Lang Policy
DOI 10.1007/s10993-014-9332-0

ORIGINAL PAPER

Modelling linguistic diversity at school: the excluding impact of inclusive multilingualism

Jürgen Jaspers

Received: 26 February 2014 / Accepted: 13 June 2014

Abstract This paper discusses data from a Dutch-medium secondary school in Brussels where almost all pupils speak a different language than Dutch at home. It illustrates that teachers' preference for maintaining the school's monolingual policy did not preclude their creation of haphazard or humorous multilingual interstices that temporarily alleviated the friction between the school language policy and the reality of pupils' linguistic repertoires, and promoted the construction of an agreeable classroom climate. The paper argues, however, that these multilingual interstices also suggested ideal models of language use across differently valued discursive zones at school, and that the inclusion of unofficial linguistic resources in specific discursive slots implied their exclusion in other, more important ones. The scarce openings for linguistic diversity that teachers made, in other words, at the same time socialized pupils into the broader sociolinguistic hierarchy that creates their own disfluency and problematization.

Keywords Classroom interaction · Multilingualism · Metapragmatic regimentation · Socialization · Brussels · Dutch-medium schools

Introduction

Language policies have become critical tools for nation-states to reinvent themselves in a time and age governed by what has come to be called late or advanced capitalism. Confronted with an economy that exceeds national boundaries, with supranational organizations (such as the European Union) that produce linguistic policies of their own, and as they see their own turf become increasingly

J. Jaspers (✉)
Languages and Literatures Department, Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB),
Avenue F.D. Roosevelt 50, CP 175, 1050 Brussels, Belgium
e-mail: jurgen.jaspers@ulb.ac.be

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

multilingual, nation-states have typically been developing, as Heller & Duchêne (2012) point out, an unequivocal love for multilingualism, paradoxically coupled with an equal affection for monolingualism (see also Blommaert 2010; Hambye and Richards 2012; Pujolar 2007; Jaspers & Verschueren 2011). The paradox spatializes linguistic diversity through locating multilingualism in the individual (as 'skills') or in international communication, while it zones off the national territory as monolingual. In so doing, nation-states can maintain that they function in a globalized world and that they are still viable, normal political entities. The success of this paradox is in large part driven by a discursive process that marries national pride with economic profit (Heller and Duchêne 2012). This does not only involve the promotion of individual multilingual skills or the linguistic authentication of local produce that will help propel the nation-state in the global economy, but this process also pertains to nation-states' marketing of the national standard language increasingly through discursive tropes that represent this standard as a prerequisite for equal access to the service sector, integration and efficient nationwide communication. These tropes help quell fears of internal fragmentation, and they legitimize the representation of other languages and varieties on national territory as out of place, unuseful, or irresponsible.

Since education traditionally is a salient site for nation-state concerns, it has become one of the key domains for the application of these late capitalist tropes for language. This activity runs parallel with the anxiety nation-state governments have been cultivating for persistent social inequality under their auspices, and with their appeals to education as the quintessential method of fair social credentialling (Anderson-Levitt 2005; Marsh 2011), famously captured by former British Labour PM Tony Blair in his career marking slogan: "Ask me my three main priorities for government and I tell you: education, education and education".[1] While (western) nation-states have successfully democratized and in this way massified access to education, they have equally noticed their schools' tendency to fail, or refer to less prestigious orientations, pupils who already have low social credentials, threatening to expose national education systems as simple reproducers of social inequality. One response to this has been to try to promote, from as early as possible, children's entry to school, combined with the replacement of a discourse of equality (for all) with one that focuses on equal opportunities (for those willing to seize them). Another has been a growing preoccupation, within the field of education, with quality management, testing, and ranking (Rampton 2006: 4–11; Varenne & McDermott 1999). A third response has been an increasing obsession, certainly in Flanders, the Dutch-speaking north of Belgium, with language testing and language policy. "Equal opportunities lead to three clear priorities", the former Flemish Labour Education Minister Frank Vandenbroucke proposed in a 2007 speech at a symposium titled 'Surviving Babylon. Languages in Europe'. Blandly recycling Blair's motto, he continued to say these priorities were: "language, language and language". Consequently, "each teacher must be a language teacher" and the Minister left no doubt over what kind of language this was, explaining there and in

[1] Quote from Blair's opposition leader's speech at the Labour Party Conference in Blackpool (UK), 1 October 1996.

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

his policy brief that "only […] the standard language, will […] be able to guarantee that opportunities in society do not depend on social origin" (Vandenbroucke 2007: 6). Admitting that the acquisition of Standard Dutch could rightly be called his 'obsessional hobbyhorse',[2] his and his successor's educational policies have increased teachers' and pupils' accountability with regard to language use, teaching and learning, and certainly in urban settings, where pupils' linguistic diversity tends to be pronounced, schools have become salient sites of linguistic friction, and excellent barometers of broader tensions.

Policy makers are usually much less obsessed with investigating the actual implementation and success of their policies, as Shohamy (2010) points out. But this is a challenge language policy studies have more and more taken up as they have shifted their approach from a focus on policy texts to their actualization or appropriation in actual practice (see McCarthy 2011; Menken and García 2010; also see Heller 1995). This shift is inspired by the insight that policy in practice is mostly different from what policy makers intended, since implementation is inevitably characterized by the unpredictability and creativity of policy negotiation in actual practice. In this vein, a number of authors have insisted that teachers are never the passive implementers of policy: "the line of power does not flow linearly from the pen of the policy's signer to the choices of the teacher", Johnson & Freeman (2010: 27) argue, while Ball (1997: 270, cited in Creese 2010: 34) points out that "policies pose problems to their subjects, problems that must be solved in context. Solutions […] will be localised and should be expected to display 'ad hocery' and messiness" (see, for similar arguments, Canagarajah 2005; Creese 2010; Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester 2000; Shohamy 2006).

This paper contributes to this line of thought through describing and explaining the 'messy' responses of some teachers at a Dutch-medium school in Brussels. These teachers were generally in favour of the school linguistic policy at the same time as they created short-lived multilingual spaces that, even if briefly, alleviated some of their pupils' linguistic problems. I will argue, however, that this construction of multilingual spaces also communicated implicitly to pupils what the relative value was of the languages being used, notably through including pupils' home languages in less important discursive slots or representing pupils' daily language use as marginal to the central goings-on at school. In doing so, my paper concentrates on teacher behaviour that is less regularly in focus, given that it does not concentrate on the difficulties pupils experience as a result of suffocating linguistic regimes or on the alternatives teachers develop to allay such difficulties and to foster their learners' multilingual competence and well-being. Indeed, while language policy studies are in principle aware that teachers can open up or close off possibilities for policy negotiation, they have often tended to be favourably disposed towards teachers and pupils who usurp, undermine or resist nation-states' monolingual policies. Given the difficult conditions within which teachers and pupils have to work, and in light of what practical alternatives to policies such studies can provide, this interest is certainly justifiable. But it may also ignore a number of other possible responses to language policy, for instance from teachers

[2] A confession made on 26 March 2007 in the national newspaper *De Standaard*.

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

who are neither extremely convinced of policies nor very apt at usurping them, or from those who are very convinced but also excell in undermining them. And in this paper I want to illustrate how teachers' constructions of informal multilingual spaces appeared to be tied more to overcoming the daily friction between policy and practice than to overthrowing the policy responsible for it. Rather than on the horror of strict policy imposition or the hope of resistance to untenable language policies then, this paper, continuing the alliteration, will be focusing on something more hybrid, haphazard and often also humorously ambiguous.

Context

The data for this paper were collected through sociolinguistic-ethnographic fieldwork in one Catholic, state-supported secondary school—henceforth 'Sacred Heart'—in Brussels, Belgium.[3] Sacred Heart offers Dutch-medium education in a city where the predominant lingua franca is French. Like other Dutch schools in Brussels, it has in recent years attracted a rising number of pupils from non-Dutch speaking homes, so that almost all pupils at Sacred Heart now speak another language than Dutch at home. Since there is no provision—as elsewhere in Belgium—for pupils' home languages, the school has arrived in what is called a state of 'wild' or 'unstructured' immersion (Ceuleers 2008). This does not only lead to pedagogical challenges, but it also touches a sensitive chord in the threat it is seen to pose to the *raison d'être* of this type of school in Brussels. To explain this I briefly need to go into the history of Dutch in Belgium.

Dutch in Belgium

Dutch-medium schools in Brussels are intimately intertwined with the history of Belgium and the linguistic discordances that have become its hallmark. Officially bilingual since 1963 and geographically situated just above the Dutch-French language border in the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium, Brussels historically was a Dutch-speaking city where from the 18th century onwards inhabitants gradually shifted their language use away from (Brabantic) Dutch, resulting in the largely French-speaking city it is today. Various political, socio-economic and cultural processes supported this frenchification, not least the fact that Brussels became the capital of the new kingdom of Belgium in 1830 and was home to its mostly French-

[3] Data collection involved 5 months of participant observation (September through December 2011 and May 2012, 3 days a week), individual audio-recording (35 h), classroom audio-recording (35 h), interviewing and retrospective interviewing (10 h), taking pictures and befriending pupils on *Facebook* through a special research account. All names are pseudonymised. The school was selected on the basis of (1) its high amount of non-Dutch speakers; (2) information from acquaintances (viz., drama teachers) in Brussels that its school team was ambitious and that the head of school would not view with disfavour the prospect of research. Contact and permission was sought and obtained via e-mail and an interview with the Head in February 2011.

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

speaking rich, powerful and famous. Recent statistics estimate a mere 5 % of the Brussels population as Dutch speaking at home.[4]

The frenchification of Brussels has evolved in inverse proportion, however, to linguistic evolutions in the rest of Belgium that tilted the scale of socio-economic dominance in favour of Dutch. The explanation for this lies in part with one of the most successful linguistic revitalization attempts world-wide: the so-called 'Flemish Movement'. This nationalist movement objected to the impending language shift in the north of Belgium towards French, inspired by a romantic perspective in which the Belgian state was seen to smother a historical language that deserved preservation. Through the 19th and 20th century, various advocates of this movement—at first priests, teachers, authors, lower public servants, later on also politicians—deplored the endangerment of Dutch in Belgium as well as the predicament of Dutch-only speakers in a state that organized itself in French. As elsewhere, language often was a pretext for a socio-economic and political struggle: the job market for the literate classes was presented as advantaging French-only speakers in the north of Belgium; raising the economic value of Dutch would give bilingual and literate Flemings a serious advantage, as an institutional need for Dutch would increase their political leverage. Universal suffrage in 1918 gave extra weight to these demands since Dutch speakers outnumbered French speakers by 65–35. So, inspired by romantic visions of a separate nation for the Flemings, by resistance from French speakers to nation-wide bilingualism (which would open the job market for bilingual Flemings in the south of the country), and through its alliance with increasing calls for political representation and demands for democratization, the Flemish Movement eventually managed to inspire the complex spatialization of the Belgian state from the 1960s into different regions and linguistic communities (for fuller discussion, see among others, Hermans, Vos and Wils 1992).

This soon implied that economic evolutions had linguistic repercussions. The gradual decline of heavy (steel and mining) industry in the south, the presence in the north of the country of harbours for overseas minerals trans-shipment and the rise of chemical and service industries there slowly but surely tilted the economic scales in favour of Flanders and started to recalibrate the relations between Dutch and French. Indeed, while the Flemish Movement was predicated on liberating Flemings from the burden of bilingualism, most top political positions have now become practically unattainable for French-only speakers since Flemings expect their politicians to address them in Dutch; the same holds for all administrative and service jobs on the Brussels job market that require or reward bilingual skills. One of the consequences is that the implicit value of Brussels' official bilingualism since 1963 is at least partially shifting: at first a political compromise that re-planted Dutch in the heart of the rapidly frenchifying Belgian capital (the wish of the Flemish Movement) but that also officialised Brussels as a separate, non-Flemish region (to the relief of francophones), this bilingualism is now increasingly appreciated as an economic opportunity for francophones and speakers of other languages who seek French-Dutch bilingualism. This is certainly noticeable in the domain of education.

4FL01 [4] See "Brio-taalbarometer 3: diversiteit als norm". www.biobrussel.be.

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

Education in Brussels

In spite of the city's bilingual status, education in Brussels is organized monolingually (in Dutch or French, not counting the international schools). This creation of separate spaces for each language avoided imposing on French speakers a language they saw as unuseful, if not as inferior, and it created safe islands for Dutch-minority speakers in a French speaking ocean (cf. Treffers-Daller 2002). Dutch-medium schools were fewer in number (in keeping with the city's decreasing number of Dutch speakers), and they struggled with falling pupil numbers in the 1960s and 70s as also many Dutch-speaking parents were convinced that only French-medium education would help their children find acceptable employment. In an attempt to reverse this trend, and aware of the new economic valuation of language (cf. above), the Flemish Government in the 1980s started to play the multilingual skills card, advertising Dutch-medium education as the road to the booming service industry. "Becoming truly bilingual, a good trilingual and international? Dutch-medium education in Brussels is the place to be",[5] advertisements said. Some were even in French, exhorting French speakers to *Osez! L'avenir est aux bilingues* 'Dare! The future is for bilinguals'. With hindsight, this strategy has been so successful—or the economic conditions so pressing—that it isn't unfair to say it has blown up in its designers' faces. In 1991 more than 75 % of pupils in Dutch schools still had two Dutch-speaking parents, and 17 % one Dutch-speaking parent. In 2011 these numbers dropped to 28 % for pupils from Dutch-speaking homes and rose to almost 30 % for pupils with one Dutch-speaking parent. The number of French-only speakers has increased dramatically (3.7 % in 1991, 21 % in 2011), while the number of pupils from other language homes has almost multiplied by ten (2.6 % in 1991, 22.2 % in 2011).[6] Put differently, Dutch-medium schools have been welcoming so many pupils speaking other languages than Dutch at home, that, the prestigious colleges excepted, many of them have seen the city's lingua franca (French) become their playground lingua franca.

Apart from the threat this is seen to pose to schools originally meant for a Dutch-speaking minority, this situation also creates daunting pedagogical challenges. Ever more pupils struggle with the instruction language, but as state-subsidized institutions Dutch-medium schools are obliged to work with a curriculum designed for Dutch-speaking pupils so that, among other things, fluently French-speaking pupils in their third year at Sacred Heart are taught how to conjugate French verbs as *avoir* 'to have' and *être* 'to be' and are asked to study the French names for the different seasons.[7] Teachers, in their turn, are faced with reconciling the maintainance of the linguistic character of the school and the disciplinary role that this requires, with a focus on fostering an inclusive classroom and school climate that demands a more friendly, inviting teacher persona (cf. Harris and Lefstein 2011). In the next sections I will explain how these tensions were addressed in Sacred Heart.

[5] This is a translation from the Dutch original. Here, and elsewhere, when the specific language of the utterance is not the focus of the analysis I will only provide the English translation.

[6] Flemish Community commission statistics: http://www.vgc.be.

[7] Such knowledge is appropriate for Dutch-speaking pupils in their third year in a vocational trajectory.

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

Sacred Heart

Sacred Heart offers technical and vocational secondary education from age 12. Many pupils have tried but failed a grammar school type trajectory elsewhere. Originally a white school that recruited pupils from outside Brussels but faced with dwindling pupil numbers some 15 years ago Sacred Heart decided to accommodate pupils with learning difficulties, poor backgrounds, and other religions (despite its own Catholic background). This decision led to the school's growing popularity among ethnic minorities, which in its turn sparked an exodus of white pupils to other, whiter and often suburban, schools. In comparison to other schools therefore, Sacred Heart is at the bottom of the symbolic educational hierarchy, but still valuable to many French- or other language-speaking parents for its Dutch-speaking character.

The class I followed was a third year, in a vocational trajectory called *Kantoor* 'Office Skills'. *3 Office Skills* (henceforth "3OS") counted 17 pupils (7 girls, 10 boys), their ages varying between 13 and 16. All except one were born in Brussels. Eight pupils had a Turkish-speaking background, six of them a Moroccan background (with parents speaking Arabic, Berber, or both, or only French), two pupils were Belgian-white and came from French-speaking homes, one pupil had a mixed Netherlandic-Congolese background and spoke French and some Lingala at home. All pupils had working or lower middle class backgrounds.

Three of 3OS's teachers were bilingual Dutch-French, other teachers were Dutch-speaking and hardly ever spoke French or could not speak it. Pupils' linguistic skills were undeniably 'truncated' (Blommaert 2010). Most of them spoke and wrote Dutch with difficulty, and with much interference from French or other home languages. Teachers often had to ask 'and now in Dutch?' when pupils had said something in Dutch but completely failed to make themselves understood. They struggled with Dutch syntax, adjective-noun agreement, articles, and often didn't understand low frequency nouns used in textbooks, tests or teacher instructions. Teachers constantly corrected pupils, explained the meaning of words and echoed particular unidiomatic contributions to make pupils reflect and self-correct. Some pupils, mostly of Turkish descent, struggled not just with Dutch but also with French, the urban (and informal school) lingua franca, to the extent that their French teacher often allowed them to respond in Dutch during French class, while the same pupils in another class said "I can't say [it] in Dutch" and flushed embarrassedly. Many of these pupils were thus faced with robust linguistic challenges every day, depending on where they were or whom they were talking to, and found very few free places to relax linguistically. Pupils' disfluencies constantly illustrated the wide gap that existed between the target linguistic skills and what could be realistically achieved with these pupils. For most teachers, these difficulties only added to the necessity of imposing a Dutch-only climate.

Constructing a monolingual space

Although it strove to attract pupils with 'difficult' backgrounds, the school's mission statement certainly didn't welcome their home languages. All pupils received a

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

schools rules booklet that informed parents about the Dutch-speaking character of the school, and besides this pupils were reminded of what language they had to speak through "I choose … Dutch" posters or, in some more words:

> Example 1
> "Sacred Heart is a Catholic Dutch-medium school. The Dutch-language character of the school cannot be drawn into question. When you signed the school rules you also accepted the fact that this is a Dutch-medium school. You can be penalized for not speaking Dutch. A small effort prevents unnecessary sanctions".

The school staff were committed to this construction of Sacred Heart as a monolingual space. At the end of my very first meeting with the Head of School, as soon as I had naïvely suggested that I might have to brush up my school French in order to talk to pupils, the Head concernedly asked: "I hope you're going to speak Dutch to these lads?". And throughout my research, teachers at Sacred Heart (also those who didn't teach 3OS) could frequently be observed insisting on the use of Dutch or penalizing the use of home languages. "Speak Dutch to me", teachers said, "You have to speak Dutch", they insisted when they caught pupils talking French in the playground just before class, and as part of a serious dressing down that 3OS was given for their pretty uncooperative behaviour, the English teacher included (in Dutch): "pupils are speaking Turkish here, are speaking French here, and that is unacceptable". "If you keep talking French, you'll be going to the office", the IT teacher likewise said. The most frequent sanction pupils received for failing to live up to this linguistic regime was a note in their diary that their parents had to sign off—such sanctions were given almost every day. Some pupils, who were also misbehaving in other than linguistic ways, received a contract with a specific paragraph on language (cf. below).

Even though this insistence on Dutch can be read as a sign that teachers were "soldiers" or "servants of the system" (Shohamy 2006: 78–79), their actions were often informed by a genuine concern for pupils' well-being. Sacred Heart only catered to pupils who weren't planning on going to university, so staff members knew in advance that they would have to work in non-academic, relatively boisterous classrooms. Teachers who couldn't stomach this didn't stay very long and left, as I saw two of 3OS's teachers (of Dutch and religion) do in the course of the year. Teachers thus stayed because they liked it there, and a number of them in so many words said they preferred this type of school since it allowed for relations with pupils that were generally much more direct, honest and congenial than the more business-like interactions typical of elite schools. Consequently, teachers were generally quite prepared to help pupils find out what they wanted in life and to help them acquire the skills for obtaining a reasonable job. This didn't contradict an insistence on the use of Dutch. On the contrary, a good competence in Dutch would give these pupils a serious edge on the competition for relatively low-skilled bilingual service jobs. In view of their limited skills in Dutch, and as they were living in a mainly French-speaking city, where else would they be able to practice their Dutch than here at school, teachers threw up their hands asking, adding that the Dutch of those pupils who stayed on for an extra, non-obligatory year after graduation, progressed much more than it had in the 6 years before, "because there, they

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

have to talk with Dutch speakers all the time, which is much better input than what they hear in the playground here at school", one teacher said.[8]

Yet, the climate at Sacred Heart wasn't extremely repressive with regard to language use. Older teachers said that 10 years ago it had been much worse, with pupils booked for weekly Wednesday afternoon detentions until the end of the year, but that inspection, upon hearing of this, had demanded that this be changed and that pupils could not be punished anymore for failing to speak Dutch in the playground. When I asked pupils who had gone to other schools before Sacred Heart what they thought of the linguistic regime, they too said that their previous school had been stricter, more repressive than their current school, to that extent that Antal (15, Turkish speaking) in one interview added that "the teachers ought to be stricter" about language, half-joking that there would be less pupils with minority backgrounds then (which would raise the school's prestige, at least in the public eye).

In interesting counterpoint to this tolerant climate, also pupils contributed actively to the school's linguistic identity or disapproved of those who in their view were supposed, but failed, to implement it. Pupils from other classes were often surprised to hear that I spoke French—out of teachers' earshot—with 3OS pupils who preferred to speak it. While I was talking to Ilhame and Nour, another girl came to join us but suddenly and without a hint of irony said to me: *'s nie goe hé, u praat Frans*[9] 'it's not right is it, you are talking French'. Similarly, when Mr D the IT teacher at the end of a museum trip downtown cheekily uttered parlez le néerlandais 'speak Dutch' to Nour and Ilhame who were standing in front of the traffic light, Nour immediately replied *Meneer u mag geen Frans praten!* 'Sir you mustn't speak French!'. In both cases it looked as though Mr D and I had crossed a moral line, illustrating how much pupils had ingrained what was appropriate language use in the absence of punitive sanctions.

Some teachers, however, were starting to ask themselves explicit questions. Mr K, the German teacher (who didn't teach 3OS) said he thought implementing the school policy was like fighting a running battle, and that the staff were in this way undermining their authority by asking the impossible. But he did not want to break ranks in regard to what had been agreed upon at school. Mr S, the French teacher, who was bilingual Dutch-French, having gone to a Dutch-medium school as a French speaker, said:

Example 2

"I'm actually one of the strictest teachers when it comes to maintaining the school linguistic policy, in contrast to that whole table over there", he said, pointing to a group of older teachers sitting nearby. "As a French speaker I know how difficult it is. But I'm really starting to ask myself questions about this policy, because it's hard to impose, and it creates negativity around Dutch". (Fieldnotes)

[8] Education in Belgium is compulsory until the age of 18. Primary school comprises 6 grades from age 6 to 12. Secondary school again has 6 grades. Some schools offer an extra post-graduate year.

[9] I will use different fonts hereafter for the various source languages: French, *Dutch*, **Arabic**, ***Turkish***, unless stated otherwise.

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

In what follows, I describe how teachers created short-lived multilingual spaces that seemed to be reflective of the questions they were starting to ask, before explaining how even those multilingual spaces were difficult to describe as ushering in any change or as offering sustainable escape routes from monolingual policy imposition.

Multilingual interstices

It was not uncommon that teachers used French phrases or expressions in the classroom. When the English teacher in his first class to 3OS, which for nearly all of these pupils was their very first English class, was laying out what kind of co-operation he would be expecting from them in the year to come, he explained that if pupils were prepared to apply themselves, he would be happy to give extra lessons, adding that "this is a bit, as they say in French, donnant-donnant" 'give and take'. So, as he was trying to create some goodwill at the start of a class many pupils were anxious about since it was going to add yet another language to their already challenged repertoires, the English teacher briefly recruited an expression from a language they all knew was in principle off-limits. While in this example the expression is still hedged off from the rest of the utterance through presenting it as a quote from a source other than the speaker, the teacher of accounting sometimes unreservedly acknowledged French as a resource for his own voice, as in this example:

Example 3

Participants and setting: September 2011, Accounting class. Mr A (+25), Lionel (15), Derya (15), Kemal (15), Yasmine (15). 3OS haven't been particularly accommodating the lesson flow, to Mr A's dismay. They are working on naming and noting down various terms ('balance', 'expenses', 'revenues' and so on) as different column titles for a financial administration. 'Pocket money' is another term they have to note down, but Lionel, to Mr A's and other pupils' irritation, doesn't understand why, since the word is already on his page.

	Dutch original	English translation
1	Lionel: opnieuw zakgeld schrijven?	write pocket money again?
2	Mr A: schrijf hier [..] zakgeld	write here [..] pocket money
3	Lionel: watte?	what?
4	Yas: | [slightly irritated:] ja dat is	| [slightly irritated:] yes that's
5	toch echt nie moeilijk	really not so difficult is it
6	[3.0]	[3.0]
7	Mr A: [to the class:] en dan?	[to the class:] and then?
8	Derya: inkomsten 70 euro	revenues 70 euros
9	Mr A: mon dieu mon dieu mon dieu=	my god my god my god=
10	Kemal: | [to	| [to
11	Derya?] ZWIJG	Derya?] QUIET
12	Mr A: =mon dieu mon dieu mon dieu	=my god my god my god
13	[4.0]	[4.0]
14	Mr A: 'k zou beter 'ns kwaad worden,	I'd better get angry for real
15	dan is't tenminste [..] weg	then at least it would be [..] gone

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

So, after 3OS hadn't been particularly helpful yet with moving the lesson forward nor quick to pick up on the new subject matter, Mr A in lines 9–12 rapidly produces a repeated "mon dieu" 'my god', and briefly manages to quiet them down. Such self-talk "in which we address an absent other" (Goffman 1981: 79) is usually presented as private but intended to be overheard by others or "to leak across the private–public boundary" (Hill 2001: 85). In this case, through presenting his frustration about their behaviour as a private complaint while standing in front of them as a teacher whose every word is publicly hearable, he strategically mobilises the leakage between private and public spheres to indicate that his patience with 3OS is ending, and that they had better change their behaviour. Producing this complaint in the urban lingua franca may have contributed to presenting it as off record, in this way only making it more conspicuously noticeable as the warning that lines 14–15 present it as.

Such fleeting examples may still be argued to be typical for the Brussels context, where Dutch is often peppered with French phrases and expressions. But other examples were harder to interpret in this way. The Dutch teacher for instance was telling me one day in the staff room that 4OS was actually much more tolerable than 3OS; she said she knew a couple of Turkish words that she had shared with 4OS, and that she had "definitely scored some good teacher points there". Another example is what happened at the end of the 'Free Podium', an afternoon during which pupils are allowed to perform in any artful way they want to share with other pupils and their teachers:

Example 4

At the end of the 'Free Podium' the teacher giving out the different prizes (she's a somewhat bossy one, I thought her name was Ms A), says that all toddlers of the adjacent nursery school, because they're also around, will receive *ne lekstok* 'a lollypop' she says in Flemish dialect, une sucette 'a lollypop' she then adds in French, 'a lollypop' she continues in English. And before giving out the prizes for the best performances she says: "and now, we'll have the moment suprême 'superlative moment', yes for once it can be in French" (Fieldnotes)

Thus, when the focus is away from curriculum content, and during the key moment of awarding prizes, we can see a teacher (who didn't teach in 3OS) providing translation in French and English and even making an explicit opening for the use of French. Obviously, the teacher may have realized that *lekstok*, a dialectal word, needed further translation, and she may not only have wanted to give a French translation for fear of suggesting that French is the base language to which everything should eventually be translated. One can similarly argue that the teacher inadvertently used moment suprême, a much-used loan expression in (Belgian) Dutch, and that she felt this needed to be accounted for in a school where teachers aren't supposed to speak French. But in translating twice, and in explicitly allowing (at least herself) the use of French in view of the special circumstances, she was undoubtedly recognizing the multilingual pupil populace,

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

anticipating translation problems and even if only 'for once', sanctioning the use of French positively.

Some teachers, like Mr S, 3OS's French teacher, even cultivated such multilingual interstices. Mr S had just turned 30 at the time of my fieldwork, and besides French he also taught (Catholic) religion in many other classes. He was the driving force behind various charity events at school and combined an outgoing character with a deep religious conviction and an Ecumenical perspective. Perhaps one of the most visible and counter-official examples of his cultivation of multilingualism (and religious open-mindedness) was the greeting card he had made sure all pupils received on Eid al-Adha (the Muslim Festival of the Sacrifice) which he proudly showed to me one day in November 2011. The card wished all pupils in Dutch as well as in French:

Example 5

"On the occasion of the Festival of Sacrifice we wish to congratulate all Muslims! United in Abraham we dare hope for a good understanding among everyone. Let us become angels of peace…" (Fieldnotes)

and below the card he had let add "Let us become angels of peace" in Arabic, Hebrew and Turkish.

Far more frequently than such prearranged and serious interstices, Mr S could be observed using other languages than Dutch (or French, during French class) in a fleeting and jocular manner. During my visits to school I could hear him ask 3OS pupils how he had to say 'yes' and 'no' in Turkish, he repeatedly sang a multilingual welcoming song when his pupils arrived ('Wilkommen, bienvenue, welcome!', from the musical *Cabaret*), he occasionally used Italian and Spanish, he sometimes engaged in mock-insults in German with pupils from other classes in the corridor just before their German class (*Ruhig! Schwein!* 'Quiet! Pig!'). He also 'crossed' (Rampton 1995) into pupils' home languages for greeting them as they came into class, saying ***merhaba*** 'welcome' or **salam aleikum** 'peace be with you', and he used various phrases for other ritual acts, saying **inshallah** 'if God wills', reproaching someone by saying c'est **haram** de sjieker 'It's forbidden to chew gum', or apologising with **smahli** 'sorry' when he mixed up two pupils' names in class, or underlining what he said with **billeh** 'I swear to god', as in this example:

Example 6

Participants and setting: September 2011, French class. Mr S (30), Kemal (15). In a class on naming the different zodiac signs in French and their dates, Mr S explains that the 1st of May is a holiday because of Labour Day (*Feest van de arbeid*, in Dutch), which he says many French-speaking pupils note down as *Feest van de aardbei* 'Strawberry feast' (here pronounced with strong French accent). Dutch in italics, Arabic in bold.

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

		French original	English translation
1	Mr S:	le premier mai tu ne vas jamais à	the first of May you never go to
2		l'école [.] jamais [.] euh la fête du	school [.] never [.] uhm Labour Day
3		travail hein (parce que) ce qui est	right ('cause) what's
4		drôle c'est que la fête du travail	funny is that Labour Day
5		beaucoup d'élèves notent ça dans	many pupils note this
6		leur journal de classe *feezd van*	in their diaries 'feast of the
7		*de aardbei* [..] *en feezd van de*	strawberry' [..] and 'feast of the
8		*aardbei* c'est dire fête de la fraise	strawberry' that's saying 'feast of
9		hein [.] c'est *arbeid*	the strawberry' isn't it [.]it's labour
10	Kemal:	| *ARBEIDERS*	| LABOURERS
11	?:	( )	( )
12	Mr S:	| h- *arbeid* [.] *arbeid* [.] point	| h- labour [.] labour [.] full stop
13	Kemal:	c'est vrai?	that's true?
14	Mr S:	**billeh**	I swear to god
15	?:	[giggles]	[giggles]

Besides this Mr S also recruited these languages for saying various swearwords or referring to taboo physical activities or body parts, asking how he had to say 'my ass(hole)' in Turkish, or, as in this example:

Example 7

Mr S is standing with his back to Kemal, who says that Mr S surely will fart now, and starts laughing. Mr S laughs too and asks "a fart? How do you say that again in Turkish?". Güler and Antal, who always seem to be expert in these kinds of things, make a couple of suggestions, and ***osurmak*** 'to fart' comes out as best. "That's too difficult", Mr S says. "No, that's just ***osurmak***", Güler insists, and I laugh. A bit later Mr S says to Fatih, who was speaking in Turkish, "no you have to work" and then imitates Turkish phonology in producing "guzuguzuguzuguzuguzu". A little while later Mr S sneezes and immediately says "*gezondheid*, **bismillah**" 'to your health, in the name of god'. I sneeze too and Nour says, in English, "bless you". (Fieldnotes)

Exceptionally, just after the last lesson of the day on a Friday, Mr S looked up a Turkish song on YouTube that Kemal and Antal said they were dying to hear (a dance hit of that year, 'Apaci') and he played it very loud, while Mr S and I were both highly amused watching the two boys doing dance moves.

On a number of other occasions, and different from most other teachers (but see Mr D above), Mr S also played with linguistic regulations. So, when he saw a pupil secretly texting during the Free Podium afternoon—using cell phones was forbidden at school, and Mr S was known for confiscating them—he said "hey!" but immediately added "or is it in Dutch?" and grinned. In this way Mr S was suggesting he was willing to turn a blind eye to an infringement of the school rules if the pupil was at least following another (viz., texting in Dutch). A similar blend of rule following and rule violation can be found in the following example:

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

Example 8

Participants and setting: September 2011, just before French class, in the playground. Mr S (30), Zaki (13), Lionel (15, wearing microphone), Derya (15), Félix (15), JJ (35). This is the first day of recording, the microphone is often in focus. Mr S notices Lionel wearing it (line 1). Zaki rises to the occasion and directs an insult to Lionel's microphone (line 14). Mr S suggest that they switch to Dutch. French is underlined. Derya produces English in line 5.

		Original recording	English translation
1	Mr S:	[to Lionel:] HE HEEEEEEEE	HE HEEEEEEEE
2	?:	meneer weet ge nie meer (	sir don't you know anymore (
3		)?	)?
4	Lio:	'k weet het meneer	I know sir
5	Derya:	how are you?	how are you?
6	Lio:	ik doe da voor u hé	I'm doing this for you eh
7	Félix:	quel local welke lokaal?	what room what room?
8	Zaki:	Lionel tu as encore le micro?	Lionel do you still have the mike?
9	Mr S:	| ha normaal zitten w'in de 50	| ha normally we're in room 50
10		maar ik weet nie waar-	but I don't know where-
11	Zaki:	| laisse moi dire un truc	| let me say something
12		[..]	[..]
13	Lio:	[announces:]Zaki Zaki Zaki Zaki	Zaki Zaki Zaki Zaki
14	Zaki:	[to mike:] NIQUE [.] TA MÈRE	FUCK [.] YOUR MOTHER
15	Lio:	allez- [..] ma-	allez- [..] ma-
16	Mr S:	Nederlands praten [..]	speak Dutch [.]
17	Lio:	| ma da-	| but tha-
18	Mr S:	neuk je moeder	fuck your mother
19		[laughter]	[laughter]
20		[2.0]	[2.0]
21	Mr S:	is da nu al aan 't oppakken?	it's already recording now?
22	JJ:	[nods?]	[nods?]
23	Lio:	da was v- [..] da was v-	that was fr- [..] that was fr-
24	Mr S:	[laughs out loud]	[laughs out loud]
25	Lio:	da was van Mr S hé!	that was from Mr S eh!

When they are still on the playground before going up to a room they need to find for French class, and thus in between break time and the more focused attention that will be required in a couple of minutes, Mr S is as amused by Lionel's microphone as a number of his pupils, but when Zaki directs a common French insult to it he does not so much rebuke the insult—which would usually be sanctioned as inappropriate—but its linguistic form, 'say foring' (cf. Goffman 1981) it in the appropriate language, but in this way of course still producing an insult, which his pupils certainly find amusing, and he too when he realizes this was on record.

In addition to this, Mr S topicalized and played around with pupils' backgrounds, through joking to pupils of Moroccan descent that they had probably stolen his pen when he couldn't find it, "with all these Moroccans here". Alternatively, he often called Kemal and Antal in English the "Turkish connection", brought a Turkish

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

soda drink to class, savoured its (hyper-sweet) taste as his pupils were doing an exercise and asked how the drink's name should be pronounced. He sometimes joked about drinking a Turkish brand of beer (Efez), and allowed Antal and Kemal one day to sing a Turkish song for him after class. On another occasion he even jocularly said tais-toi sale turc 'shut up dirty Turk' when two pupils had just been laughing with him, which his Turkish-speaking addressees found very amusing.

But while Mr S's behaviour was much appreciated by 3OS and could undoubtedly be called unconventional, he wasn't a maverick who didn't care about the school linguistic policy. Much to the contrary (and see examples 7 and 8), during my fieldwork it was hard to find another teacher who insisted so much on the use of Dutch. Neither did this concern dwindle over the year. In June of that year Mr S reproached Kemal for speaking Turkish in class, saying that "it's not because your contract has been annulled that you're now free to do as you like, there's still a class council meeting tomorrow". When I later asked Mr S what kind of contract this was he said it was 'for speaking Turkish' and in all seriousness asked me if I didn't agree that their use of Dutch had increased compared to the beginning of the year, suggesting in this way that he believed such contracts were useful for making pupils speak Dutch. Next to this, he—like many other teachers—was often exasperated by his pupils' limited level of Dutch (and of French in French class) and their slow progress, and he didn't stop correcting his pupils, as much as he often revoiced what they had said in Dutch (cf. example 6) to present it as incorrect, funny, or both. He laughed at the literal translations pupils made from French into Dutch, with their accent in Dutch, and with their incorrect, French-influenced subject verb order (imitating *waar wij hebben les* 'where we have class' instead of *waar hebben wij les* 'where do we have class'). If he didn't say that their skills in Dutch were simply insufficient: after calling a friend up on the phone during French class, for which he and 3OS had just practised and sung joyeux anniversaire 'happy birthday', Mr S briefly said to his friend—on speaker—that he had better thank the class in French because they still understand that a lot better than Dutch, and laughed. Exceptionally, Mr S was frank about the value of his pupils' linguistic skills in relation to hierarchically ordered educational tracks and professional futures:

Example 9

Mr S is teaching the *passé composé* (simple past and present perfect), explaining it is one of the most difficult tenses (which I doubt), so they have to pay some attention. If they don't they might as well go and do bakery studies, or textile, he says. Nassim (of Moroccan background, relatively fluent in spoken French) is asked to write the simple present of avoir 'to have' on the blackboard. Ça va aller hé? 'you'll manage won't you' Mr S says to Nassim as he sends him to the blackboard. But Nassim cuts a miserable figure, wasting a lot of time and only managing to write tu as, il a 'you have, he has', and then nous allons 'we are going'. Mr S is very dissatisfied and warns Nassim: "I swear, it'll be bakery, or textile, or hairdressing. BUT NO OFFICE". "And it's full of homos there", Lionel adds.

Examples such as these point out that the creation of playful multilingual interstices did not prevent a serious investment in the school's linguistic policy and with

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

distinguishing correct from incorrect language use. At the same time, Mr S certainly wasn't going to make them believe that their current linguistic repertoires, while on many occasions an undeniable source of humor and fascination, were going to make much of an impression on the job market that awaited them. How can we understand this contradictory if not inconsistent behaviour?

Discussion and conclusion

So far, this article has described how teachers face the expectations and limitations that are incumbent on them in their daily classroom and playground proceedings through briefly recruiting languages other than the one that is officially requested, without, however, a diminished belief in the good that may come from the official policy or reneging on their responsibility to impose it. I will now argue that this practice was often inclusive, but also implicitly placed pupils in the wider socio-linguistic hierarchy and so reproduced rather than changed the status quo.

In order to gauge the impact of especially Mr S's playfully created multilingual spaces, it is necessary to know that most teachers dreaded teaching 3OS, and that only Mr S had developed a reasonably good *modus vivendi* with this class. I think his jocular behaviour and recruitment of home languages was in large part responsible for this. In a school context where pupils' home languages are usually flatly ignored, and where pupils' truncated linguistic competencies lead to all sorts of disfluencies, it must for some pupils at least have been rewarding or heartening, and it may at times have compensated for their feelings of linguistic incompetence, to see Mr S temporarily redistribute teacher and learner roles to become a learner of a language they are much more competent in; to see him draw home languages from the shadows into the discursive spotlights; to recruit these languages occasionally for orienting pupils to school matters (example 6, or 'it's forbidden to chew gum') rather than only for banter; or at least to see Mr S signal an awareness of the clash between policy and reality through playing with linguistic rules and regulations or through fuzzing up the boundary between expected and actual language use (example 8). Some scholars would argue that it was not unimportant either that Mr S often produced laughter (Billig 2005; Dubberley 1993; Woods 1979). "Laughter has this supremely important function of not resolving conflict, but dissipating it, transforming it to a zone of reality where it doesn't matter any more" (Woods 1979: 23). Laughter moreover is:

> "the means by which pupils—and teachers […]—displace the grimness, the sourness and hostility that impinges upon them, and make their school lives more palatable, even enjoyable […] a pleasant way of surviving, a means of infusing life, zest, interest and excitement into sometimes hostile and alien surroundings; and an activity which emphasizes togetherness, *camaraderie* […] Laughter can be an instrument of policy, its aim to forge better relationships and to create an atmosphere judged to be conducive to the achievement of the aims of school" (Woods 1979: 102–104)

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

In light of the friction between official expectations and what was realistically achievable, it is not unreasonable to suggest that laughter, and laughter about different languages and pupils' backgrounds in particular, was a way of transcending this friction, displacing it temporarily elsewhere, and surviving it in a way that constructed some form of *camaraderie* that was well tuned to the exigencies of contemporary urban classroom culture, where "communication with pupils often relie[s] on negotiation rather than authority" (Harris & Lefstein 2011: vii). As D'Amato (1993: 190) says, for a good working consensus to develop between teacher and pupils that holds the middle between indifference and resistance, it is crucial that pupils are able "to locate a rationale that will enable them to accept the costs of school [viz., a loss of autonomy, personal affronts due to sanctions and poor evaluations of performance]", so that they will "view participation in lessons and other school processes as a means of maintaining valued relationships with teachers and peers and of gaining access to experiences of mastery and accomplishment" (ibid.: 191). Given that Mr S was by far 3OS's favourite teacher, it looks as though he had succeeded in helping his pupils to locate such a rationale, and that although short-lived, these humorous stretches were perhaps not unlike what others have called 'third spaces', that is, "symbolic or metaphorical space[s] that merg[e] the 'first space' of children's home, community and peer networks with the 'second space' of more formalized settings like school" (Combs et al. 2011: 195) and where alternative forms of collaboration and learning can take place (Gutiérrez et al. 1999).

At the same time, while these interstices were important to the creation of an enjoyable classroom dynamics, it is necessary to see where these interstices occurred from an interactional perspective, what actually happened when they occurred, and how this contributed to the metapragmatic modelling or regimentation (cf. Silverstein 1993) of language use. Various sociolinguistic and anthropological studies of classroom settings have pointed out that language use in the classroom is saturated with metapragmatic meaning that orients pupils to pervasive and authoritative views about appropriate social conduct, ways of speaking, and the status and value of different languages (and their speakers) in that world (see, among others, Howard 2009; Jaffe 2009; Mertz 1998). Language in the classroom in this sense not only transfers curriculum content, but unavoidably also models language use and ways of speaking and so teaches pupils how to act with language, i.e. how "to use language appropriately, in ways that index culturally salient dimensions of the situation" (Wortham 2005: 96). This regimentation of language use can be done fairly explicitly, through exhortations ("I choose … Dutch"), instructions ("speak Dutch to me"), evaluations ("It's not right is it, you're talking French") and permissions ("for once it can be in French"), or through other commentary on language that echoes or typifies it as incorrect or funny (cf. example 6; Agha 2005). But in addition to these overt qualifications pupils also learn about the value of particular kinds of language use implicitly, through the constant distribution of linguistic choices across specific activities and their association with models of personhood. Such implicit regimentation could also be found in Sacred Heart's 3OS class.

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

There was a clear pattern for instance in the way multilingual interstices occurred, in that these were, with some exceptions, predictably produced in the institutional cracks, that is, on transitional moments when participants were shifting from one discourse type to another, or on 'ritually sensitive' moments when participants were increasingly aware of social and interactional boundaries and sensitivities (cf. Goffman 1971; Rampton 2006: 303ff.): just before or after class (dancing to Turkish music, singing a Turkish song, example 8); when interactional trouble or sensitivities were in the air (example 3 and 4); when thank yous, goodbyes, bless yous and other ritual phrases were produced; on special occasions (examples 3 and 4). Switches to playful or multilingual behaviour could equally introduce a more jocular tone, and open up cherished or exciting opportunities for poetic rather than referential language use and for the brief display of other stances to the classroom proceedings than the on-task attitude that pupils are mostly required to perform (examples 5 and 6).

Very often then, multilingual spaces appeared to be adjusted to moments at which participants were shifting in and out of institutional roles and identities, when different speaking rights were manifesting themselves, when pupils were moving from one discursive zone (e.g., from the relatively unfocused multi-party and multi-topic interaction in the playground) to another (e.g., the concentrated two-party interaction and respect for institutional and other identities that classroom interaction often requires). Rather than throwing a spanner into the works, moreover, such behaviour often seemed to ease the transition from official to non-official business or to flag what behaviour was called for as participants moved across discursive boundaries. Such behaviour, in other words, was "auxiliary rather than focal" (Rampton 2009: 169), it facilitated the normal flow of affairs rather than disrupting it or drawing attention to itself as a model for interaction.

In this way, the transitory multilingual activity some teachers produced at Sacred Heart was usually zoned off to the margins of official business, not unlike what a number of scholars have observed happening in classrooms with supplementary language teachers (speaking the home language of those pupils needing extra support for English). Creese (2010) and Martin-Jones & Saxena (2001) both describe how such teachers are generally yoked to work only in supportive mode, positioned "as marginal to the main action of the class; at the same time, the bilingual resources they brought to the classes [are] contained within a primarily monolingual order of discourse" (2001: 136; see also Heller 2004). Consequently, as Martin-Jones & Saxena argue, this positioning of bilingual teachers as mere assistants gave "quite clear messages […] to the children about the relative value of the languages being used" (2001: 135). In other words, the bilingual teachers' positioning and their use of pupils' home language, embedded assumptions about their value in relation to 'real' language (viz., English) and centre stage discursive action (cf. Codó and Patiño-Santos 2014). Similar implicit messages seemed to be given at Sacred Heart about other languages than Dutch (target languages in the foreign language classroom excepted).

Furthermore, not only did the interactional placement of home languages and play with linguistic rules in discursive stretches that book-ended the more serious, curriculum oriented moments of the day indexicalize such behaviour as acceptable

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

only at marginal moments, if a teacher was willing to take the opportunity there; but they were also typified through their frequent association with a more jocular, relational type of interaction, and with physical actions (example 5, dancing, singing), sexuality (example 8), swearing, and uncommon objects in class (Turkish soda drinks, beer) that differentiated these linguistic resources from school activity where non-accented, non-playful, curriculum-oriented and serious language use was crucial, and from rational types of personhood. In this way, from speech event to speech event (cf. Agha 2005), it looked as though the multilingual interstices that occurred at Sacred Heart socialized pupils into recognizing what types of language could be used when and by what types of person, and taught them to distinguish differently valued discursive zones at school. In light of the wider spread evaluation of linguistic skills that differentiates elites (mastering several standard languages) from non-elites (with truncated linguistic skills) in the global economy, the much-appreciated *camaraderie* that Mr S created, and the scarce openings for linguistic diversity that other teachers made, seemed to socialize pupils into the predominant sociolinguistic hierarchy that creates their own disfluency and problematization.

Hence, moments that temporarily alleviated the friction between expectations and what was realistically achievable were thus conducive to, in effect, an "excluding inclusivity" (Reay et al. 2007: 1054): the inclusion of particular linguistic resources in specific discursive slots implied their exclusion in other, more important ones. It is important to see though, as Reay et al. (2007) point out, that such behaviour may be fairly typical for those who "are negotiating an impossible situation that individually they can do little to improve" (ibid.: 1054) without structural changes or negative career sanctions, and that this can even foster inconsistent behaviour. Caught between reaching out to pupils, preparing them as best as possible for life after school through insisting on the use of Dutch, and being aware of the tensions that this creates, the *camaraderie* Mr S and his 3OS class were sharing may perhaps not have been the worst negotiation of the sociolinguistic complexities at Sacred Heart.

Acknowledgments This work was supported by a Grant from The Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences (NIAS). The author wishes to thank Ad Backus, Leonie Cornips, Vincent de Rooij, Kit Woolard and two anonymous referees for their useful comments and suggestions.

References

Agha, A. (2005). Voice, footing, enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 15*(1), 38–59.

Anderson-Levitt, K. (2005). The schoolyard gate. Schooling and childhood in global perspective. *Journal of Social History, 38*(4), 987–1006.

Billig, M. (2005). *Laughter and ridicule*. London: Sage.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2005). *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ceuleers, E. (2008). Variable identities in Brussels. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 29*(4), 291–309.

Codó, E., & Patiño-Santos, A. (2014). Beyond language: class, social categorisation and academic achievement in a Catalan high school. *Linguistics and Education, 25*(1), 51–63.

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | LE | TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | CP | DISK

Combs, M. C., González, L., & Moll, L. C. (2011). US Latinos and the learning of English. In T. McCarthy (Ed.), *Ethnography and language policy* (pp. 185–203). New York-London: Routledge.
Creese, A. (2010). Two-teacher classrooms, personalized learning and theinclusion paradigm in the United Kingdom. In K. Menken & O. García (Eds.), *Negotiating language policies in schools* (pp. 32–51). New York-London: Routledge.
D'Amato, J. (1993). Resistance and compliance in minority classrooms. In E. Jacob & C. Jordan (Eds.), *Minority education* (pp. 181–207). Norwood NJ: Ablex.
Dubberley, W. S. (1993). Humor as resistance. In P. Woods & M. Hammersley (Eds.), *Gender and ethnicity in school* (pp. 75–94). London: Routledge.
Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public. Microstudies of the public order*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejada, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity Hybridity and hybrid practices in the Third Space. *Mind Culture and Activity, 6*(4), 286–303.
Hambye, Ph, & Richards, M. (2012). The paradoxical visions of multilingualism in education. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 9*(2), 165–188.
Harris, R., & Lefstein, A. (2011). *Urban classroom culture*. London: King's College, Centre for Language, Discourse and Communication.
Heller, M. (1995). Language choice, social institutions and symbolic domination. *Language in Society, 24*(3), 373–405.
Heller, M. (2004). Pratiques et structuration à l'école en milieu multilingue. *Sociolinguistica, 18*, 73–85.
Heller, M., & Duchêne, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Language in late capitalism*. New York- London: Routledge.
Hermans, T., Vos, L., & Wils, L. (1992). *The Flemish Movement*. London: Athlone Press.
Hill, J. H. (2001). Mock Spanish, covert racism, and the (leaky) boundary between public and private spheres. In S. Gal & K. Woolard (Eds.), *Language and publics* (pp. 83–102). Manchester-Northampton: St. Jerome's.
Hornberger, N., & Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2000). Revisiting the continua of biliteracy. *Language and Education, 14*(2), 96–122.
Howard, K. M. (2009). "When meeting *Khun* teacher, each time we should pay respect": Standardizing respect in a Northern Thai classroom. *Linguistics and Education, 20*(3), 254–272.
Jaffe, A. (2009). Stance in a Corsican school. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Stance* (pp. 119–145). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Jaspers, J., & Verschueren, J. (2011). Multilingual structures and agencies. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(5), 1157–1160.
Johnson, D. C., & Freeman, R. (2010). Appropriating language policy on the local level. In K. Menken & O. García (Eds.), *Negotiating language policies in schools* (pp. 13–31). New York-London: Routledge.
Marsh, J. (2011). *Class dismissed*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
Martin-Jones, M., & Saxena, M. (2001). Turn-taking and the positioning of bilingual participants in classroom discourse. In M. Heller & M. Martin-Jones (Eds.), *Voices of authority* (pp. 117–138). London: Ablex.
McCarthy, T. (2011). *Ethnography and language policy*. New York-London: Routledge.
Menken, K., & García, O. (Eds.). (2010). *Negotiating language policies in schools*. New York-London: Routledge.
Mertz, E. (1998). Linguistic ideology and praxis in US law school classroom. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: practice and theory* (pp. 149–162). New York: Oxford University Press.
Pujolar, J. (2007). Bilingualism and the nation-state in the post-national era. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism. A social approach* (pp. 71–95). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing. Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
Rampton, B. (2006). *Language in late modernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rampton, B. (2009). Interactional ritual and not just artful performance in crossing and stylization. *Language in Society, 38*, 149–176.
Reay, D., Hollingworth, S., Williams, K., Crozier, G., Jamieson, F., James, D., et al. (2007). A darker shade of pale? *Sociology, 41*(6), 1041–1060.
Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy*. Hidden agendas and new approaches. New York & London: Routledge.

Journal : Small-ext 10993 | Dispatch : 18-11-2014 | Pages : 21
Article No. : 9332 | □ LE | □ TYPESET
MS Code : LPOL-D-14-00014 | ☑ CP | ☑ DISK

Shohamy, E. (2010). Cases of language policy resistance in Israel's centralized educational system. In K. Menken & O. García (Eds.), *Negotiating language policies in schools* (pp. 182–197). New York-London: Routledge.
Silverstein, M. (1993). Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. In J. A. Lucy (Ed.), *Reflexive language* (pp. 33–58). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Treffers-Daller, J. (2002). Language use and language contact in Brussels. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 23*, 50–64.
Vandenbroucke, F. (2007). *De lat hoog voor talen in iedere school*. Flemish Government: Ministry of Education.
Varenne, H., & McDermott, R. (1999). *Successful failure*. Boulder: Westview Press.
Woods, P. (1979). *The divided school*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Wortham, S. (2005). Socialization beyond the speech event. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 15*, 95–112.

Jürgen Jaspers is associate professor of Dutch linguistics at the Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB). His research interests are in interactional sociolinguistics, ethnography, multilingualism and linguistic standardization processes. Recent publications include articles in Multilingua, Language in Society, Pragmatics and Journal of Sociolinguistics.

Journal : **Small-ext 10993** | Dispatch : **18-11-2014** | Pages : **21**
Article No. : **9332** | □ LE | □ TYPESET
MS Code : **LPOL-D-14-00014** | ☑ CP | ☑ DISK