

AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction

Language Program Articulation: Developing a Theoretical Foundation

Catherine M. Barrette
Kate Paesani
Editors

THOMSON
—★—™
HEINLE

Australia • Canada • Mexico • Singapore • Spain
United Kingdom • United States

THOMSON

HEINLE

Publisher: Janet Dracksdorf
Senior Assistant Editor: Heather Bradley
Assistant Editor: Arlinda Shtuni
Executive Marketing Manager: Lindsey
Richardson
Associate Marketing Manager: Rachel Bairstow

Advertising Project Manager: Stacey Purviance
Editorial Production Manager: Michael Burggren
Manufacturing Manager: Marcia Locke
Production Service/Compositor: GEX
Publishing Services
Cover/Text Printer: Malloy

©2005 Thomson Heinle, a part of The Thomson Corporation. Thomson, the Star logo, and Heinle are trademarks used herein under license.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. No part of this work covered by the copyright hereon may be reproduced or used in any form or by any means—graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, taping, Web distribution, information storage and retrieval systems, or in any other manner—without the written permission of the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 09 08 07 06 05 04

For more information about our products,
contact us at:

**Thomson Learning Academic
Resource Center
1-800-423-0563**

For permission to use material from this
text or product, submit a request online at
<http://www.thomsonrights.com>.

Any additional questions about permissions
can be submitted by email to
thomsonrights@thomson.com.

Library of Congress Control Number:
2004112856

ISBN 1-4130-0380-X

**Thomson Higher Education
25 Thomson Place
Boston, MA 02210-1202
USA**

Asia (including India)
Thomson Learning
5 Shenton Way
#01-01 UIC Building
Singapore 068808

Australia/New Zealand
Thomson Learning Australia
102 Dodds Street
Southbank, Victoria 3006
Australia

Canada
Thomson Nelson
1120 Birchmount Road
Toronto, Ontario M1K 5G4
Canada

UK/Europe/Middle East/Africa
Thomson Learning
High Holborn House
50/51 Bedford Row
London WC1R 4LR
United Kingdom

Latin America
Thomson Learning
Seneca, 53
Colonia Polanco
11560 Mexico
D.F. Mexico

Spain (includes Portugal)
Thomson Paraninfo
Calle Magallanes, 25
28015 Madrid, Spain

Chapter 7

Co-Construction and Articulation of Code Choice Practices in Foreign Language Classrooms

Glenn S. Levine

Abstract

In developing a theoretical foundation for language program articulation the author argues that code choice practices be co-constructed by instructors and students as an integral part of the adult second language acquisition (SLA) and socialization process. A principled approach to classroom code choice is introduced and related to issues of vertical and horizontal language program articulation. This multilingual model derives from a rejection of the “monolingual native speaker” as the target toward which adult second language learners should strive, in favor of training them as multilingual, intercultural speakers in their own right. Motivated also by the tenets of critical applied linguistics, sociocultural and sociocognitive approaches to SLA, and the conceptualization of language as social semiotic, learners are granted a vital and ongoing role in co-constructing classroom code choice norms. This role is facilitated by a critical examination of codes, dynamic strategies instruction, and investigation of multilingual speech communities in the target culture(s). The model contributes to horizontal articulation in multi-section language courses by providing a unifying yet heterogeneous framework for code choice practices. It contributes to vertical articulation by treating the development and modification of code choice norms as a long-term, multi-stage endeavor. This chapter concludes with consideration of the implications of the multilingual model for language program articulation and direction.

Introduction

Any model of language program articulation must include serious consideration of how code choice relates to classroom communication as part of the process of adult instructed second language acquisition (SLA) and socialization at each level of instruction (introductory, intermediate, advanced) and across multi-section courses. I argue that a multilingual rather than a monolingual approach to instruction is necessary because it can both maximize second language (L2) use and promote learner autonomy and critical awareness. These two factors are important to horizontal and vertical articulation because both can serve as the glue that unites disparate or intentionally diverse elements of a language program.

In recent years, a monolingual approach to L2 instruction has been brought into question from different perspectives and with varying degrees of vehemence. The debate has centered around two main issues: (1) the degree to which the classroom is or should be regarded as a multilingual environment or a site of code choice, and (2) the assumed target of adult SLA. With regard to the first issue, V. Cook (1999, 2001) argues that there is no theoretical basis for the “monolingual principle” underlying communicative language teaching. Blyth (1995) suggests that we call the language class what it is, namely a multilingual environment. Belz (2002, 2003) demonstrates some of the ways in which multiple language use enriches rather than undermines L2 communication. Chavez (2003) explores the ways in which the foreign language (FL) class resembles a diglossic community. And Antón and DiCamilla (1999), Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain (2004), Levine (2003), Macaro (2001), and Swain and Lapkin (2000) offer empirical evidence that whether we like it or not, the learners’ first languages (L1) appear to serve important functions in the SLA process. Macaro (2001) asserts that what is needed is a principled approach to L1 use in the language class. Cohen (1998) echoes this challenge. Levine (2003) suggests that although L1 may serve important functions, unprincipled and unguided L1 use in the FL class might actually impede L2 communication.

With regard to the second issue, the assumed target of SLA, the conceptual source of the monolingual principle can be found in the largely unquestioned adherence to the “monolingual native speaker” as the target toward which adult learners must strive (Crozet and Liddicoat 1999; Kramersch 1997, 1998), despite our awareness that most of them likely will never come close to it. Kramersch (1993, 1997, 1998, 2002) instead proposes that we train not pale imitations of monolingual native speakers but multicompetent, intercultural speakers in their own right. In Kramersch’s conceptualization of the ideal classroom, learners should strive not toward the native speaker target but rather a “third place,” a manifestation of a bilingual “linguaculture” (Crozet and Liddicoat 1999, p. 115) that validates the L2 learner.

One approach to striving for a bilingual linguaculture as the target of instruction lies in instructors’ and learners’ handling of classroom **codeswitching**, also referred to in this chapter as **code choice**, defined in the broadest sense as the alternation between two or more languages at the word, sentence, or discourse level. According to Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain (2004), codeswitching at any instructional level can serve several important conversational functions, for example to reinforce the content of a speaker’s utterance, prevent a breakdown in communication vis-à-vis maintaining the flow of conversation, facilitate community-building through affecting the footing of a conversation (Goffman 1979, cited in Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain 2004), obtain the floor, initiate a conversational repair, or elaborate on or explicate conversational content.

The purpose of this chapter, then, is to further develop a principled approach to classroom code choice beyond the brief suggestions made in Levine (2003), paying particular attention to the ways it can or should be conceptualized and managed at different instructional levels. Also important is the way we design the roles

played by all class members—instructor and students—in managing code choice practices, for herein lies the connection to both vertical and horizontal articulation and the contribution of the language program director (LPD). In the model presented here, each section of a multi-section language course develops a class-internal “community of practice” (Wenger 1998) intended to meet the communicative needs of a particular group of learners. The guiding principle of the model is that the critical sanctioning of L1—effectively destigmatizing, limiting, and maximizing L1 use simultaneously—can contribute to the maximal use of L2 and serve to unify the different communities of practice in multiple sections of the same course and across instructional levels. No claim is made here that classroom codeswitching or L1 use itself causes or promotes SLA, and in this regard the reader should note that this chapter is not a research report. Rather, my intention is to offer a means for rethinking the way language professionals approach code choice and offer a pedagogical model for implementing such an approach, especially as an important component of conceptualizing, planning, and teaching language curricula. For fundamentally, successful construction and management of a multilingual approach across multi-section courses and instructional levels can promote successful articulation by (1) maximizing the amount of time learners spend using the L2 overall, thereby opening the door to accomplishing a great deal with language earlier in the instructional sequence than is arguably typical in many U.S. FL classes; (2) facilitating learner autonomy and critical awareness; and (3) overtly politicizing classroom communication itself in classroom-internal and classroom-external ways, something we usually keep opaque or intentionally steer clear of in typical U.S. university-level FL classes (van Lier 1996). These factors can contribute to articulation by serving on the one hand as the linguistic glue binding verbal behavior across language sections and instructional levels, and on the other hand by contributing to the development of a reflective community of practice within each course and facilitating critical insights that learners carry with them through further language courses and interaction with L2 speakers in the target culture(s).

The multilingual model is a refinement of the tenets originally proposed in Levine (2003)¹ and of the tenets of critical applied linguistics (Pennycook 2001). These tenets include the “creative expansion of possibilities resulting from hybridity” (Pennycook 2001, p. 9), the assumed interrelationships between learning, knowledge, and power, and the basic questioning of the simple dichotomies we generally rely on to study adult SLA. The model also derives from the conceptualizations within sociocultural and sociocognitive approaches (Atkinson 2002; Brooks and Donato 1994; Lantolf 2000; Vygotsky 1978) to the complex interrelationships between language development and interaction. Finally, the multilingual model assumes language to be one sort of social semiotic system among numerous semiotic systems (Halliday 1978; Kramsch 2002).² Although identifiable as a set of pedagogical strategies and techniques, the model does not dictate a particular way of teaching language; in this regard I do not propose a new approach to or technique for FL teaching overall. First and foremost I am concerned with the issue of language use and language socialization (Rampton 1995) of speakers in verbal or

written interaction and how speakers become multilingual users of L2 (along with other codes) by allowing them to have a critical stake in what goes on in the classroom in terms of the agreed-upon norms of code choice and use. The development of these norms within each language class and across instructional levels is guided by (1) the instructor as an expert in the L2 and its culture(s), and who is presumably also knowledgeable about relevant SLA research, (2) knowledge acquired about multilingual speech communities in the target country or countries, and importantly, (3) the learners' own informed and contextually bound ideas about what is right and appropriate in different situations.

Codeswitching as Creative Language Use

Four basic assumptions about codeswitching as a social and linguistic aspect of human interaction underlie the multilingual model. The first is that codeswitching is a systematic, grammatical phenomenon that appears to apply, if not universally, then at least across a multitude of language contact situations (Li Wei 2000; Myers-Scotton 1993; Zentella 1997). The view of codeswitching as ungrammatical or erroneous verbal behavior seems to be limited largely to the fields of applied linguistics and language pedagogy (Chavez 2003; Rampton 1995; Valdman 1989). Second, as already mentioned, numerous scholars have offered strong arguments that a monolingualist view of the language class (i.e., the view that use of the learners' L1 has little or no pedagogical value) is counterproductive, counterintuitive, and untenable (Antón and DiCamilla 1999; Belz 2002, 2003; Blyth 1995; Chavez 2003; Cohen 1998; V. Cook 1999, 2001; Levine 2003; Macaro 2001; Swain and Lapkin 2000; Turnbull and Arnett 2002). Third, recent literature has argued fairly convincingly that language classroom codeswitching serves a variety of important discourse functions, just as it does in societal multilingual situations (Antón and DiCamilla 1999; Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain 2004; Swain and Lapkin 2000).

The collective message of much of the scholarship on classroom dual code use is that language professionals need not view learners' use of L1 as an aberration of normal or desired behavior, but rather as part of what should go on in the classroom (Blyth 1995). Yet accepting dual code use as part of what we do in the classroom leads to a fourth assumption about codeswitching that has not yet been addressed sufficiently in the literature: although codeswitching may be systematic and grammatical as a linguistic phenomenon, it should not be assumed that all forms and functions of codeswitching actually contribute to maximal use of the L2 (or ultimately to successful SLA). I propose that whether or not codeswitching is advantageous to maximal classroom L2 use depends on whether it is a **socially unmarked** code for its users, that is, whether the use of the L1 in alternation with the L2 in the FL classroom is (1) a communicative practice accepted as socially and pedagogically valuable by instructor and students, and (2) managed in such a way as to limit or *mark* L1 use in acceptable ways. According to Myers-Scotton **markedness** is based on the idea that "the particular linguistic variety used in an exchange carries social meaning" and that "all linguistic code choices are indexical of a set of rights and

obligations holding between participants in the conversational exchange” (1988, p. 152). The model assigns unmarked status to the code that feels the most natural or appropriate to a particular speaker at a given moment.³

In many language classes, and actually in all introductory classes, one cannot assume the L2 to be socially unmarked. The pedagogical goal of the multilingual model thus comes into focus, namely to help the L2 become an (but not the only) unmarked code. The primary means to this end lie in a dynamic combination of effective content instruction, learning- and communication-strategies instruction, and avid task-based, learner-initiated and learner-guided communication. Viewed in these terms, the development of a multilingual model becomes a long-term project for instructor and learners, contributing to program articulation as it spans multiple instructional levels.

The Default Condition: The Hegemony of English and the Social Markedness of the L2

The initial state or **default condition** that I assume exists in almost any introductory and many intermediate and advanced language classes is that the L1 remains the socially dominant or unmarked code and the L2 the socially marked one. The unmarked status of the L1, which is most often English in U.S. FL classrooms, is influenced partly by conversation-external factors such as the symbolic dominance of English (Bourdieu 1991), the uncritical monolingualist convictions of instructors and students, the incipient grammatical and lexical L2 knowledge of the speakers, and conversation-internal factors such as footing (Goffman 1979) and the sequential patterns of interaction (Li Wei 1998). For each speaker, switching to English is often a tool (Myers-Scotton 1988, p. 156), and a speaker may choose to follow or flout the perceived unmarked code in a given conversation for a variety of reasons (p. 151). For the listener, switching is “an index, a symbol of the speaker’s intentions. Switching is both a means and a message” (p. 156), and as such can itself be a marked or unmarked event, depending on the situation. This means, for example, that the language instructor who attempts to impose a marked status on English by stigmatizing its use may be frustrated as learners intentionally flout those norms and use the language at inappropriate times. Relatedly, learners who flout the unmarked code (English) may do so to set themselves off from other learners, in solidarity with the instructor’s efforts to mark English.

Numerous factors determine the choice of one code over another in a given exchange in a bilingual community and in the language classroom. As mentioned, one of these is the symbolic dominance (Bourdieu 1991) of a particular code in a given exchange and the need speakers feel to engage in marking the boundaries of linguistic identity by either accommodating to the dominant code, or resisting or rejecting it (Hill 1993; Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985). For example, in typical immigrant situations (Zentella 1997), English dominates symbolically in numerous situations. Similarly, in the typical U.S. FL classroom, English—as the socially and cognitively dominant language of most or all learners—likely holds a similar

hegemonic status. The central problem is that the intuitive tendencies for code choice of learners and instructors, such as those described by Chavez (2003), Duff and Polio (1990), Guthrie (1987), Levine (2003), and Swain and Lapkin (2000), do not necessarily support the L2 as an unmarked code and may actually contribute to its perpetuation as a highly marked code, especially in introductory-level courses (e.g., Horner and Trimbur 2002; Pennycook 2001).

In the absence of the sort of conscious reflection on code choice called for by the multilingual model, many learners may view classroom L2 use as little more than a pretense, a complex word game. At the introductory level learners' incipient L2 ability is a key factor in arriving at what feels most comfortable or natural, yet for many the L2 may remain a marked code for as long as they study the language, even as L1 use takes on more definitive boundary-marking roles later on. Further, in many language classrooms, the instructor (bolstered by published curricular materials) may contribute to maintaining rigid, standardized native speaker norms as the stated target, acting as the "language police" to "keep" the students in the L2, thereby stigmatizing the use of the L1 (V. Cook 1999, 2001). In this scenario, if the L2 remains the socially marked code for learners in the introductory level, then it may become more difficult to shift later on. Therefore, the classroom community should establish a multilingual model as early as possible in the learner's L2 education.⁴

Based on the default condition, creating or co-constructing a multilingual classroom means crafting for and with students a more sophisticated system of markedness that can operate within a given language class and across academic terms, one that asks students to look the social and political hegemony of English in the face and artificially (at the outset, in any case) mark that code. In the following discussion I detail the pedagogical steps or stages of a multilingual model of classroom code choice. Thereafter several issues crucial to language program articulation and direction are considered.

A Multilingual Model: Formalizing Classroom Code Choice as a Means of Horizontal and Vertical Articulation

To reach the goal of a classroom in which both L2 and L1 can be socially unmarked codes based on the context and desires or inclinations of the speakers, it is necessary for all class members—instructor and students—to reflect critically on who speaks what to whom and in what contexts at different points in time. This means formalizing a sort of classroom diglossia, such as that described by Chavez (2003). The difference between Chavez's description and the multilingual model proposed here is that language choice conventions are overtly agreed upon through a series of stages and are articulated across instructional levels. This entails not only formal instruction, as the instructor serves as the expert on matters related to the L2 and its culture(s), but also collaborative construction of multilingual conventions that work for a particular group of learners in a particular course, articulated

across instructional levels. In this model instructors engage in strategies instruction and students are granted an active, ongoing role in creating and attending to the agreed-upon classroom conventions for language choice. Following the establishment of classroom multilingual norms, the instructor must allow learners to engage in frequent meaningful and purposeful communication in which the norms are put into practice, reflected upon, revised and refined, and developed toward the achievement of a classroom in which learners can manipulate all the codes at their disposal for personal and mutual benefit. At each stage, the importance of the role of instructors and the LPD in coordinating horizontal articulation across multi-sectioned courses, and vertical articulation from the introductory to the intermediate to the advanced levels, cannot be overstated.

The horizontal articulation of multi-section courses is often a problematic undertaking, in part because the very notion of horizontal articulation follows from the institutional assumption that some sort of homogeneity exists among learners, instructors, curricula, institutions, and so forth, whereas most LPDs and instructors know that with identical curricula and similar teacher training, the vicissitudes of classroom communication remain complicated and manageable primarily in the context of individual classes (Kumaravadivelu 2003; Tudor 2001; van Lier 1996; Wenger 1998). And in fact this reality could be regarded as an impediment to successful horizontal articulation of multi-section language courses. The multilingual model represents, however, an acknowledgment of this complexity and a unifying factor in the face of the messy reality, a means to promote learner (and instructor) autonomy under the umbrella of a principled, critical set of tenets and practices. Put another way, the multilingual model means that in multi-section language courses, each section can function as an independent "community of practice" (Wenger 1998), such that the LPD or the instructor acts as the architect of instruction whereas the learners themselves contribute to its design on an ongoing basis, at least in terms of code choice practices.

Though it is perhaps somewhat paradoxical, I suggest that horizontal articulation is achieved through the common pursuit of heterogeneity across language courses. Of course, if one defines horizontal articulation simply as the creation of similar instruction across courses at the same level, then programmatic heterogeneity of practice appears antithetical to the endeavor. Presumably, if one were to identify through quantitative or qualitative study particular trends in the establishment of code choice norms across multiple sections of the same course, these trends could perhaps be generalized so that the most salient among them would become pre-established code choice norms in all sections. Through such generalization, horizontal articulation would appear to have been successfully achieved. And yet, this approach would risk undermining the central advantage of the multilingual model, namely learner autonomy and the development of viable classroom communities of practice. Ultimately it is the creation of conditions for learner critical reflection and control over code choice norms that lead, in my view, to the strongest curricular bonds across sections of the same course. Hence, the multilingual model itself points toward rethinking horizontal articulation not in terms of homogeneity across same-level courses, but rather in terms of principled heterogeneity.

Turning to the issue of vertical articulation, the main obstacle facing LPDs, instructors, and students is moving from the initial default state (unmarked L1, marked L2) to the goal (unmarked L1, unmarked L2) within the multilingual classroom as learners move through the levels of a language program. Figure 1 presents one version of the process as a chronological two-stage sequence. Stage II is defined or differentiated from Stage I primarily by virtue of L2's status as an unmarked code, at least some of the time, and by learners' ongoing critical reflection about and revision of classroom code choice norms. The time frames associated with each stage may vary depending on the number of contact hours, the characteristics of the particular L2, the size and personality of particular classes, and so forth. Each stage consists of the various steps listed in the center column; the steps do not necessarily proceed in a fixed order. The progression through each stage and its associated steps is assumed to span several academic terms; Figure 1 therefore represents a schema for vertical articulation. In an introductory language course such as that offered in the ten-week quarter in my institution, the group may only move into Stage I, having succeeded in establishing multilingual norms appropriate to that level and assigning a socially marked value to L1. The term "marked" is printed in quotes to indicate that at this stage all class members agree that making L1 socially marked is an artifice, a contrivance in service to the goal of helping L2 become socially unmarked.

The sorts of activities engaged in that relate to the establishment and development of code choice norms can be divided into four categories: collaborative decision making, strategies instruction, content instruction, and learner-centered interaction. The divisions between these instructional categories are not assumed to be rigid; areas of overlap are unavoidable and perhaps desirable. For example, content instruction about multilingual speakers can serve simultaneously as data for critical reflection about what goes on in the language class, or consideration of code choice can be injected into language tasks that involve verbal interaction. In the following I describe each of the two main stages of the progression in turn.

Stage I: Instructor and Learners Co-Construct Multilingual Norms

To co-construct a multilingual classroom, the instructor and students must have a sense of the goal they are targeting, and they should strive to consider themselves partners on equal footing in the endeavor. In part because of the typical power dynamics of the classroom, the initial stages in the creation of a multilingual classroom are in the hands of the instructor. This does not mean that the students simply sit and absorb the sage guidance provided by the instructor; good teaching always engages all learners actively, regardless of the pedagogical paradigm.

The main thrust of this crucial opening stage is strategies instruction.⁵ Learning strategies pertinent to code choice and use ask learners to reflect on and analyze issues of context and communicative situation, genre, and what constitutes important communication in the language classroom. Hence, in the first days and weeks of a course the instructor should help learners determine for themselves what constitutes important contexts of communication, and what code

would be appropriate for each of those contexts. This sort of strategies instruction could be labeled **discourse strategies instruction**, and could be supplemented by a variety of in-class and out-of-class activities for students. Part of this discourse strategies instruction is the formal sanctioning of L1 use. This means that students and the instructor make L1 use explicit and condoned through the simple question (spoken in the L2), “May I say/ask something in English?” In keeping with the arguments of V. Cook (1999, 2001), Turnbull and Arnett (2002), and others, in the introductory German courses at my institution, the answer to this question, at least from the instructor, is almost always *yes*.⁶ This simple, formal sanctioning of a discourse switch highlights the fact that, although the socially unmarked code of the moment may be L1, all are aware that the return to the L2 is imminent.

In addition to discourse strategies instruction, a most crucial role for the instructor is to engage in some sort of **codeswitching strategies instruction**. This

Figure 1
Creation of a Multilingual Classroom

Initial/Default state L1 = Unmarked code L2 = Marked code		
Stage I Instructor and learners co-construct multilingual norms L1 = “Marked” Code L2 = Marked Code	Vocabulary-building instruction (phrases, gambits)	Throughout: Frequent learner-centered/initiated, meaningful (often task-based) communication
	Discourse/Negotiation and code choice strategies instruction	
	Basic code choice and use concepts instruction/discussion	
	Level-appropriate investigation of multilingual communities in the TL country/countries	
	Collaborative creation of level- appropriate ground rules for code choice and code use	

Figure 1
 Creation of a Multilingual Classroom (continued)

<p>Stage II</p> <p>Emerging multilingual classroom</p> <p>L1 = Marked code</p> <p>L2 = Variable marked/unmarked code</p>	<p>Revision, refinement, and evaluation of multilingual norms based on language level (introductory, intermediate, advanced)</p>	
	<p>Level-appropriate investigation of multilingual communities in the TL country/countries</p>	
<p>Goal/Final state</p> <p>Multilingual classroom</p> <p>L1 = Unmarked or marked code</p> <p>L2 = Unmarked or marked code</p>		

involves teaching students what codeswitching is and providing opportunities to reflect critically about code choice and language use, and may take the form of classroom tasks and activities to facilitate learner reflection and discussion about these issues.

Apart from strategies instruction designed to help students engage critically with code choice practices, an additional sort of instruction that can be initiated at this stage is **multilingual content instruction**. As early as possible, learners should begin to investigate actual multilingual communities and the situations of multilingual speakers of the L2. For example, in German courses students could investigate some Turkish-German communities in Germany through reading authentic fiction or nonfiction texts, listening to Internet radio broadcasts, and writing short texts (in English if at the introductory level, in German if intermediate or advanced). The writing activity, in addition to asking students to deal with some current target country issues, also can ask them to reflect upon and share personal experiences about their own exposure to multilingual situations in the United States or elsewhere. In the process of both moving L2 to an unmarked status and accepting that both L2 and L1 can have a role in the classroom, the goal becomes to expand students' perceptions and understandings of the possibilities for language use and the creative and even playful nature of language choices (e.g., Auer

and Dirim forthcoming; Belz 2002; G. Cook 2000), and crucially, to pursue the achievement of the “third place” in the L2 learning process, that unique state that is neither the L1 lingua culture nor the native L2 lingua culture (Crozet and Liddicoat 1999; Kramsch 1993), but rather the essence of intercultural communicative competence (Byram 1997; Byram, Nichols, and Stevens 2001).

As learners become comfortable with code use strategies, the next task is in their hands. Together with the instructor (or independently of her or him if they choose), they decide when to speak what code and to whom. At this stage they also decide how the use of L1 should be sanctioned; this is an important step toward artificially marking L1 in the classroom setting. As mentioned earlier, in our own German program at the University of California–Irvine, most often learners and the instructor opt for the simplest approach at the outset: both must ask permission to use English. In addition, the learners decide what should happen (i.e., what sort of “penalty” should be given) if someone uses English without permission.⁷ This can range from the friendly reminders of interlocutors to some more serious consequence.⁸ Whatever means or consequences, or whatever level of consistency with which the agreed-upon conventions are enforced (if at all), the simple fact that learners engage in the process of thinking about and monitoring code use in the classroom is crucial to marking the L1 without actually stigmatizing it, perhaps more crucial than any particular interactional patterns or other aspect of the multilingual model. Put another way, not only is learners’ awareness of code use patterns raised, but their sense of the importance of different code choices in different contexts is heightened. As students move through subsequent instructional levels, the ground rules for language choice can and should be made more complex or domain-specific (Chavez 2003). For example, in some courses learners may agree to move explicit treatment of grammar—a context in which L1 appears to be preferred as the unmarked code (Levine 2003; Schultz et al. 2002)—into the L2.

Stage II: Emerging Multilingual Classroom

Once the multilingual norms of the class have been established and the L1 has in effect become an artificially marked code, the longer progression from this stage toward the multilingual classroom begins. This is where the usual business of the language course takes place, which is assumed to be a largely learner-centered, task-based curriculum. In its ideal form the language class that likely works best with a multilingual model follows a dynamic view of language teaching and learning, one predicated on the complexity of the process rather than one that is constrained by a particular methodology. The tenets of the **macrostrategic model** presented by Kumaravadivelu (2003) accord well with the multilingual classroom as described here. This conceptualization is related to a critical view of the language class as the site of continuously (re)negotiated identities and power relationships (e.g., Pennycook 2001; Foucault 1980a, 1980b). In the emerging multilingual classroom, the instructor’s job is to help learners reflect on the developing code use norms and their relationships to classroom discourses, and of course to engage in as much meaningful, purposeful communication as possible (Lee 2000; Skehan 1998). During this communication, students should be allowed to make use of the

L1 to facilitate completion of tasks according to the norms they have established. Several studies have shown that learners naturally use the L1 for the completion of language tasks, especially writing tasks, as well as for a variety of discourse purposes (Antón and DiCamilla 1999; Chavez 2003; Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain 2004; Swain and Lapkin 2000), and that L1 use appears to facilitate the completion of those tasks. It is important to keep in mind, however, that although the unprincipled use of L1 may help learners complete tasks, it says nothing of whether this use of L1 maximizes time spent using L2. With the engagement of explicit, mutually-agreed-upon code choice norms within a task-based, learner-centered framework, I suggest that the use of L1 can both help students complete tasks, as shown by Antón and DiCamilla (1999) and Swain and Lapkin (2004), and facilitate maximal L2 use because the process of socially marking but not stigmatizing the L1 can serve to minimize the absolute amount of time spent using L1 (Levine 2003).

As learners in the emerging multilingual classroom engage in frequent verbal interaction, they reflect upon, revise, and refine the ground rules for L1 use. Crucially, by this point codeswitching itself should have become an unmarked condition regardless of the agreed-upon conventions, similar to codeswitching as it takes place in societal bilingual situations. As students’ active vocabulary expands and their L2 abilities develop, the domains and contexts in which L1 is preferred will likely change, as well as the sorts of L1 uses that learners consider acceptable.

But there are certain aspects of dual code use that may be common to all language levels. These have to do with the sociocultural and sociocognitive functions of the switches. For example, some codeswitching may occur to compensate for insufficient knowledge of L2. Zentella (1997) calls this sort of switching “crutching,” or switching not because of social motivations or markedness issues but because of a gap or momentary lapse in the speaker’s linguistic knowledge. Although the crutching would likely manifest itself differently at the introductory, intermediate, and advanced levels, and for different learners at each level, it is a sort of switching one would expect to find in all language classes that do not explicitly forbid students to use the L1 during class time.

In addition to revising and refining the multilingual norms of the classroom community, in this stage the instructor facilitates additional learning about multilingual speakers in the target culture(s). For example, in German classes learners could investigate bilingual areas along the borders of Germany and Austria (South Tyrol, Alsace), the multilingual dynamics of Switzerland, or even speech islands outside of Germany, such as the *Russlanddeutschen* (Russia-Germans) or the Pennsylvania Dutch in the United States. As in Stage I, this sort of study, apart from providing opportunities for interesting content learning, serves to enrich learners’ notions of what it means to be a multicompetent, intercultural speaker, and it may help challenge the popular monolingualist view that pervades mainstream culture in the United States.

At some point in Stage II, or perhaps repeatedly at intervals during this stage, the class assesses together the state of multilingual norms at work in the class in order to answer the crucial question, “Are both L1 and L2 unmarked codes,

depending on the choices of speakers in the interaction?” A second important question, which some but perhaps not all language classes would be able to address, is, “Does our communal use of L1 appear to help us use the L2 more frequently, efficiently, and in more contexts?” Put another way, “Do learners (and the instructor) believe that they generally make appropriate use of the L1 to support L2 acquisition and use?” If the answer is a strong *yes* to both of these questions, the goal of a multilingual classroom is achieved. If, however, sufficient numbers of learners think the L1 is used frequently in situations in which they would rather see the L2 used, the class may have more work to do. Of course, the point at which a class can consider itself to function in a truly multilingual way is highly variable and will depend on the motivation and engagement of a particular group of learners, the characteristics of the L2 being learned, or the number of contact hours available.

Types of Code Choice Practices across Instructional Levels

The most fundamental difference between codeswitching at the introductory level and codeswitching at the intermediate and advanced levels of FL learning is the basic type of switch that likely predominates. In the introductory course or courses, intersentential or discourse switches are and should be the most frequently occurring type of switch. As learners gain greater expressive control over L2 and begin to move away from a monolingualist perspective, their ability to engage in intrasentential codeswitching will increase, a use of language closely associated with the ability to manipulate two codes creatively (Auer 1998; Myers-Scotton 1993; Zentella 1997). Therefore, in the early courses the vital task is for learners and the instructor to engage in principled codeswitching by clearly delineating the boundaries between codes. Note that this represents a departure from typical verbal behavior in societal multilingual situations, in which code boundaries are far from rigid. Yet in the framework of the teaching and learning of national languages in the university setting, I suggest that this delineation is desirable and important, even if one of our goals is to call into question the validity of the monolingual construct itself (Kramsch 1998; Pennycook 2001; Rampton 1995). Requiring formal sanction of an intersentential or discourse switch is a key way to achieve this delineation. Of course, this does not mean that learners should or will not engage in frequent unsanctioned discourse switching, and for this reason the instructor should refrain from serving as the language police. Co-constructed classroom conventions should help minimize the instructor's need to do this in any case.

In Stage II, when learners are at the intermediate and advanced levels, instructors can encourage intrasentential codeswitching. Our experience at the University of California–Irvine, suggests that the insertion of individual words or syntactic constituents (such as noun phrases or prepositional phrases) are the easiest sorts of intrasentential switches to “artificially” integrate into classroom discourse. I say “artificial” because intrasentential switches, although quite common in societal

multilingual situations, are unlikely to occur if learners are not informed of what they are and prompted to attempt them in class. Therefore, at the intermediate and advanced levels, when students' grammatical knowledge allows for more sophisticated communication but their lexicon is still limited and frequently the source of conversational breakdowns, the instructor can help learners brainstorm their own codeswitching conventions. One way to help students explore the forms intrasentential switches can take is to analyze (i.e., read and discuss) examples of actual conversational exchanges in which speakers engage in codeswitching; these are numerous and readily available in the codeswitching literature. A second way for students to integrate intrasentential switching into their normal language use is to ask them to write (and perhaps perform) fictional L2 dialogues with intentionally inserted L1 elements (e.g., Muysken 2000 on "lexical insertion"). The purpose is for learners to discover some of the ways in which English—far from being forbidden—can continue to support L2 communication even in advanced language classes.⁹

In addition to the progression from intersentential to intrasentential as the most frequently occurring types of switches from the introductory to intermediate and advanced levels, an important and interesting factor to consider and draw on is some students' own multilingualism or multiple linguistic identities. We can no longer assume that the L1 of most of our learners is English (Horner and Trimbur 2002; Kramsch 1998). To date we in the FL teaching profession have accepted the predominant status of English, and many aspects of the typical U.S. university setting send multilingual students the message that they should leave their non-English linguistic identity at the campus gate (Horner and Trimbur 2002). This is part of the reason I have opted to describe this model as a multilingual rather than a bilingual model. Belz (2002), Crozet and Liddicoat (1999), Horner and Trimbur (2002), Kramsch (1997, 1998), and Rampton (1995), among others, discuss learners' linguistic and cultural identities as complex and fluid, anchored to their personal and ethnic backgrounds and continually influenced by and negotiated through a variety of factors and events and the nature and course of classroom interaction. Any sound pedagogy, including language pedagogy, must somehow acknowledge and validate this complexity, even if it means we are ultimately unable to neatly operationalize the results either empirically or instructionally (Block 2002). In the FL classroom at the intermediate level and beyond, when learners have begun to gain some amount of creative control over the L2, they can consider, as part of the co-construction of classroom multilingual norms, the relative status of languages other than the L2 and English (in the U.S. setting). Put another way, they can consider the ways fellow learners would be allowed to use their own native languages in overt ways, to the extent that these allow them to maintain the L2 as a predominantly unmarked code. Learners' creative use of the L1 as well as other codes at the intermediate and advanced levels can serve as a strong indicator of whether learners have achieved the goal of the multilingual model, namely the creation of a multilingual classroom in which L2, L1, or learners' other languages can serve as the socially unmarked code(s) based on the desires and inclinations of speakers in interaction.

Implications for Language Program Articulation and the LPD

In this chapter I have argued that the creation and maintenance of a multilingual model can contribute to both vertical and horizontal language program articulation. Primarily, the approach fosters vertical articulation by involving the instructor and learners in the co-construction of code choice norms across instructional levels. In the pursuit of a critical, ongoing creation and re-creation of such norms, an important connection is forged between learners in their first semester and those at the advanced levels. Although the specific parameters of the code choice issue will be different at each instructional level, the basic importance and roles of code choice are constant for all levels. Horizontal articulation is promoted through negotiating code choice practices within each section of a multi-section course, contributing to learners' sense of autonomy from the instructor, the curriculum, and the institution, and to the creation of a classroom community of practice regarding code choice. In other words, horizontal articulation is achieved not through the creation of pedagogical homogeneity, but rather through principled heterogeneity, a heterogeneity that is grounded in the tenets inherent in the multilingual model.

Viewed in broader terms, the multilingual approach described in this chapter contributes to alleviating what Lee and VanPatten (1995) have called "the Atlas complex" by handing over control of code choice norms to the learners and compelling them to usurp an aspect of classroom communication that has long been the domain of the instructor, the LPD, and the institution (namely, who should speak what, to whom, and in what contexts). In addition, by relating classroom code choice conventions to those in real-life societal bilingual situations through multilingual content instruction, we assign political and social value to differential code use within the four walls of the classroom, effectively removing those walls and allowing learners to connect with aspects of the L2 world that are independent of the instructor or course designer. This effect contributes perhaps most subtly to language program articulation by providing learners with a legitimate role in it, placing them in this one area on an equal footing with the instructor, the LPD, and the institution.

In this discussion the focus has primarily been on what goes on with learners and the instructor inside the classroom. In closing I shift the focus to the LPD, in particular the issue of implementing the model in multi-section language courses. As an LPD my practices ranged over the years from the imposition of explicit code use policies, in particular the ever-(un)popular exclusive-target-language-use policy, to expressing that instructors should simply act on intuitive judgments of what feels right in a particular class. The problem with the extreme exclusive-target-language-use position is that it requires, among other things, that the instructors and the creator of the policy be of one mind on the matter, and that most or all FL learners acquiesce and adhere to the policy; obviously, I have attempted to show here that this is likely impossible and undesirable in any FL

class (Levine 2003). And even the maximal-target-language-use position (as defined by Macaro 2001) raises complex questions of what “maximal” represents.

The dilemma with the approach at the opposite extreme, whereby each instructor in a multi-section program follows intuitive judgments, is that the L1 as the default unmarked language will likely establish itself early on and prevail, that the L1 may remain the socially unmarked code for many of the most important sorts of classroom communication and that the L2 may remain a marked code indefinitely for many learners. Hence, the multilingual model as described here is intended to solve the problems that both of these extreme positions represent by offering a way of thinking about and approaching classroom code choice that accords with several streams of SLA theory. In addition, the model draws on and exploits what we know about codeswitching practices in societal multilingual situations, and—crucially for the multi-section language course and the LPD—remains flexible for individual instructors and their students. The model intentionally puts learners in the driver’s seat in the construction of code choice norms, granting them an indispensable role in managing classroom discourse, and compelling them to reflect critically on the ways language is or can be used. In multi-section courses the multilingual model affords a level of autonomy to instructors and students while providing a basis for course coordination and articulation that is crucial to the success of a language program overall.

Notes

1. In Levine (2003, p. 355) I offer the following preliminary tenets: (1) *Optimal Target Language Use Tenet*. Instructors should accept the idea that the FL class is a multilingual environment; (2) *Marked L1 Tenet*. Using L1 simply for the sake of reducing anxiety or increasing efficiency is untenable. Instructors might rather strive to create situations in the classroom in which L1 could serve meaningful pedagogical functions yet remain, relative to the L2, a marked code; (3) *Collaborative Language Use Tenet*. Students should be actively engaged in managing L2 and L1 use in the FL classroom, in creating bilingual norms.
2. **Social semiotic** refers to “the way language functions both as an expression of and as a metaphor for social processes of *meaning making*” (Kramsch 2002, p. 9; my emphasis). Learning an L2 is learning how to make meaning in ways that would be acceptable to native speakers of that language. Crucial to this understanding of language as social semiotic is also the idea that language use not only reflects culture, identity, power, and so forth, but actually constitutes those constructs and is used to continuously (re-)negotiate the boundaries of both culture and identity (Pennycook 2001).
3. The terms “unmarked” and “marked” as they are used in this chapter are adapted from Myers-Scotton’s (1983, 1988, 1993) Markedness Model and Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai’s (2002) Rational Choice Model. Although these models are not uncontroversial in the codeswitching literature, these terms have proved useful in both developing a pedagogical approach to codeswitching and in communicating with students and instructors about the issue of codeswitching.
4. Obviously, a multilingual model must develop means of dealing with the students who enter the language course later on in the sequence, as is common for those

coming from high school language classes into intermediate- or advanced-level university courses (Magnan, Frantzen, and Worth, this volume). At the very least, the sort of strategies instruction described in this chapter for Stage II should incorporate features or activities that help this group of students profit from and gain access to the ongoing management of classroom code choice. Doing so will help this group of students more smoothly move into and through the language program, thus facilitating articulation.

5. Suggested sample activities that promote discourse strategies instruction, codeswitching strategies instruction, and multilingual content instruction during Stage I may be found at the Web site for the Department of German at the University of California–Irvine: <http://www.humanities.uci.edu/german/>.

Chamot defines learning strategies as “steps, plans, insights, and reflections that learners employ to learn more effectively” (1994, p. 324). A good deal of research has demonstrated that learners can benefit in a variety of ways from strategies instruction on both content learning and language learning (Chamot 1994, 2001; Oxford 1990). The most effective sort of strategies instruction, according to Oxford, is explicit. Additionally, strategies training is most successful when it is “woven into regular class activities on a regular basis” (2002, p. 126).

6. Under the mutually-sanctioned-use-of-L1 rule in some of our language courses at the University of California–Irvine, the instructor must also ask the students’ permission to switch to English. Interestingly, in our second- and third-quarter courses, some instructors have received a negative response to the question in many instances; the students came to prefer compelling the instructor to communicate with them primarily or exclusively in the L2.
7. Obviously, this sort of convention diverges dramatically from any sort of societal multilingual situation, in which it would be unthinkable to have to ask permission to use one code or the other (except perhaps in certain one-parent one-language situations). Yet one of the great advantages of the educational setting is our ability to exploit the very artificiality of the classroom environment.
8. In order to raise students’ awareness of what code they were using and in what contexts, a creative instructor in our German program instituted a “spider system”: she brought to class a bag of plastic spiders and distributed an equal number to each student. The students agreed to pass a spider to anyone (including the instructor) whom they heard using English in an unsanctioned way (i.e., flouting the agreed-upon norms). The idea was to rid one’s self of all spiders, and the people with the smallest number of spiders at the end of the hour were the winners. The instructor said this sort of technique should not be used too frequently; its main purpose is to raise awareness and should not become a new way of stigmatizing L1 use.
9. Anecdotally we have noted that most of the intrasentential switches intermediate- and advanced-level students produce involve nouns and noun phrases, especially object noun phrases, complementizers (e.g., *because, that, if*), and discourse markers of various sorts (e.g., *well, y’know*). Interestingly, this appears to accord with typical patterns of many societal multilingual situations (e.g., Zentella 1997).

References

- Antón, Marta, and Frederick J. DiCamilla. 1999. Socio-Cognitive Functions of L1 Collaborative Interaction in the L2 Classroom. *Modern Language Journal* 83(2): 233–247.

- Atkinson, Dwight. 2002. Toward a Sociocognitive Approach to Second Language Acquisition. *Modern Language Journal* 86(4): 525–545.
- Auer, Peter. 1998. Introduction: *Bilingual Conversation* Revisited. In *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, edited by Peter Auer, 1–24. London: Routledge.
- Auer, Peter, and İnci Dirim. Forthcoming. Gebrauch türkischer Routinen bei Hamburger Jugendlichen nicht-türkischer Herkunft. In *Sprachgrenzen überspringen. Sprachliche Hybridität und polykulturelles Selbstverständnis*, edited by Volker Hinnenkamp and Katharina Meng. Tübingen: Narr.
- Belz, Julie A. 2002. The Myth of the Deficient Communicator. *Language Teaching Research* 6(1): 59–82.
- . 2003. Identity, Deficiency, and First Language Use in Foreign Language Education. In *The Sociolinguistics of Foreign-Language Classrooms: Contributions of the Native, the Near-Native, and the Non-Native Speaker*, edited by Carl Blyth, 209–248. AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Block, David. 2002. ‘McCommunication’: A Problem in the Frame for SLA. In *Globalization and Language Teaching*, edited by David Block and Deborah Cameron, 117–133. London: Routledge.
- Blyth, Carl. 1995. Redefining the Boundaries of Language Use: The Foreign Language Classroom as a Multilingual Speech Community. In *Redefining the Boundaries of Language Study*, edited by Claire Kramsch, 145–183. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brooks, Frank B., and Richard Donato. 1994. Vygotskian Approaches to Understanding Foreign Language Learner Discourse during Communicative Tasks. *Hispania* 77(2): 262–274.
- Byram, Michael. 1997. *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, Michael, Adam Nichols, and David Stevens, eds. 2001. *Developing Intercultural Competence in Practice*. Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.
- Chamot, Anna Uhl. 1994. A Model for Learning Strategies Instruction in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*, 323–336. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- . 2001. The Role of Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition. In *Learner Contributions to Language Learning*, edited by Michael P. Breen, 25–43. Harlow, U.K.: Longman.
- Chavez, Monika. 2003. The Diglossic Foreign Language Classroom: Learners’ Views on L1 and L2 Functions. In *The Sociolinguistics of Foreign-Language Classrooms: Contributions of the Native, the Near-Native, and the Non-Native Speaker*, edited by Carl Blyth, 163–208. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Cohen, Andrew D. 1998. *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language*. London: Longman.
- Cook, Guy. 2000. *Language Play, Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, Vivian. 1999. Going Beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 33(2): 185–209.
- . 2001. Using the First Language in the Classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La revue canadienne des langues vivantes* 57(3): 402–423.
- Crozet, Chantal, and Anthony Liddicoat. 1999. The Challenge of Intercultural Language Teaching: Engaging with Culture in the Classroom. In *Striving for the Third Place: Intercultural Competence through Language Education*, edited by Joseph Lo Bianco, Anthony J. Liddicoat, and Chantal Crozet, 113–125. Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Duff, Patricia A., and Charlene G. Polio. 1990. How Much Foreign Language Is There in the Foreign Language Classroom? *Modern Language Journal* 74(2): 154–166.

- Foucault, Michel. 1980a. *The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction*. New York: Vintage Books.
- . 1980b. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon.
- Goffman, Erving. 1979. Footing. *Semiotica* 25(1–2): 1–29.
- Guthrie, Elizabeth M. Leeman. 1987. Six Cases in Classroom Communication: A Study of Teacher Discourse in the Foreign Language Classroom. In *Research in Second Language Learning: Focus on the Classroom*, edited by James P. Lantolf and Angela Labarca, 173–194. Proceedings of the 6th Delaware Symposium on Language Studies, Oct. 1984, University of Delaware. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1978. *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. Baltimore: University Park Press.
- Hill, Jane H. 1993. Structure and Practice in Language Shift. In *Progression and Regression in Language: Sociocultural, Neuropsychological, and Linguistic Perspectives*, edited by Kenneth Hyltenstam and Åke Viberg, 69–93. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horner, Bruce, and John Trimbur. 2002. English Only and U.S. College Composition. *College Composition and Communication* 53(4): 594–630.
- Kramsch, Claire. 1993. *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1997. The Privilege of the Nonnative Speaker. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 112(3): 359–369.
- . 1998. Approaches through Ethnography: Learner Perspectives: The Privilege of the Intercultural Speaker. In *Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective: Approaches through Drama and Ethnography*, edited by Michael Byram and Michael Fleming, 16–31. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2002. Language and Culture: A Social Semiotic Perspective. *ADFL Bulletin* 33(2): 8–15.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. 2003. *Beyond Methods: Macrostrategies for Language Teaching*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lantolf, James P. 2000. Introducing Sociocultural Theory. In *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*, edited by James P. Lantolf, 1–26. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, James F. 2000. *Tasks and Communicating in Language Classrooms*. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Lee, James F., and Bill VanPatten. 1995. *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Le Page, R. B., and Andrée Tabouret-Keller. 1985. *Acts of Identity: Creole-Based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levine, Glenn S. 2003. Student and Instructor Beliefs and Attitudes about Target Language Use, First Language Use, and Anxiety: Report of a Questionnaire Study. *Modern Language Journal* 87(3): 343–364.
- Liebscher, Grit, and Jennifer Dailey-O’Cain. 2004. Code-Switching in the Content-Based Foreign Language Classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes* 60(4): 501–525.
- Li Wei. 1998. The ‘Why’ and ‘How’ Questions in the Analysis of Conversational Code-Switching. In *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, edited by Peter Auer, 156–176. London: Routledge.
- . 2000. Dimensions of Bilingualism. In *The Bilingualism Reader*, edited by Li Wei, 3–25. London: Routledge.
- Macaro, Ernesto. 2001. Analyzing Student Teachers’ Codeswitching in Foreign Language Classrooms: Theories and Decision Making. *Modern Language Journal* 85(4): 531–548.

- Muysken, Pieter. 2000. *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1983. The Negotiation of Identities in Conversation: A Theory of Markedness and Code Choice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 44: 115-136.
- . 1988. Code Switching as Indexical of Social Negotiations. In *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, edited by Monica Heller, 151-186. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 1993. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol, and Agnes Bolonyai. 2002. Calculating Speakers: Codeswitching in a Rational Choice Model. *Language in Society* 30(1): 1-28.
- Oxford, Rebecca L. 1990. *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- . 2002. Language Learning Strategies in a Nutshell: Update and ESL Suggestions. In *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*, edited by Jack C. Richards and Willy A. Renandya, 124-132. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pennycook, Alastair. 2001. *Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Schultz, Jean Marie, Armando Di Carlo, Lynne Frame, Rick Kern, Hermania Kerr, Lisa Little, Sam Mchombo, Kay Richards, and Clare You. 2002. The Use of the L1 in the Foreign Language Classroom at UC Berkeley. *Language Teaching at Berkeley*. UC Berkeley Language Center Newsletter 17(2): 1-4.
- Skehan, Peter. 1998. Task-Based Instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 18: 268-286.
- Swain, Merrill, and Sharon Lapkin. 2000. Task-Based Second Language Learning: The Uses of the First Language. *Language Teaching Research* 4(3): 251-274.
- Tudor, Ian. 2001. *The Dynamics of the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turnbull, Miles, and Katy Arnett. 2002. Teachers' Uses of the Target and First Languages in Second and Foreign Language Classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22: 204-218.
- Valdman, Albert. 1989. The Problem of the Target Model in Proficiency-Oriented Foreign Language Instruction. *Applied Language Learning* 1(1): 33-51.
- van Lier, Leo. 1996. *Interaction in the Language Curriculum: Awareness, Autonomy, and Authenticity*. London: Longman.
- Vygotsky, L. S. 1978. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wenger, Etienne. 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zentella, Ana Celia. 1997. *Growing Up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Acknowledgments

For the many invaluable office and hallway discussions and the classroom implementation of the model, I would like to thank the devoted, talented instructors who have worked in our German program in recent years: Jennifer Bierich, Natalie Eppelsheimer, Charles Hammond, Kai Herklotz, Rose Jones, Franz Kuzay, Susan

Morse, Simona Moti, Priscilla Palacios, Magda Tarnawska, Jason Wilby, and Jessica Wood. Also, I would like to thank the students in our German courses at the University of California–Irvine. Their engagement, enthusiasm, patience, and open-mindedness over the last few years has contributed immeasurably to the development of the multilingual model. I am also grateful to Gail Hart and Irmela von der Luehe for their important feedback on the multilingual model and the best ways to write about it. Finally, my gratitude is extended to Cathy Barrette, Kate Paesani, and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful and insightful comments. Any errors or omissions remain my responsibility.