +/.

This example is somewhat similar to the previous one: the same type of interactional situation, where Emine is initiating a conversation, while Yesim seems to be reluctant to respond because she is either occupied with other things, or talking to somebody else. Emine starts off the conversation with Yesim by addressing her in Turkish and telling about the length of her text, which she apparently decided to make shorter. Yesim does not react to this input, since she is busy talking to her left-hand neighbor. Emine makes another attempt by announcing “I have written half of the page # done”, also in Turkish. The fact that she also adds that she is finished with her text suggests that such a formulation was meant to draw Yesim’s attention. While Yesim is not responding this time either and goes on talking to her neighbor, in the next utterance Emine code-switches to Norwegian (line 3). By code-switching to Norwegian she contextualizes the turn-taking problem that has occurred in the interaction.

In the meantime, Yesim seems to be discussing another topic with her neighbor: they are talking about the font size. Emine, seeing that Yesim is not responding to her attempts of discussing the length of her text, changes the topic and asks her in Turkish why she chose the font size she is using (line 7). This time Yesim answers her; she explains in Norwegian that the font size influences the length of the text.

In the beginning of this excerpt Yesim is having a discussion with her neighbor, while Emine tries to involve her in the conversation. Yesim speaks Norwegian to her non-Turkish speaking friend and neighbor Hanni. Emine initiates the conversation with Yesim twice, but Yesim’s answer remains absent. In the next utterance we can see Emine employing the same technique as she used in the previous example – she code-switches to Norwegian. The code-switching from Turkish to Norwegian seems to function as an attempt to draw Yesim’s attention. And Yesim finally answers her – in Norwegian. It is interesting that once Emine gets Yesim’s attention, she alternates back to Turkish - despite the fact that Yesim responds in Norwegian.

This next utterance is about the font size and, as we have also seen in other examples, Emine seems to prefer to use Turkish when talk involves numbers.

Excerpt 7. The excerpt is taken from the same lesson as the previous one; the class is working silently on the story-writing. Emine is trying to figure out what font size to use in her text and asks Nur about it.

1. Emine: Nur hvilken nummer *onalti mi sayi?* ((looks at Nur, asks about the font size))

Nur which number *is your number sixteen?*

2. Nur: *yirmi.*

twenty.

3. Emine: *oha benim* overskrift *im yirmi # seninki kac?*

oh my headline is twenty # how is yours?

4. Nur: *otuzbes xxx onalti # yazim onalti.*

thirty-five xxx sixteen # mine is sixteen.

Emine's starts the interaction by addressing Nur in Norwegian, code-switching to Turkish in order to say the number sixteen (line 1). Nur answers her in Turkish, and Emine proceeds with her inquiry - now in Turkish, with a single code-switch to Norwegian to say "headline" (Norw. *overskrift*, line 3). Nur's response is completely in Turkish.

Emine's code-switching in the first utterance of the given excerpt seems to be related to the issue of language competence. Emine chooses Norwegian as the language of interaction in the beginning of her conversation with Nur, and switches to Turkish when she has to say the number sixteen. Maybe she does so because she does not recall the Norwegian variant for sixteen at once and code-switches to Turkish in order to finish her utterance smoothly and rapidly, in order to achieve her interactional aims. It is interesting that in the excerpt 6, presented above, Emine also uses Turkish when talking about the font size (sixteen and eighteen). This suggests that Emine may prefer Turkish whenever she has to deal with

numbers. The fact that she is subsequently alternating to Turkish whenever she has to deal with numbers in learning related interactions with Turkish-speaking peers signals that she finds it less convenient to use Norwegian in this context. This seems to be reflecting Emine's language competence.

In line 2 of the present excerpt Nur answers in Turkish and Emine requires more information about the size of the headline-font in Nur's text. This time her utterance is Turkish, but now she makes a single insertional switch to Norwegian in order to say "headline", which is a typical school-word. "Headline" is a "content word" which Emine probably mostly uses in the official classroom context and when dealing with her homework, so it is possible that she often uses this word in Norwegian. Nur's answer follows entirely in Turkish (line 4).

Emine's language alternation in the given excerpt demonstrates her language preference and linguistic competence: she prefers Turkish when she is dealing with numbers and finds it more convenient to use Norwegian for the typical school-words (such as "headline").

Summing up

What appears to be common for most of the above mentioned examples is that they seem to support a thought expressed by Aarsæther (2004) and Cromdal & Aronsson (2000): competence related code-switches can only very seldom be explained by competence related issues only. Most often they carry some degree of polyvalence by suggesting it to be both discourse – and participant related code-switching at the same time.

The examples discussed above showcase different bilingual strategies Emine and Yesim employ in order to position themselves in subject related discourse. They use their linguistic resources in ways that are both similar and different, suggesting the great potential lying behind their access to multiple languages as a resource in daily interactions in the school arena.

Emine

Emine shares in her interviews that she is fond of reading in Turkish and reads a lot. She has a lot of Turkish books at home and tells that her mother wants her to master Turkish properly. It comes forth in the interviews that Turkish language has a central place in her family, making it the main language of communication at home. In her learning-related conversations with

Yesim Emine often chooses to speak Turkish. The analysis of the video material revealed the following tendencies in Emine's linguistic behavior in school-related interactions:

- She is more comfortable with narrating a story in Turkish;
- She often switches to Turkish when numbers occur in the utterance;
- In Emine's utterances colors and other content-words from the school vocabulary most often appear in Norwegian, regardless the language of interaction they occur in;
- She tends to use Turkish when she needs help from Yesim with a school-task.

Yesim

Unlike Emine, Yesim reports to speak both Turkish and Norwegian with her parents. It comes forth in the interview that sometimes Yesim's mother speaks Norwegian to her simply because she does not realize that she is not at work anymore.

Yesim does not read in Turkish, since she does not know the Turkish alphabet. Her parents decided to withdraw Yesim from the mother tongue instruction classes after the first year. It is impossible to know what made them take this decision; maybe they were worried about the degree of exposure to Turkish in the neighborhood, and that it could influence Yesim's proficiency in Norwegian. As it becomes evident from the test results, Yesim scored above average in Norwegian vocabulary, which was significantly higher than Emine's score. An interesting finding occurred in excerpt 2: Yesim manages to guess that Emine is trying to recall the word "island", despite the fact that Emine cannot find a word for it neither in Turkish, nor in Norwegian. Not only Yesim manages to guess the right word, but also suggests both Turkish and Norwegian variants of the word to Emine, who is still in doubt. This has a lot to say about the competence of the target children.

The following tendencies emerged in the process of analysis of Yesim's linguistic behavior:

- Yesim seems to be more comfortable with narrating a story in Norwegian;
- Often code-switches to Norwegian at once when the interaction is directly related to the school tasks, as if she finds it to be the right language to discuss the school work or

finds it easier to do in Norwegian. Yesim tends to switch back to Turkish when the utterance starts to be less task-specific;

- Most of the content-words from the school vocabulary come in form of insertional code-switching in Norwegian (colours, numbers etc.)
- Often starts her one-to-one conversation with Emine in Norwegian with later switch to Turkish in accordance with Emine's language preferences, stated explicitly (in line with Auer's (1984) *preference for the same language talk*).

4.4 What are the similarities and differences in the ways the two girls use their bilingual resources to position themselves in informal peer interactions?

While the examples presented above are from the interactions that occurred between Emine and Yesim, the following examples are taken from the informal conversations between Emine, Yesim and some of their peers. The interactions occurred either during the lunch or a dancing activity with other girls.

Excerpt 8. The lesson is over and the teacher asks pupils to log off and switch off their computers.

1. Emine: *ok.*
arrow ((meaning "arrow" in Turkish))
2. Yesim: /ok!
/okey!
3. Emine: *ok.*
arrow.((looks at Yesim, smiles))
4. Yesim: /ok!
/okey!
5. Emine: *ok bok.*

arrow poop. ((saying it in a playful voice. Emine uses “*bok*”, which is Turkish for poop, as a rhyme for “ok”))

6. Yesim: /ok!
/okey! ((turns away, laughing silently))

7. Emine: ***ok bok xxx dedim.***
arrow poop xxx I said.

In the first 4 lines Emine and Yesim are playing with the word “ok”, which means different things in their two languages: “okey” in Norwegian and “arrow” in Turkish. The first time Emine says the word probably in the meaning of Turkish for “arrow”, which Yesim comments by stressing the difference of what she says “ok” in the meaning of “okey”. In line 5 Emine comes up with a rhyme to “ok”, which is “bok” – Turkish for poop. Yesim plays along by responding with the Norwegian “okey”, while Emine playfully insists on her pun: “arrow poop I said” (line 7).

The Girls use their entire linguistic competence in order to produce a witty moment by contrasting different meanings of the same word in the two languages they master. Emine finds a rhyme for the word, which is Turkish for “poop”, and the fact that those who does not speak Turkish would not understand the rhyme makes it probably even funnier for the girls.

Also in this excerpt Emine appears to be representing the Turkish side of her identity by standing for the Turkish understanding of the word and finding a funny Turkish rhyme for it, while Yesim stands for the Norwegian translation of the word, representing the Norwegian side of her identity.

Excerpt 9. This example is taken from the video-record of the lunch break. Children are sitting on their usual places around the table, eating food from the lunch-boxes they brought from home.

1. Emine: vet du hva # ***ama ayip söylemeyeceğim.***
you know what ((looks at Yesim)) # *but it is bad I won't say.*

((Yesim turns away and continues to eat her lunch without reacting))

2. Emine: du vet *asik olmus xxx Gabrielle*.

 ((looks at Yesim again and touches her shoulder)) you know *xxx is in
love with Gabriella*.
3. Yesim: ((nods)) xxx.
4. Emine: *iste ciplak resimleri var xxx +/-*.

 has naked pictures xxx +/-.
5. Yesim: *biliyorum*.

 I know.
6. Emine: google de # hun har bilder i google de er kjempefine.

 google them # she has pictures in Google they are very nice.

The excerpt starts with Emine initiating a conversation with Yesim: she wants to share some information with her in Norwegian, but instead of saying it at once she ends her utterance with Turkish “it’s bad, I can’t say” (line 1). As Yesim does not react and simply continues eating, after a short pause Emine makes another attempt to draw Yesim’s attention to what she wants to share: she says in Turkish that somebody (probably a character from the movie) is in love with one of the pop-stars from a teenage-movie “High School Musical” named Gabriella. Yesim answers to this utterance, but her answer is unfortunately inaudible. But it seems that Emine has more information to share, since in the next utterance she mentions that somebody has naked pictures (I believe she is still talking about the same pop-star from “High School Musical”). Yesim’s answer is rather short “I know” in Turkish (line 5). Next, Emine code-switches to Norwegian this time, to tell that Gabriella has very nice pictures in Google.

It is Emine who initiates the conversation with Yesim, starting off with Norwegian “you know what” which signals that Emine has something interesting to share with Yesim. Emine switches to Turkish to share that she cannot say it because “it is bad”. This way of first announcing that there is some information, and then suddenly informing that she cannot tell it, together with a code-switch and token of attention “you know what?” suggests that Emine possibly wants Yesim to get really interested in what she has to say. Also, the way Emine directly addresses Yesim in this utterance makes it relevant to expect an answer. Nevertheless, Yesim remains silent. Emine takes initiative once again to draw Yesim’s

attention to the topic by starting the utterance with an alternational switch to Norwegian, saying “you know”, and straight after that alternating to Turkish again to inform that xxx is in love with Gabriella. The code-switch and one more introductory “you know” indicates that Emine was not finished with the topic, even though she announced it to be “bad”; her code-switch contextualizes problematics in the sequence of turn-taking. There follows an inaudible answer from Yesim. Emine informs Yesim that there are naked pictures of Gabriella, but all Yesim answers is “I know”. Her intonation sounds emotionally neutral and the answer is followed by a full stop. In the next utterance Emine switches to Norwegian, with her utterance contrasting to the rest of the interaction. Emine’s code-switching may be seen as an attempt to get a response. At the same time, it seems to be clear that Yesim is not answering because she does not want to talk about it – maybe because she considers it to be inappropriate to speak the language nobody around the table can understand. This also might be the reason why Emine switches to Norwegian in the last utterance, feeling that she has to speak the language everybody else can understand. What seems to be clear in this example is that Turkish functions for the target children as a language for discussing delicate, probably even secret topics.

In this excerpt Emine is switching from the majority language, Norwegian, to Turkish in order to hide the conversation about the nude pictures of a pop-star from occasional listeners. She also appears to use code-switching as means of gaining attention to her utterance or trying to make it sound more interesting to Yesim (line 1 and 2). By doing so she conveys to Yesim that the information she wants to share with her is rather sensitive and is not meant to be understood by others. Emine code-switches to Turkish when she wants to share some delicate information with Yesim, signaling that Turkish is “their” language, the language for sharing secrets.

Yesim does not seem very willing to develop the discussion of the naked pictures any further. She remains silent and provides no response to Emine’s introductory utterance. Her second utterance is inaudible and when Emine shares the information about the naked pictures with her, Emine alternates from Norwegian to Turkish with a short confirmation that she has seen the pictures. This switch confirms the finding that the girls tend to use Turkish when they need to hide the sensitive information from the outsiders. Yesim’s language choice and her answer being so short signals to Emine that she understands the sensitive character of the topic, but is not willing to develop it further.

Excerpt 10. The following excerpt depicts further development of the previous interactional episode. I choose to divide this example in two excerpts because it includes two different bilingual strategies that Emine and Yesim apply in their interaction. I find it more convenient to look at these strategies separately.

1. Emine: *iste ciplak resimleri var xxx +/-*
has naked pictures xxx +/-
2. Yesim: *biliyorum.*
I know.
3. Emine: google de # hun har bilder i google de er kjempefine.
google them # she has pictures in Google they are very nice.
4. Yesim: de er fine men ## *ciplak resimleri onu # seyde görmusler +...*
they are nice but ## *that's naked pictures of her # have seen her at +...*
5. Emine: *sey # gögsune stjerne yapmislar xxx*
((looks at Yesim)) *so # she had stars on her boobs xxx* ((chuckles,
covers her mouth with her hand))
6. Yesim: har du sett på High School Musikal-2?
have you seen High School Musical-2?
7. Emine: nei.
no.
8. Yesim: bedre enn High School Musical-1.
better than High School Musical-1.
9. Emine: jeg har ikke sett på to bare en.
I haven't seen two just one.
10. Yesim: jeg har sett begge.
I have seen both.
((Emine gets silent for a short while, thereafter both girls engage in a
conversation with other pupils sitting across the table)).

As we have seen in the previous example, Yesim remains neutral to the information about the naked pictures and answers only “I know” in Turkish (line 2). Emine code-switches from Turkish to Norwegian and says that the pictures are very nice and that one can find them in Google. Yesim agrees with Emine that the pictures are nice and code-switches to Turkish to develop the topic further and say that she has seen naked pictures of this star at xxx (it is not possible to hear where exactly she saw the pictures, her utterance is partly inaudible). Emine chuckles and says in Turkish that there are stars on Gabriella’s boobs on those photos: she uses alternational code-switching to Norwegian to say stars – “stjerne” (line 5). Yesim does not comment the stars; instead she asks Emine in Norwegian if she has seen “High School Musical-2”. After this turn all the turn-taking is conducted in Norwegian. Emine’s answer is no, she hasn’t seen it. In line 8 Yesim announces that it is better than “High School Musical-1”. Emine answers that she only has seen “High School Musical-1”. Yesim concludes in line 10 that she has seen both.

It is Emine who starts off the conversation about the naked pictures of Gabriella and code-switches to Turkish to share this delicate information. Yesim is rather reserved in the beginning, but when Emine then switches to Norwegian to tell that the pictures are nice and are to be found in Google, she switches to Turkish to tell that she has seen them at xxx (line 4). In line 5 Emine seems to be eager to develop the topic further, telling in Turkish that on these pictures Gabriella had stars on her boobs. Again, she switches to Turkish, once the information she wants to share starts to be sensitive. Emine seems to perceive Turkish as the language of sharing secrets with her best friend. By her language choice Emine creates an alliance with Yesim, topicalizing their commonality. Instead of reacting, Yesim asks Emine in Norwegian if she has seen “High School Musical-2” (line 6). The contrasting code here may contextualize a topic change. Instead of continuing the discussion about naked pictures, Yesim produces a change of “footing”. It turns out that Emine has not seen the movie. The focus is now moved away from the naked pictures, and the interaction is on a new track. With Yesim’s introduction of a new angle to the topic in line 6 the code of interaction is suddenly changed to Norwegian and remains as such until the end of the interaction. The new angle is also a symbol of something entirely different from Turkish culture, something non-Turkish. If the first part of the interaction, initiated by Emine, was about the Turkish part of the girls’ identity, Yesim’s code-switching signals that she does not want to be so “Turkish” at the moment, and rejects the discussion of the secret, sensitive topic. She wants to be more “Norwegian” and talk about things that any other child in their Norwegian class can

understand. I believe that Yesim's attempt to distance herself from the discussion of the naked pictures becomes even more visible when she claims that she has seen both films and challenges Emine's knowledge about High School Musical. Emine has to confess that she has only seen the first one.

The above mentioned excerpts make examples of how the target children negotiate their bicultural identities in their everyday interactions - with the help of their bilingual resources.

The following examples were chosen from a break, where both target-girls were with some other classmates rehearsing a dance. It was winter and the girls got the teacher's permission to stay inside and dance together instead of going out. The examples complement each other and unfold the variety of utilizing bilingual resources at rivalry and open conflicts. This dance-situation is an interesting example of how Emine and Yesim become active negotiators between bilingual and monolingual parts of their school-reality. Both stand out as sociable and concerned participants, who feel responsible for the positive spirit in their dancing group.

Excerpt 11. The four Turkish-speaking girls in the class (Yesim, Emine, Semra and Nur) and monolingual (Norwegian-speaking) Adriana are dancing together. It is important to remember here that Adriana and Yesim are good friends from kindergarten, and Adriana is the only one in this group who does not speak Turkish.

A CD with background music is brought to school and proudly showed to the classmates by Emine; it is a CD with songs in Turkish, sang by the popular girl-band from Istanbul called Hepsi (as mentioned in the previous chapter). The melody of the first song playing has characteristic Turkish sounds, rather different from typical Western European teenage pop-music. Each of the four Turkish-speaking girls has their own role in accordance to the scenic roles of the four singers in *Hepsi*; Adriana is the fifth, who does not seem to be familiar with this girl-band. Nevertheless, she has no problem fitting in the dancing group, one can see that she is a good dancer but her moves are rather different from other girls'. The dancing starts; the way the girls seem to fit into their dancing-roles, the air of confidence in what they are doing suggests that the dance has been practiced many times before. All the Turkish-speaking girls seem to know their roles and with the first sounds of music know their "own" moves. Adriana probably does what she always does when she dances.

In the middle of the rehearsal Semra forgets her next move and, as a result, everybody gets confused about the sequence. Emine looks at Semra's desperate attempts to get in tact with the other girls, and starts to laugh at her confusion.

1. Semra: *sen söyle.*
you should be here.
2. Semra: *ya kızım Emine xxx .*
hey you Emine xxx.
3. Emine: <hallo> [>]!
hello!
4. Semra: <sen> [<] *burda duracaksın!*
<you> [<] *should stand here!*
5. Emine: nei du skal stå foran # *kızım bu herseyi karistirdi hi hi hi.*
no you should stand in front # *you she has messed up everything hi hi hi.*
6. Semra: *ya!* ((angry))
oh!
7. Emine: *yesim bu herseyi karistirdi.*
yesim she has messed everything up. ((to Yesim))
8. Semra: *hayir sen benim arkamda degilmiydin?*
no were you not in front of me? ((to Emine))
9. Emine: <nei du skal bak # se> [>] +...
no you should be behind # look> [>] +... ((to Semra))
10. Semra: <*ben sura geldim böyle oldu*> [<].
<*I came here so it was like that*> [<].
11. Emine: se du hit og hit.
look you here and here. ((shows Semra in which direction she should dance))
12. Nur: xxx.
13. Emine: er det kjempe vanskelig?
is it very difficult? ((in a mocking voice))
14. Yesim: ikke sant!
isn't it! ((to Semra, mocking voice))
15. Semra: *yapamıyorum bak ses cikmiyor ama!*

I can't see there is no sound! ((flips fingers and is pretending to plug in ear-plugs))

16. Yesim: vi skal ikke det xxx semra!
we are not doing that semra! ((irritated))

17. Semra: sånn.
so. ((pretends to take out the “ear-plugs”, makes some dancing moves to please Yesim and waves to her))

18. Yesim: xxx ((her body language shows that she is irritated))

19. Semra: uff Yesim!
urgh Yesim! ((disappointed))

In this situation Semra gets confused about her own moves in the dance and gets irritated over Emine, as she thinks that it was her who made a wrong move. Semra uses Turkish to draw Emine's attention (line 1, 2). In line 3 Emine answers Semra in Norwegian. Using Norwegian seems to be a marked choice, which allows Emine not only to create a distance from Semra's language choice, but also from Semra's accusation that it might be Emine who forgot her move. In line 4 Semra once again in Turkish points to Emine's wrong placement in the dance. Emine points to Semra in Norwegian that she is wrong: “no *you* should be in front”. Emine contextualizes her opposition to Semra by code-switching to Turkish in the same line in order to address Yesim: “she has messed up everything” (line 5). Semra reacts to this accusation with a token of frustration (line 6). Yesim is not responding though, and Emine, not getting her friend's support, in line 7 again she tries to gain Yesim's attention by addressing her directly in Turkish: “Yesim she has messed everything up”. Code-switching this time is used together with name – a tool that makes it difficult for Yesim to get away without answering; but Yesim is still not reacting to Emine requests. In line 9 Semra is still protesting to Emine's pointing to her mistake: “no were you not here?” in Turkish, to which Emine is responding persistently in Norwegian: “no you should be behind # look” (line 10). Semra protests in line 10 by stating in Turkish that she is on a right place, while Emine decides to show her what she was supposed to do by using Norwegian “look you here and here” and making dancing moves that Semra was supposed to do (line 11). Emine escalates the opposition by laughing at Semra's inability to do it in a right way by being ironic and asking Semra: “is it very difficult?” At this point Yesim supports Emine (line 14). Seeing that now it is not only Emine, but also Yesim who is opposed to her, Semra decides to leave the conflict behind and flips her fingers to Yesim, saying playfully in Turkish: “I can't see there is no sound”. Yesim looks

irritated and insists in Norwegian that Semra is wrong (line 16). Semra immediately switches to Norwegian (for the first time in the interaction) and waves her hand to Yesim, in order to please her and make her smile.

As we can see in this excerpt, there appears an open confrontation between Emine and Semra, where Emine points to Semra's mistake and therefore challenges her position in the group. Semra uses Turkish in her attempts to reject her mistake in her confrontation with Emine; her first strategy is to point out Emine as the one who is responsible for the mistake. In line 5 Emine chooses Norwegian to address Semra and alternates to Turkish to address Yesim. Thus she appears to use Turkish in order to seek coalition and support from Yesim, while displaying her oppositional stance to Semra by subsequently choosing Norwegian – a code that is contrasting with Semra's language choice – when addressing her. Yesim does not respond at once, so Emine addresses her once again, this time using her name and declaring in Turkish that Semra has messed everything up. The use of name and code-switching conveys Emine's strong wish to draw Yesim's attention to the situation. In the meanwhile, Emine uses Norwegian once again in order to point out her mistake. Again, her language choice is contrasted to Semra's, and communicates Emine's opposition to Semra. Emine proceeds with instructing Semra in Norwegian and asking her in a mocking voice if it is too difficult for her. While using Turkish when addressing Yesim is an attempt to seek coalition, the choice of Norwegian when addressing Semra is unusual for Emine (as seen in the previous examples) and may be an attempt of signaling power over Semra.

At this point Yesim joins Emine in her opposition and they are now two in their coalition against Semra. The normal pace of interaction in the group seems to be threatened. Semra gives up her attempts to prove that she is right and seems to initiate a repair by trying to make Yesim laugh. Interestingly, she simultaneously switches to Norwegian. It is also worth mentioning that Norwegian is a social norm in a Norwegian multilingual class; choosing Norwegian as a language of interaction signals inclusion of everybody in the interaction, since Norwegian is the language understood by everybody. This excerpt displays how the language choice and language alternation is used by the girls in their power negotiations and how they establish their position in relation to the two languages.

Excerpt 12. The next excerpt is taken from an interaction that followed the one analyzed in the previous excerpt. The conflict situation in excerpt 1 reached its climax and all the girls engaged in a common repair process, trying to restore the sequence of moves so that they can

proceed with their dancing. Adriana, whose dance moves are a little less “Hepsi-like” than the other girls’, is suggesting a new move. Everybody seems to be excited, especially Semra, who states loudly in Norwegian “we can try it!” and looks at Yesim to check out her reaction. Yesim shows the new move to Nur. However, Nur does it in a wrong way and again Yesim starts to show some signs of irritation.

1. Yesim: nei # du skal gjøre sånn.
 no# ((disappointed)) you should do so ((squats)).
2. Nur: sånn?
 so?
3. Yesim: <ikke sånn> [>] !
 not so!
4. Emine: <nei sånn litt sånn> [<].
 no so and a bit so
5. Yesim: **bøyle kizim /bøyle.**
 you so/so. ((seems to be slightly irritated))
6. Emine: <du kan åpne litt sånn> [>].
 you can open a bit so
7. Yesim: <**aralarini bøyle**> [<] **tamam?**
 <*spread legs*> [<] *fine?*
8. Emine: ja
 yes
9. Yesim: **bøyle yap bøyle yap aralarini ac.**
 do so do so spread legs.
10. Emine: **aralarini biraz daha.**
 spread a bit more.
11. Nur: sånn.
 there
12. Emine: ja ikke glem det Semra
 yes don't forget it semra

13. Semra: <jeg gjør det> [>].
I will do it
14. Emine: <istersen ben> [<] *ønde durayim benim tersimi yaparsin # tamam mi istersen.*

<I can> [<] *stand in front so you do the opposite of what I do # is it ok if you want.*
15. Semra: *sen xxx xxx yap sen onu bi yap døn yap simdi yap.*

you xxx xxx do it do it go around do it now.
16. Emine: *bak.*

look.
17. Semra: xxx.
18. Emine: *bak ben böyle yaptigimda bak sen ellerini havaya kaldir sonra+...*

look when I do like that look you lift up your arms later +...
19. Emine: *ama ilk basta bu var demi # sonra bu sonra ben semra ile yer degisiyorum sonra ayaginin altindan geciyorum sen gibi # ben semranin önune geceyim dedim semra sey +...*

but in the beginning it is it is not like this # later it is this is this later I switch places with semra I go between legs like this# I said that I go behind semra semra[] +... ((addressing Yesim))
20. Yesim: *søyle søyle+...*

so so +...
21. Emine: *ja iste+...*

yes so +...
22. Yesim: også sånn# sånn
and also so# so
23. Emine: ja ja
yes yes

24. Yesim: og hun skal gå # nei først skal hun# hun gjør sånn#
and she would go# no first she is# she is doing so#

Yesim seems to be the most conscious among the girls about Norwegian being a social norm at school arena; she also seems to feel responsible for binding the multilingual dancing group together: with four girls who have Turkish as their mother tongue, Adriana might easily feel excluded from the group. Yesim appears to be rather pragmatic in her language choice and chooses Norwegian in order to bind the group together and not make Adriana feel left behind. At the same time Yesim may use Turkish to achieve other communicative goals: as it becomes visible in line 5, where Yesim switches to Turkish in order to make her explanation clear to Nur, who struggles with reproducing the move that Yesim has been showing to her. In line 6 Emine interferes in order to help, but the code she chooses is different: she speaks Norwegian. While Yesim proceeds in instructing Nur in Turkish, using available linguistic resources to enhance the effectiveness of her words; Emine continues to play along, but speaks Norwegian. Emine seems to have her own goals to achieve: she is negotiating her own position in the classroom hierarchy. Even though she is also in the position of “helper”, Emine seems to use Norwegian to distance herself from Nur and Semra. This is very interesting in light of the fact that Yesim uses Turkish at the same time.

As we can see in line 9 Yesim seems to subsequently stick to Turkish in her instructions to Nur until she is sure that Nur gets it right; at that time Emine changes the footing and switches to Turkish as well. She is helpful in explaining Nur how she should do the move in a proper way in Turkish, but right after that she switches to Norwegian and with a slight air of superiority asks Semra not to forget the move. By this switch she may be trying to signal her dominance; Semra accepts the code Emine chose and also answers in Norwegian that she would not forget it. Emine changes the footing once again and starts to be helpful telling Semra in Turkish that she can stand in front and show Semra the moves. Semra accepts her help, so Emine starts to give her instructions in Turkish. Right after she addresses Yesim to discuss the sequence of the following moves in Turkish, the language that seems to have a function of a “we-language” for Yesim and Emine in this dance-situation. In line 22 Yesim initiates switch to Norwegian, which is accepted by Emine and other girls. The switch seems to symbolize that the conflict is left behind and interaction may proceed in the “common language of cooperation” – Norwegian. Both target-children seem to change the code in order to collaborate in a common interactional repair.

The girls in the group are dealing with the interactional problem which occurred in excerpt 11. First two phases of repair already took place in excerpt 11; excerpt 12 is the third stage - namely fulfillment of the repair. All of the participants try now to actively intervene into the conflict-solving, so that they can keep the interaction (and the dance rehearsal) going.

Excerpt 13. The forthcoming excerpt is intended to function as another example of how the girls escalate the social opposition in the group. This excerpt, alike with previous two, is taken from the same dance rehearsal-situation; participants are the same as in excerpts 1 and 2. The song, the language and the roles the girls are taking, are understandable and familiar to all four Turkish girls; Adriana, however, does not understand the language of the song and does not have the same cultural references to guess what kind of dancing she is supposed to perform. She is dancing in her own, street-style-like way. There appears a mismatch in the moves of the girls, Adriana seems not to fit in the group and stops the music.

1. Emine: hva skjer? # hva skjedde?
 what is going on? what happened?
2. Adriana: nei gidder ikke å si det # xxx blir lei seg.
 no I don't want to say# xxx going to be sad.

((Adriana goes back and starts the song over again, yet she doesn't seem quite pleased. The dancing proceeds for a couple of minutes, Yesim is trying to restore the sequence of the moves, but the tact seems to be lost.))
3. Emine: ja # denne veien ## hva var det du skulle gjøre?
 yes # this way ((Adriana is confused about what she was supposed to do and stops dancing again)) ## what is that you were going to do?
4. Adriana: vet ikke jeg!
 I don't know! ((is irritated, turns to stop the song)).
5. Emine: ja, jeg husket det! Adriana! Du skulle gå mellom oss# gå liksom der og der!
 yes I remember! Adriana! You were going to go between us# go like there and there! ((runs after Adriana who is on her way to turn off the music))
6. Yesim: se! Kom!
 look! Come!
7. Adriana: kan ikke ta en lettere sang?
 can't we take an easier song? ((irritated tone))

8. Yesim: hvordan da?
like what?
9. Semra: vi er jo ut på denne sangen! ## kan ikke gjennomgå sangen da? Kan begynne å gjennomgå sangen?
but we are in this song! ## can't we just go through the song? Can we start going through the song? ((irritated))
10. Adriana: xxx ta en lettere sang.
xxx take an easier song.
11. Emine: ja en lettere ## xxx er den letteste.
yes an easier ## xxx is the easiest. ((xxx is most likely a Turkish name of the song that she considers to be the easiest one))
12. Yesim: ja.
yes.
13. Semra: **hayir o oyun dørt kisilik.**
no this song is for four persons.
14. Emine: hallo he he okey.
15. Yesim: xxx fire stykker.
xxx four.
16. Semra: det går ikke.
it won't work.
17. Yesim: det går.
it works.
18. Emine: okey vi må finne en annen sang da hvis du vil.
okey we have to find another song if you want.
19. Semra: xxx.
20. Yesim: nei.
no.
21. Semra: **yavas bi tane sarki vardi xxx sey yapin bi # bi karistirin!**
it was a quiet song xxx do something like # a bit easy!
22. Yesim: NEI!
NO!

23. Semra: ***xxx ## sen bassana.***
 xxx ## press the button. ((about CD-player))
24. Emine: Nur ok # gå.
 Nur ok # go. ((is waving her hand sending Nur to the CD-player))
25. Yesim: men hva mener du lissom?
 but like what do you mean?
26. Adriana: en som er litt lettere som# at en for eksempel får stå og xxx hva jeg skal
 gjøre#
 one that is a bit easier# that one for example can stand and xxx what I
 am supposed to do# ((quietly))

The excerpt starts with a sequence in Norwegian, where Emine reacts to the fact that Adriana suddenly stopped dancing and is on her way to stop the music. Emine asks Adriana what is the matter, Adriana answers her in line 2 that she won't say it and takes her place among the girls again. The dancing starts over again, though it is clear that Adriana considers something to be disturbing. And indeed, in a few minutes the girls got confused with the sequence of moves, the dancing starts to be messy. Emine, laughing, asks Adriana what she was supposed to do (line 3). Adriana responds, irritated, that she does not know, and turns to stop the music. It seems here that Adriana feels as an outsider in the group where all the other girls know their roles, while her own role as a dancer remains unclear.

Emine tries to repair the interaction by running after Adriana and telling her that now she remembers what Adriana was supposed to do (line 4). Yesim joins Emine in her attempt to persuade Adriana to get back and start dancing again (line 5). Adriana responds to this in a quiet manner, but raising her voice markedly: "can't we take an easier song?" and by doing so she states that she is not comfortable with the way things are. Her tone gives an impression that she is serious. Yesim looks for a solution of the conflict that arose and asks Adriana what kind of song she wants (line 8), but the idea of changing the song is confronted by Semra's protest that they are already in the middle of a rehearsal and why can't they just go through the moves to this song.

Adriana responds with repeating her demand, though now in a slightly milder tone of voice: "xxx take an easier song". Emine is also trying to come with the solution of the problem and suggests some Turkish song which she considers to be easy (line 11). Her suggestion is again

met by a protest from Semra, who informs that this song is only for four of them (line 13). So far the whole interaction was performed in Norwegian, and since the conflict is about making Adriana not feel excluded from Turkish-speaking group, Semra's remark, made in Turkish, is in strong contrast with the rest of the conversation, and seems to highlight intensity of her oppositional stance towards the suggestion to change the song. Semra's claim that the song is only for four is received by Emine's laughter in her "hallo he he okey" (line 14), and a protest from Yesim. Both Emine's and Yesim's responds are made in Norwegian, which shows their collaboration and makes a contrast with Semra's utterance, allowing them to create a distance from her claim.

Semra switches back to Norwegian, but insists that they have to be four to dance to that song, otherwise "it won't work" (line 16). Yesim insists that it would work with five of them. Emine suggests they change a song (line 18), and Semra comes with another remark, this is met with Yesim's firm "no" (line 20). Semra does not seem to be willing to give up her idea, and switches to Turkish once again, stating that the song they were dancing to is a quiet one and they can make some easy moves to it. Once again she is diverging from the language of the preceding utterances, but her comment is met by instant opposition from Yesim, who raises her voice to say "no!" to Semra's suggestion. The tone of her voice states a serious disaffiliation from Semra's stance. Semra gives up and asks Nur to press the button, therefore agreeing with the idea of choosing another song; which is also confirmed by Emine's "ok Nur, go" (line 24). Yesim is eager to resolve the conflict and tries to find out what it is that Adriana wants, so she asks her about it directly (line 25). Finally, in line 26 Adriana explains calmly that she wants them to find a song where she would not need to stand there without knowing what to do next.

In this excerpt, both Yesim and Emine show their will to cooperate with Adriana, who feels left behind. But it does not seem to be so important for Semra. She indicates this by using Turkish in front of Adriana who cannot understand her, as well as through insisting on sticking to their dancing routines despite Adriana's dissatisfaction. By choosing different languages the Turkish-Norwegian girls may either open or close the conversational floor for Adriana, and both Emine and Yesim seem to be well aware of that. Through their language choice Yesim and Emine try to make Adriana feel included in the group, and simultaneously confront Semra who refuses to change the song. Through their language choice they are

ascribing membership in the dancing group and building on an opposition between the group and Semra.

Excerpt 14. Same dance rehearsal. There occurs some confusion with the moves among the girls; they stop and watch Yesim show the sequence.

1. Emine: *ama dindindint diye cikiyor biz yukari cikinca.*
but when it says dididint we come up. ((to Yesim, dindindint is a melody))
2. Emine: *biz ciktiktan sonra biseyler yapacagiz.*
when we come out we have to do something. ((to Yesim))
3. Yesim: hvem kan være i midten? vil du være i midten?
who can be in the middle? do you want to be in the middle? ((to Emine))
4. Emine: nei # jeg vil ikke men der er det sånn # *ama orda böyle +...*
no # I don't want to but there is like this ((comes closer to Yesim)) *but it is like this +...*
5. Yesim: da skal du gjøre sånn liksom# sånn snurrer dere rundt.
then you will do like this ((shows a move)) # so turn yourself around.
6. Emine: ja.
yes.
7. Yesim: også skal dere stå bak sånn # også skal finne på noe her>
and then you will stand back here # and then will figure something out>
8. Emine: <ja.
<yes.

The excerpt starts with Emine trying to help Yesim with revising the sequence of dancing moves: she suggests in Turkish that they should do a certain move at a certain point (line 1). In the next line she continues to talk to Yesim in Turkish, while Yesim responds by asking Emine in Norwegian whether she wants to be in the middle. Emine follows Yesim's language choice and starts to say in Norwegian that she does not want that, but then she switches back to Turkish to fulfill the utterance with "but it is like this" (line 4). Yesim goes on instructing the girls in Norwegian and showing them which dancing move comes next (line 5), and Emine agrees with her by saying "yes" in Norwegian. In line 7 Yesim continues instructions,

the language of interaction is still Norwegian, and Emine confirms what she is saying with Norwegian “yes” (line 8).

From the example we can see how Emine, probably intending to help out in revising the dancing moves, excitedly starts to talk to Yesim in Turkish, which is not possible to understand for Adriana. Yesim responds with an utterance in Norwegian: “do you want to be in the middle?” (line 3). Yesim’s choice of a contrasting language here suggests that her intention was to speak the language that is understandable for everybody in the group, and also to Adriana. Emine supports the switch by switching to Norwegian herself in her next utterance and saying that she does not want to, “but it is like this”, she says, and repeats it once again in Turkish. It is not easy to guess why Emine switches back to Turkish, once she started to speak in Norwegian; the reason might be that it is simply easier for her to speak Turkish. I tend to explain this switch as a preference related CS, which has nothing to do with lack of language proficiency.

Yesim does not alternate and is sticking to Norwegian in her next instruction as well: “then you will do like this # so turn yourself around” (line 5). Emine supports Yesim by short Norwegian “yes”, and Yesim goes on with instructions in Norwegian in line 7, what is once again confirmed by Emine’s Norwegian “yes”.

As we can see, in this excerpt Yesim is still staying conscious about including Adriana in the interaction. It seems that eventually Yesim reaches her goal of making the interaction understandable for everybody in the group, which she manages by subsequently choosing Norwegian as a language of interaction despite Emine’s several attempts to speak Turkish to her. By the end of the excerpt Emine is also responding to her in Norwegian.

Summing up

In the first excerpt of this section (excerpt 8), we have seen how the linguistic strategies of the girls may coincide and, moreover, they can unite in using their bilingual resources in order to create a witty moment, an internal joke. At the same time they appear to represent one language each in this example: Emine represents Turkish, while Yesim represents Norwegian language. Girls create a funny word-play by contrasting the languages to each other.

Other than that, the girls seem to differ in the strategies they use in the informal peer interactions.

Emine

- Signals to generally prefer to speak Turkish with Yesim, using it as the language for “sharing secrets”.
- She also seems to relate to Turkish as to “their” language, the language that allies her with Yesim, both in one-to-one interactions and interactions that include other peers.
- Tends to use Norwegian in order to mark a distance between her and Semra (who positions herself as a Turkish-dominant speaker).
- Seems to have a general tendency to speak Norwegian to other Turkish-speaking girls, Nur and Semra.
- Seems to use significantly more Turkish when she and Yesim are alone.

Yesim

- Signals to prefer to speak Norwegian to both Emine and other Turkish-speaking girls.
- She is nevertheless rather flexible when the situation requires it (switches to Turkish to make Semra and Nur understand her instructions better).
- Tends to use Norwegian in order to create a contrast between hers and Semra’s language choice and mark a distance between them.
- Tends to choose Norwegian when addressing Emine in front of Adriana. This is in contrast with Emine’s tendency to use Turkish with Yesim regardless the audience.

Both girls indicate flexibility and sensitivity in relation to the language use and language choice. Their language preferences and code-switching appear to be purposeful and to some extent context-dependent.

There also seems to be a connection between their friendship relations and the language use. For instance, Yesim, being Adriana’s close friend, appears to be the most concerned among the Turkish-speaking girls about the language of interaction. It seems also that Semra (and maybe also Nur) feels less bounded to take non-Turkish-speaking Adriana into consideration when choosing the language of interaction.

5 Discussion and Conclusions: Bilingual strategies across the contexts

The central research question of the present thesis is to reveal and investigate the various strategies of utilizing the bilingual resources used by Emine and Yesim to constitute themselves in the classroom discourse. Through the in-depth analysis of the classroom interactions of the girls I intended to find answers to the 3 sub-questions, related to their general use of Turkish and Norwegian and the bilingual strategies used in subject related discourse and in informal peer interactions.

Theoretically and analytically I've been relying on the ethnomethodological perspective of identity, formulated by Widdicombe as "something that people do which is embedded in some other social activity, and not something that they are" (Widdicombe, 1998: 191). Considering conversational activity of the girls to be a part of the social structure I intended to investigate how Yesim and Emine positioned themselves using the language alternation as a resource.

The next three sections will present answers to the three research sub-questions concerning bilingual behavior of the girls in specific contexts, followed by a final discussion of the way the girls are doing being bilingual across the contexts.

5.1 Doing being a bilingual fifth-grader

5.1.1 Similarities and differences in the relative use of Turkish and Norwegian

The quantification of the initiatives Emine took during the day in both Turkish and Norwegian reveal some characteristic patterns in her language use. As we could see, Emine addresses Yesim in Turkish more often than in Norwegian, while it is Norwegian that seems to dominate in the initiatives directed towards other children. Generally, Emine addresses Yesim relatively often – more often than Yesim addresses her. To understand the bilingual

strategies in Emine's interaction, we need to look at her language environment both at home and at school.

As we have seen in section 4.2, Yesim has generally less inquires towards Emine during day 3, and most of them are produced in Norwegian. She has also conducted a slightly bigger share of inquiries towards the other children, 98% of which were in Norwegian, and most of the inquiries were directed towards her friend Hanni.

Despite the differences in language preferences and in, as I will discuss later, interactional strategies for utilizing bilingual resources, there is one fundamental common feature to be seen in the video material. Turkish and Norwegian seem to be present in Yesim and Emine's interactions all the time. The extent to which the languages are present in a particular interaction varies in accordance with the communicative strategies and goals of the girls. This finding is particularly interesting on the background of the belief expressed by the teaching personnel of the class – that the girls spoke only Norwegian to each other.

The video material also reveals that code-switching is a language practice both girls use rather frequently. My perception of code-switching in the present thesis was to a large extent based on Auer's (1984) functional model of code-switching, with its distinction of such overall categories as insertional and alternational, discourse-related and participant-related code-switching. Even though the insertional code-switching in the form of content words often appears in the classroom interactions of the girls, alternational code-switching appears even more frequently and the analysis reveals that it often has a pragmatic purpose. It may serve as a tool for organizing the interaction (discourse-related language alternation) or as means of communicating some particular information to other participants (participant-related language alternation) - such as language preferences or linguistic competence of the speaker. Gafaranga (2001) argues for the importance of the language preference in bilingual conversation, stating that "in order to talk, speakers categorize themselves and one another either as monolingual or as bilingual and in which language(s)" (p. 219). Cashman (2005) argues that in this way language preference appears to be a resource used by speakers to ascribe and accept or reject membership in groups. At the same time, through the language preferences they may also categorize others, by ascribing the group membership or disaffiliating from the group. Cashman considers this negotiation to constitute the social action in practice. In line with Widdicombe and Cashman, I would argue that the identity-work of Yesim and Emine is embedded in this membership negotiation.

5.1.2 Different strategies of using code-switching in the subject related discourse

As the analysis has shown, although both girls are competent in both Turkish and Norwegian, they have different languages of preference in the learning context. Emine in her one-to-one subject related conversations with Yesim often chooses Turkish as a preference language for discussing various school tasks. At the same time, she uses code-switching as a tool for organizing the ongoing interaction – as for example in excerpts 5 and 6, contextualizing the turn-taking problem or the absence of response from Yesim. Through her language preference and code-switching in her private conversations with Yesim she positions herself as “Turkish-dominant speaker” or “user of two languages”.

Despite her preference for using Norwegian across nearly all the above-presented conversational examples, Yesim alternates to Turkish whenever she is helping Emine with the school task (excerpts 2, 3 and 4). In excerpt 2 we could see how Yesim code-switched from Norwegian to Turkish to help Emine find the right word for the text she is writing, and, furthermore, suggested first a Norwegian variant, and then Turkish translation of the word, so that Emine would recognize at least one of them. This exemplifies how Yesim alternatively constructs her competence in Norwegian and Turkish, positioning herself as a competent user of two languages.

Even though the strategies for utilizing their bilingual resources in subject related discourse seem to differ, there is one overall tendency both Yesim and Emine seem to have in common regarding their bilingual practice. Both girls of the present study are *linguaging* (Jørgensen 2003); they use the whole linguistic repertoire in order to accomplish their communicative goals. In line with Cook’s multi-competence model (cited in Block, 2003), discussed in the theory section, the integrity of language resources increases the possibilities of the girls in content-related learning and makes their peer-learning more meaningful.

Code-switching comes into sight as a widespread activity for Emine and Yesim, an extra-resource, widely used as a helpful tool in the organization of interaction – as a marker for an emerging problem in the interaction, means of gaining attention, changing topic, building alliances and demonstrating of an oppositional stance. Analysis of the conversational examples reveals a number of cases proving this finding. It is also supported by earlier research of conversational strategies of bilingual children (Aarsæther, 2004, Cromdal, 2000a).

When it concerns learning related conversations between Emine and Yesim, code-switching makes it possible for them to participate in the classroom interaction with the entire subject knowledge they have. It helps them avoid a lexical lack in one language and makes it possible to express themselves in a subject-relevant way in their one-to-one interactions. Moreover, using code-switching in order to participate in the conversation with one's own subject competence enables peer-learning processes, as we have seen in the examples 2, 3, 4 and 7. This finding is similar to one made by Slotte-Lüttge, who documented that in pupil-pupil interaction it is easier for the pupils to use bilingualism as an access to participation with their subject competence (Slotte-Lüttge, 2005). Code-switching serves as an indicator and a facility to achieve understanding between bilinguals, and as Slotte-Lüttge (2005) also concludes, it functions as a tool for securing the accomplishment of an interactional goal, and a tool that makes this accomplishment smoother.

At the same time, I assume that the amount and type of code-switching in the video material may be significantly influenced by the local context. As mentioned earlier, the learning activities of this class were characterized by high amount of individual work, and few opportunities to participate in teacher-led whole-group conversations were seen across all the days documented in the video material. Complex subject related conversations could have triggered the target children to use their language resources more fully. Instead, what I saw in the video material was a great amount of individual work at one's own desk where pupils worked with individual tasks of the "right-wrong"-type. As a result, the interactions between the target children may become more simplified, with a lot of insertional code-switching. It would have been interesting to see how the girls would have used their bilingual resources in different circumstances or within a different structural frame of the lesson. It is fully possible that Yesim would have used her bilingual resources differently and probably to a greater degree.

It is also important to take a reservation that I have concentrated my analysis on one single day of the observations. It is fully possible that there could appear more complex subject related conversations during the trip to the forest, when the class was solving group-tasks. Unfortunately, the quality of sound in these recordings was too poor to make use of them in the analysis. It is important to keep in mind that the methodological choices that were made are also influencing the phenomenon being studied, causing challenges and making limitations that find their reflection in the analysis.

This being said, I want to emphasize that with several other studies looking at code-switching in group conversations (Aarsæther, 2004, Cromdal, 2003, Esdahl, 2003, Madsen, 2003) and code-switching in pupil-teacher conversations (Slotte-Lüttge, 2005), there is a need of more studies investigating the use of bilingual resources in subject-related pupil-pupil conversations.

5.1.3 Different strategies in the informal peer interactions

In the informal peer interactions the language choice serves for Yesim and Emine not only as a tool for self-categorization, but also a tool with the help of which the girls can categorize others. It can be used in order to ascribe or reject membership in groups and negotiate one's position within the group. As seen in the examples, in the informal peer interactions Yesim seems to use the strategies that are relatively similar to the ones she uses in her private interactions with Emine, while Emine seems to employ a broader set of strategies in the informal peer interactions, deviating from the ones used in one-to-one interactions with Yesim.

Norwegian is Yesim's trans-episodic language of preference, talking into being her identity as a "Norwegian-dominant speaker" across the contexts. Simultaneously Yesim seems to be constructing her social identity of "negotiator": she alternates to Turkish when Emine requires her help or explanations for solving a school task, she alternates to Turkish in order to explain the dancing moves to a "Turkish-dominant speaker" Nur, but she uses Norwegian in order to stress that Semra's failure in excerpt 12, exposes it to others. She does it by contrasting her language choice, Norwegian, to Semra's language of preference, which is Turkish. When Emine wants to discuss a delicate topic of naked pictures of a Turkish pop-star, Yesim with the help of language preference, Norwegian, signals to Emine her unwillingness to discuss the topic that may symbolize belonging to the Turkish group and makes it clear that she wants to talk about something related to a dominant culture instead. Moreover, it seems that Yesim feels conscious about the group's well-being at the same time as being responsible for including her friend, monolingual Adriana, in the dancing group. With the help of language alternation she manages to maintain order in the group and negotiates between the Turkish-speaking and non-Turkish-speaking parts of it.

Emine's use of Turkish with Yesim (both in private interactions and peer interactions including other girls) signals her willingness to ally with Yesim as her best friend, but as we

have seen from the interactional episodes in section 4.4, her language preferences undergo changes when participants other than Yesim appear on the interactional floor. Through Emine's use of Norwegian with Semra and Nur, who prefer to speak Turkish, she rejects membership in the group "Turkish-dominant speakers" and categorizes herself as a Norwegian-dominant speaker (excerpts 11, 12 and 13). She seems to choose Norwegian to address Semra and Nur even more often than Yesim does.

What the analysis has shown to us is that both girls seem to be rather sensitive to the context the interactions occur in. As both identity and language are both context-bounded, I would argue that for these two girls there is a particular value in the code (or the language of choice) itself. This finding seems to be the contrary of the findings made by Cromdal (2000) and Aarsæther (2004), who argued for the meaningfulness of code-switching itself and considered the direction of the switch to be of secondary importance. As the analysis shows, the direction of the switch plays an important role in communicating to other participants the language preferences of the speaker, ascription or rejection of the group membership.

At the same time, it is important to point out that I do not reject the pragmatic functions ascribed to code-switching by, among others, Aarsæther (2004). There is much evidence for that in the present material, confirming that language alternation often functions as a tool for organization of the conversational structure, and the contrast it provides serves as a contextualization cue.

5.1.4 Yesim and Emine's bilingual strategies across the contexts

There is no doubt that the above mentioned findings have to be viewed against the backdrop of the information about the environment they grew up in. As known, Emine attended the same kindergarten as Yesim, with a large share of Turkish-speaking children. And it was Turkish-speaking children who became her closest friends in the kindergarten. Besides, there was a high share of co-ethnics in the multicultural area where Emine and her family lived. By the school-start as a first-grader Emine and her family moved to a majority-dominated *Tunet*-area. It is impossible to say why exactly Emine's parents decided to move. There are many challenges a minority-speaking pupil is facing at school, and minority parents, as any other parents, want the best for their children. In any case, Emine is torn from her friends and the network she had at *Myrsletta*, and spends two years at *Tunet School*, being the only Turkish-

speaking child in the class and one of the few minority children at school. As she reports in her interview, sometimes she experiences it to be hard to be forced to speak Norwegian all the time. In two years Emine and her family return back to *Myrsletta* and Emine starts the third grade together with Yesim and some other children from her kindergarten. Emine mentions several times in her interview as a fifth-grader, that it is only her best friend Yesim that she speaks Turkish with at school. To the researcher's question whether she sometimes speaks Turkish with Nur and Semra too, Emine answers that she speaks very little Turkish with them compared to her conversations with Yesim. She also states that sometimes she and Yesim may answer in Norwegian when Nur or Semra address them in Turkish.

As we have seen in many examples of peer interaction, Emine often chooses to speak Turkish with Yesim and is both familiar with and fond of the Turkish popular culture. It is interesting that simultaneously with choosing Turkish with Yesim, Emine often chooses Norwegian in her oppositions with Turkish-speaking Semra and Nur. Sometimes it seems that she is trying to create a distance between herself and Semra and Nur, who speak much Turkish with each other. In the situations of conflict and social opposition Emine often tends to use her linguistic resources to build an alliance with Yesim and oppose Semra by choosing a code contrasting to Semra's language choice. In the power-wielding process that occurs during the dance rehearsal, Emine is more powerful being in coalition with Yesim, than Semra, who is in opposition to the girls. It is obvious that she appreciates her friendship with Yesim a lot, maybe because Yesim represents the Turkish side of her identity, while she tends to emphasize her belonging majority culture in the group conversations with other peers.

Unlike Emine, Yesim never left the neighborhood of *Myrsletta*, but her parents chose to withdraw Yesim from the mother tongue instruction classes after the first year. She herself reports in the interview as a fifth-grader that she cannot read in Turkish as she did not learn the Turkish alphabet. As it is also known from the conversations with her parents, proficiency in Norwegian is highly valued at home.

When observed in the kindergarten, Yesim stood out among the other Turkish-speaking children as the only one who had friends both among Turkish-speaking and other non-Turkish-speaking children. She was lucky enough to have many of these enrolled in the same class as herself. As a result, she managed to keep both her Turkish- and non-Turkish-speaking friends (Adriana and Hanni, among others), while Emine had to negotiate her position in the class when she entered it as a third-grader. By this time Yesim had her well-established

friendship with both minority and majority speaking children in the class. Yesim seems to appreciate the friendship she has with Emine, but she does not seem to be as emotionally dependent on Emine's support, as Emine seems to be dependent on hers. Yesim also tends to show preference for speaking Norwegian across all the analyzed conversational situations – regardless both passive (excerpts 9 and 10, “the naked pictures”-situation) and active audience (excerpts 11, 12, 13 and 14, dancing situations).

In the group interactions – interactions during dance-rehearsal, for instance – Yesim seems to be rather secure about her own place in the group and appears as a conflict-resolver and a person who wants everybody in the group to feel included. She is using her linguistic competence to negotiate between the Turkish- and non-Turkish-speaking parts of her environment.

It seems that language choice and language patterns of the girls are bounded to their friendship relations, something that proves that linguistic acts are also social acts. As we have seen from the examples 11, 12 and 13, Nur and Semra appear to use relatively much Turkish even in the presence of Adriana, which suggests that they probably are not very close friends. At the same time, we have evidenced how including and conscious of her language choice Yesim is in the presence of Adriana, answering in Norwegian to almost every Turkish inquiry of Nur, Semra and even Emine. Emine also demonstrates a high degree of consciousness of her language choice when Adriana is present. All this suggests that language choice and language alternation appear to be tools that help bilinguals to signal their belonging to or rejection of a group membership and this negotiation constitutes a social action itself. As Jørgensen (2003) states, “the act of selecting a linguistic item, be it a word, a sound, a phrase, from one or the other language or variety is in itself a statement about who the speaker is, and what relationship he or she is involved in or getting involved in, with the interlocutors” (Jørgensen, 2003: 2). Linguistic variation clearly appears to be an instrument in social negotiation that is a part of Yesim and Emine's everyday school life.

5.2 Concluding remarks and recommendations

The analysis demonstrated a complex picture of linguistic behavior of two bilingual fifth-graders in a Norwegian school. They utilize their bilingualism in nearly every school activity and learn how to be bilingual in the context of a Norwegian multicultural classroom. They use

their entire language competence to participate in the peer discussion in a subject-relevant way, and they use code-switching to compensate the lack of lexical vocabulary or to make their interactional input more relevant and correct. The target-children are code-switching strategically in order to position themselves as social individuals in the peer-group. In other words, the target children make their bilingualism a social action, both functional and meaningful.

It is important to understand what kind of everyday context bilingual children are growing in, understand their experiences and challenges – in order to enhance the effectiveness of the learning process. It is therefore not of less importance to understand the whole scope of linguistic resources the bilingual children possess and to be aware of their creativity in using those resources. Through the detailed analysis and comparison of the target-children's bilingual behavior I tried to shed some light on the code-switching, a wide-spread practice of alternating between the two languages, which is often perceived as an expression for lack of linguistic competence among bilinguals. I tried to document this important aspect of using bilingual resources and being bilingual in order to contribute to the general awareness of how it is to be growing up bilingual. This type of knowledge is without any doubt needed among the school personnel who increasingly often appears in contact with bilingual children and is responsible for their school progress and academic achievements. As these examples demonstrate, bilingual conversations may often be hidden from the teachers.

However, the main limitation of the present study is that it provides only a glimpse of one day of the life of two Turkish-Norwegian schoolgirls, just a brief insight into being a 10 year old bilingual in a Norwegian classroom. For this reason, I would argue for the need of conducting more comprehensive studies exploring the language practices of various bilingual groups in the school context. Particularly, since my study is limited to the exploration of the same-gender conversations, a study of identity negotiation of the same participants in mixed-gender conversations could possibly provide some interesting findings that would differ from mine. This study may contribute to the existing knowledge about the gender-determined differences in the use of linguistic variations among bilinguals.

Literature list

- Aasen, J. and E. N. Mønness (1999). *Minoritets elever i grunnskolen: analyse av ressursbehovet til særskilt norsk- og morsmåloplæring*. Elverum, Høgkolen
- Aarsæther, F. (2003). Kodväxling som resurs i samspel. Hur pakistansk – norska barn använder flera språk för att organisera samtal. In J. Cromdal & A.-C. Ewaldsson (Red.), *Ett vardagsliv med flera språk* (105-128). Stockholm: Liber AB.
- Aarsæther, F. (2004). *To språk i en tekst. Kodeveksling i samtaler mellom pakistansk-norske tåringer*. Doctoral thesis, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway .
- Appel, R. and P. Muysken (1987). *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Auer, P. (2005). A postscript: code-switching and social identity. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, p. 403-410.
- Auer, P. (1998). Introduction: bilingual conversation revisited. In: P. Auer (ed.): *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In: L. Milroy and P. Muysken (Ed.) *One speaker, two languages. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 115-135.
- Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. (Eds). C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press
- Bloomfield, L. (1957). *Language*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cashman, H. (2005). Identities at play: language preference and group membership in bilingual talk in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, p. 301-315.

- Crocker, L. & Algina, J. (1986). *Introduction to Classical and Modern Test Theory*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Cromdal, J. and Ewaldsson, A.-C. (2003). *Ett vardagsliv med flera språk*. Stockholm: Liber AB.
- Cromdal, J. (2003). The Creation and Administration of Social Relations in Bilingual Group Work. In: Jørgensen, J. N. (ed.), *Bilingualism and social relations: Turkish speakers in North Western Europe* (pp. 56-75). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cromdal, J. (2001). Overlap in bilingual play. *Research on language and social interaction*. 34(4), 421-451.
- Cromdal, J. (2000a). *Code-switching for all practical purposes: Bilingual organization of children's play*. Linköping: Linköping studies in arts and Science; nr. 233.
- Cromdal, J. (2000b). Creating a monolingual story in bilingual conversation. In: Holmen & Jørgensen (ed.), *Det er Conversation 801 degil mi? Perspectives on the bilingualism of Turkish Speaking Children and Adolescents in North Western Europe*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Studies on Bilingualism, Køge Series, K7, 57-75.
- Dunn, L., & Dunn, L. (1997). *Peabody Picture Vocabulary test, 3rd edn. (PPVT-III)*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.
- Dunn, L., Dunn, L., Whetton, C., & Burley, J. (1997). *British Picture Vocabulary Scale II*. Windsor: NFER-Nelson.
- Engen, T.O. & L.A. Kulbrandstad. (2004). *Tospråklighet, minoritetsspråklighet og minoritetsundervisning*. Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.
- Eriksen, T.H. (ed.) (1997). *Flerkulturell forståelse*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Esdahl, T. (2003). Language Choice as a Power Resource in Bilingual Adolescents' Conversations in the Danish *Folkeskole* In: Jørgensen, J. N. (ed.), *Bilingualism and social relations: Turkish speakers in North Western Europe* (pp.76-89). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Evaldsson, A.-C. (2000). "För jag är bäst på svenska!" Om sociala och språkliga ordningar i mångkulturell skola. *Utbildning & Demokrati*, 9(2), 29-48.
- Gafaranga, J. (2005). Demythologizing language alternation studies: conversational structure vs. social structure in bilingual interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, p. 281-300.
- Gafaranga, J. (2001). Language versus medium in the study of bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5, 195-219.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Grosjean, F. (2008). *Studying bilinguals*. Oxford: University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (1992). Another view of bilingualism. In: Harris, R. (ed.). *Cognitive processing in bilinguals*. Amsterdam: North Holland, p. 51-62.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages. An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Guldal, K.M. (1997). *Three children, two languages: the role of code-selection in organization of conversation*. Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim (doctoral thesis).
- Gumperz, J.J. (1992). "Contextualization revisited." In: Auer and A.di Luzio (Ed.). *The contextualization of language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, p. 39-53.
- Gumperz J.J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Henriksen, K. (2010). *Levekår og kjønnsforskjeller blant innvandrere fra ti land*. Rapport 2010: 6. Statistisk sentralbyrå. Oslo – Kongsvinger. Retrieved from http://www.ssb.no/emner/00/02/rapp_201006/index.html (8.10.2010).
- Inglis, C. (2008). *Planning for cultural diversity*. Fundamentals of Educational Planning 87. Paris: UNESCO-IIEP.
- Jenkins, R. (1996). *Social identity – key ideas*. London: Routledge.
- Judd, C., Smith, E. & Kidder, L. (1991). *Research Methods in Social Relations*. Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

- Jørgensen, J. N. (2003). De ungas språk – om ungdomars flerspråkliga handlande. In J. Cromdal & A.-C. Ewaldsson (Ed.), *Ett vardagsliv med flera språk* (pp. 45-65). Stockholm: Liber AB.
- Jørgensen, J. N. (1998). "Children's acquisition of code-switching for power-weilding." In: P. Auer (Ed.). *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge, p. 237-258.
- Kleven, T. (2008). Validity and validation in qualitative and quantitative research. *Nordisk pedagogik*, Vol. 28, pp. 219-233.
- Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Linnel, P. (1998). *Approaching dialogue: talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Linnel, P., Gustavson, L. & Juvonen, P. (1988). Interactional dominance in dyadic communications: presentation of initiative-response analysis. *Linguistics*, 26.
- Li Wei (2005a). Starting from the right place: introduction to the special issue on Conversational Code-Switching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, p. 275-279.
- Li Wei (2005b). "How can you tell?" Towards a common sense explanation of conversational code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, p. 375-389.
- Li Wei (2002). What do you want me to say? On the conversation analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in Society*, vol. 31, nr. 2, p. 159-180.
- Li Wei (Ed.). (2000). *The Bilingualism Reader*. London: Routledge
- Li Wei (1998). "The "why" and "how" questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching." In: Auer (red.). *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge, p. 156-176.
- Madsen, L. M. (2003). Power Relations, Interactional Dominance and Manipulation Strategies in Group Conversations of Turkish-Danish Children. In: Jørgensen, J. N. (ed.), *Bilingualism and social relations: Turkish speakers in North Western Europe* (pp.90-101). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Marshall, C. and Rossman, G. (1999). *Designing Qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Messick, S. (1995). *Validity of psychological assessment*. *American Psychologist*, 50(9), 741-749.
- Miller, J., Kostogriz, A. and Gearon, M. (2009): *Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: New Dilemmas for Teachers*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Özerk, K. (1992). *Faglig utvikling med to språk: En studie av minoritetsspråklige barns språklige liv, skolegang og teoretiske utvikling*. Oslo: Pedagogisk forskningsinstitutt, UIO.
- Patton, Michael Quinn: *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods. 3rd edition*, 2002. Sage Publications.
- Portes A., Fernandez-Kelly, P., & Haller, W. (2005). "Segmented assimilation on the ground: The new second generation in early adulthood". In: *Ethnic and Racial studies*, 28(6). 1000-1040.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2nd edition.
- Rydland, V., Aukrust, V. & Fulland, H. (submitted) Immigrants living with high co-ethnic concentration versus living scattered: Turkish-speaking students' vocabulary learning comprehension across two cities in Norway. *International Journal of Bilingualism*.
- Rydland, V. (2006). *Expression of voice in peer interaction. A longitudinal study of second-language learners in preschool and first grade*. Doctoral thesis, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.
- Sahlström, F. (1999). *Up the hill backwards. On interactional constraints and affordances for equity-constitution in the classes of Swedish comprehensive school*. Doctoral thesis, Uppsala Studies on Education, Uppsala, Sweden.
- Sktutnabb-Kangas, T. (1981). *Tvåspråklighet*. Lund: Liber Laromedel.
- Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2005). *Ja vet int va de heter på svenska: interaction mellan tvåspråkliga elever och deras lärare i en enspråklig klassrumdiskurs*. Åbo: Åbo Akademis förlag.

- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- SSB (2011). *Barn og unge i befolkningen. Demografisk bilde av norske barn*. Retrieved June 12, 2011, from http://www.ssb.no/emner/02/barn_og_unge/2011/bef/
- Taylor, Ch. (1994). The politics of recognition. In: David Theo Goldberg (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: A Critical Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Thomas, W. & Collier, V. (1997). *School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students*. NCBE Resource Collection Series, No. 9. George Washington University.
- Türker, E. (2000). *Turkish-Norwegian codeswitching. Evidence from intermediate and second generation Turkish immigrants in Norway*. Doctoral thesis, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.
- Weinreich, U. (1968). *Languages in Contact*. The Hauge: Mouton.
- Widdicombe, S. (1997). Bilinguals and bilingualism: language policy in an anti-immigrant age. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 127, 25-52.
- Yin, R.K. (2009). *Case Study Research*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Appendix

Transcription key

The following key is a modified and simplified version of the transcription conventions of CA (Conversational Analysis).

Norwegian utterance in Norwegian

Translation translation from Norwegian to English

Turkish utterance in Turkish, reproduced in bold font and cursive

Translation translation from Turkish to English, reproduced in cursive

((text)) non-verbal activity/observer's comment, for example ((nodding))

xxx inaudible word

(text) guessing of an unclear utterance

(.) micro pause

(5) pause in second

! rising tone

? question

. full stop/falling tone

>text< quick pace

<text> slow pace