

Whole class interaction in the adult L2-classroom: The case of Swedish for immigrants

Åsa Wedin, Dalarna University
Annika Norlund Shaswar, Umeå University

This article focuses on verbal interaction in whole class teaching in second language education for adults in Sweden. The article draws on theories treating language as multiple resources that are situated and embedded in material life, and including complex and diverse linguistic, semiotic, physical material and social resources. The material for the article was created in a project based in linguistic ethnography in the form of an action research project, including two municipal Swedish for Immigrants (SFI) schools. The interaction patterns that occurred challenged students' language proficiency in ways that stimulated meaning negotiation through what we call extended interactions. This stresses the social aspect of interaction, which in these cases included the whole, or nearly the whole, class, students and the teacher. However, in whole class teaching, the space for each interlocutor is limited, and as our experience from other classrooms suggests that group tasks are not frequent in SFI classrooms, there seem to be reasons for the development of teaching practices that include more frequent use of interaction in small groups that offer students more space for interaction. We also see a need for developing more culture-sensitive pedagogies and making more space for the multilingual negotiation of meaning.

Keywords: classroom interaction, Swedish for Immigrants, adult education, meaning negotiation

1 Introduction

This article focuses on verbal interaction in whole class teaching in second language education for adults. In many countries, global mobility and migration have resulted in an increasing need for language education for adults to support their learning of the dominant language in their new context. Functional skills in that language are often an important key to work and social integration. In Sweden, beginners' adult education in Swedish as a second language is organised through Swedish for Immigrants (SFI), which is financed by official means and offered through adult education classes run by municipalities or by private operators. SFI includes four courses, A–D, and is organised in three study routes, 1–3, where students are categorised depending on their earlier schooling among other things. Depending on their earlier knowledge, students may start their

Corresponding author's email: annika.norlund.shaswar@umu.se

ISSN: 1457-9863

Publisher: Centre for Applied Language Studies

University of Jyväskylä

© 2019: The authors

<http://apples.jyu.fi>

<http://dx.doi.org/10.17011/apples/urn.201903251959>

studies in any of the courses and the exam in the last course, D, is also the SFI exam which is in many cases a requirement for job and further studies. Following increased global mobility, there is high demand for teachers in SFI and there is an urgent need for the development of teacher education for this group.

The goals for SFI are stated in the Swedish Education Act (2010:800, 20 ch.2) as offering support and stimulation for developing knowledge and competence, to strengthen the students' position in their social life and in work, and to promote personal development. Developing communicative competence is a specifically mentioned goal. To achieve increased efficiency, SFI was included in the school form *Kommunal vuxenutbildning* (Municipal Adult Education) following a proposition (Prop. 2014/15:85). The need for rapid language development among students in SFI is stressed in official documents and there is a concern about students who are perceived as taking too long to reach the goals for SFI.

The importance of interaction for rapid language development has been established through research (Cummins, 2000; Ellis & Shintani, 2015; Long, 1981) and in this article, the focus is on interaction patterns occurring in whole class teaching in SFI classrooms. Data for the article consists of material from teaching including interaction through digital software (SharePoint) between two classes from different parts of the country. The aim here is to analyse whole class interaction in the two SFI classrooms with a focus on how students use their verbal resources. By using the concept *verbal resources*, we want to turn our gaze towards varied resources used by the interlocutors while our main interest is on the verbal part.

2 Interaction and language development

The importance of interaction for language development has been established through research that draws on both cognitive-interactionalist theories and socio-cultural theory, but for varied reasons. While theorists from the cognitive-interactionalist field focus on interaction as a source for input and output in the current language (for example Long, 1981; Swain, 1985), researchers with a base in socio-cultural theory stress the social importance of interaction as a motivation for language development (such as Cummins, 2000; Vygotskij, [1934]1999). The *Output Hypothesis* was formulated by Long (1981), and through the *Comprehensible Output Hypothesis* Swain (1985) claimed that comprehensible output where learners are pushed to produce the L2 is necessary for language acquisition. She argued that output has a consciousness-raising function that helps learners become aware of the gaps in their interlanguage and test their hypotheses about the L2. By talking about their own output, learners can develop metalinguistic awareness about L2 rules, what Swain referred to as *linguaging*. Later (Swain, 1995) she added the importance of *noticing* for input to become intake. The importance of creating opportunities for students' extended talk for language development is stressed by Ellis and Shintani (2015). They claim that this is more likely to occur in student-initiated interaction where students have to find their own words, and when they carry out tasks that provide opportunities to perform varied language functions and roles, such as initiating and responding. Also, Thompson (2008) argues for the importance of extended talk, which he defines as "either spoken monologue or an extended turn-in dialogue" (p. 241). Apart from interaction through different types of more or less authentic conversation, tasks including information gaps have also been found to be useful to create the type

of challenges that promote language development (see for example Doughty & Pica, 1986; Nakahama, Tyler, & van Lier, 2001).

In socio-cultural theory (Vygotskij, [1934]1999), the importance of language development in the *Zone of Proximal Development* (ZPD) is stressed and the focus is on the importance of scaffolding by teachers, peers, books and other learning material. Researchers such as Cummins (2000, 2001) have highlighted the importance of teacher-student interaction in the classroom, and that teachers should focus on language form, language use and social aspects of language. Norton (2001) suggests that the opportunity to talk to other students about important things is what drives the (extended) interaction and results in learning opportunities.

The traditional interaction pattern in whole-class communication, Initiation – Response – Evaluation (IRE) (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), is usually seen as of low value in language education, not offering students opportunities for extended talk or to exercise important communicative roles and functions, such as initiating, turn-taking, responding, clarifying, agreeing, contradicting and arguing (Wedin, 2004). In Sweden, Lindbladh and Sahlström (2001), Lindberg (2004) and Wedin (2011) showed that teacher-led whole class interaction may be organised in ways that support language development by including necessary opportunities for extended and student-initiated talk. Also, Lindberg (2004) and Rosén and Wedin (2015) showed how teacher-led interaction following the IRE pattern may create opportunities for extended talk, and how teachers' adaptation to different students' L2 proficiency may open up for varied interactional patterns.

In our own earlier studies in different SFI classrooms¹, we found that classroom time was dominated by whole class interaction, sandwiched between students' individual work with exercises (Norlund Shaswar, 2014; Wedin, Rosén, & Hennius, 2018). In these studies, we found that interaction in the form of group tasks with student-student interaction only rarely took place. We decided to look further into interactional patterns in whole class interaction, as this was the part of the lessons where students were given most opportunities for verbal interaction in Swedish. Thus, we wanted to create an understanding of how interaction patterns may offer students space for performing different communicative functions and to play varied communicative roles.

3 Interaction and mobility

During the last two decades and following increased global mobility, different processes of change have transformed sociolinguistic research on multilingualism. Heller (2007) argued that researchers should turn their gaze from stability to mobility and Blommaert (2010, p. 43) called for the development of a sociolinguistics for mobility by changing perspective from a focus on “immobile languages to mobile resources”. Through what has been called the multilingual turn (Conteh & Meier, 2014; May, 2014), the earlier dominating monolingual focus on the target language in second language acquisition research has been questioned. The notion of languages as autonomous and separate entities that may be indexed by labels was questioned and instead languages were treated as multiple resources and understood as an ongoing object of development (see for example Heller, 2007; Makoni & Pennycook, 2007). Notions such as *Translanguaging* (García, 2009; Paulsrud, Rosén, Straszer, & Wedin, 2017), *Superdiversity* (Blommaert, 2010), *Truncated language* (Blommaert, 2010), and

Translingualism (Canagarajah, 2013) were created in relation to multilingualism, which came to be understood as multimodal and as situated, ecological and negotiated. Research in this emerging field has seldom treated aspects of language development in classroom interaction which is our focus here. By focusing on whole class interaction, we turn our interest toward an important space for the students' development of oral Swedish in SFI. Although we understand language as resources that are situated and embedded in material life, and including complex and diverse linguistic, semiotic, physical material and social resources, we will here turn our gaze towards the verbal exchange. The motivation for that is that we want to create knowledge about SFI as a space for the development of Swedish, which is the explicit main goal of the education. This means that while we realise that much more than verbal exchange is at stake, and we are aware that in classroom interaction external factors are also at play, such as social networks and physical positioning, our attention is on the verbal negotiation of meaning. Following Canagarajah (2018, p. 5) we understand the interlocutors, the teacher and the students, as human agents negotiating meaning, while "orchestrating language and other semiotic resources to their advantage".

In the study of language education on a classroom level, we understand that students and teachers do not speak to prove their proficiency in what is labelled "Swedish" but to negotiate meaning (see Canagarajah, 2018). This means that our interest is the success of the interaction, focusing on the outcomes of interactions rather than formal correctness in terms of standard Swedish, while we are aware of the role that correctness may play in language classrooms. Thus, verbal resources used in the interactions which are socially situated may acquire new meaning that is established through negotiation. Verbal resources used by interlocutors are here understood as mediated and embedded in diverse other semiotic resources, and as such as "situated in expanded social, material, historical and geographical scales" (Canagarajah 2018, p. 7). Here, however, our focus will be on students' spoken Swedish.

4 Participants, data and methods

The epistemological shifts in the sociolinguistics of mobility and multilingualism mentioned above have been reflected in the form of ethnographic and critical methodological approaches (Copland & Creese, 2015; Creese, 2008; Martin-Jones & Martin, 2017; Snell, Shaw, & Copland, 2015). Copland and Creese (2015) show how linguistic ethnography links "the micro to the macro, the small to the large, the varied to the routine, the individual to the social, the creative to the constraining, and the historical to the present and to the future" (p. 26). The use of linguistic ethnography here allows for viewing language as a communicative action in ongoing routines through the investigation of the linguistic sign as a social phenomenon.

The material for the article was created in a project based in linguistic ethnography in the form of an action research project with the aim of creating knowledge about language education and the development of teaching practices in SFI based on student exchanges through digital media. The project included two municipal adult education schools and four classes, two in course A–B, the beginners' level, and two in course C, the intermediate level. For this article material from the two C groups has been used. This choice was made because we found similarities and differences in the two classrooms that were interesting, and

also because the groups were working on the same task, writing and receiving written letters between the two groups. (For analysis of the A-B-groups see Wedin and Norlund Shaswar, submitted). In the action research project, we as researchers worked close together with the teachers to develop educational practices and simultaneously to contribute to teachers' understanding of ongoing practices (Zuber-Skerritt, 1996). Our role was to initiate tasks, observe educational practices and analyse the outcomes, while teachers were responsible for the teaching and reflected together with the researchers on the outcome.

In linguistic ethnography, the analysis is close to language in detail, while the social, cultural, economic and socio-political contexts surrounding the language practices are also central (Rampton et al., 2004). Thus, there is a cross-fertilizing where the ethnography is enriched by a more explicit analytical focus on language and language development, while linguistics is enriched by the vicinity and reflexivity of ethnography. The combination of linguistic ethnography with action research gives tools for the creation of both an understanding of the complex and multi-layered phenomena that are at play (Canagarajah, 2006; Hornberger & Johnson, 2017; Zeichner, 2001), and knowledge where both researchers and teachers are agents in the process of change (Wedin, 2017).

During the project, classroom observations have been the main source of data, completed with teacher interviews. Field notes were taken during all observations and parts of the observations were in addition either audio- or video-recorded. A total of ten hours of classroom observations were carried out in these two classrooms, with 1.5 hours audio-recorded and 2.5 hours video-recorded. Transcripts used are either from audio- or video-recordings.

The lessons consisted of discussions related to students' earlier pre-planned individual presentations. Students in the two classes had been instructed to create individual presentations about themselves. The presentations were written down and after being rehearsed each presentation was read out individually and audio-recorded. The presentations from the two classes were then exchanged between the two schools digitally through SharePoint. The total number of students and presentations involved were 25. In this article, the focus is on the interaction that took place during the lessons when the presentations were listened to.

For ethical reasons, the research has been carried out in ways that show respect for individual students. The teachers and students involved were informed and asked for consent in both oral and written forms, and information was given both in Swedish and in students' other languages. During the video-recording, the camera was not directed towards students' faces except when students intentionally turned towards the camera, and those who expressed less comfort with being video-recorded were respected in that the camera was never directed toward them. Thus body language and facial expressions have not been included in transcripts. All material, including field notes, has been stored safely, and material is presented in ways that avoid the recognition of individuals.

The recordings were transcribed and analysed to identify parts in whole class interaction where student interaction included student talk in ways that resulted in the negotiation of meaning and students' use of varied communicative roles and functions. By focusing on the negotiation of meaning and variation in communicative functions and roles, we want to identify interaction patterns that offer students the space to develop their oral language proficiency in Swedish.

According to our understanding, performing a transcription of observational data is a process where talk is reduced to writing. This is not a mechanical

procedure but a process that includes interpretation and analysis (Cameron, 2001, p. 43). In addition to verbal aspects, the observational data also includes some interpersonal aspects and non-verbal/extra-verbal interaction that it is not possible to document in an audio- or video-recording. Consequently, before the transcription can start, a number of decisions need to be made concerning how the oral interaction should be interpreted into writing. For the transcription, we have followed a modified version of a transcription key presented by Poland (2004, p. 279). In the selected excerpts, the interaction patterns were analysed further to identify patterns that opened up for the use of varied communicative roles and functions among students. For the transcriptions key, see endnote².

The two teachers, Mr Chris and Mr Philip, each in their respective classroom, have about 10–15 students in their classes, ranging from about 20 years of age to about 60. The students come from countries such as Syria, Somalia, Eritrea and Thailand, among other countries, and have been in Sweden for between one and four years. Some of them are working or have been placed as trainees parallel to their SFI studies. The two teachers usually arrange classroom time so that about half of the time is teacher-led whole class education, where students are invited to share experiences and knowledge, and half of the time is individual work with different tasks. During whole class interaction, both topics related to content and to grammatical form are in focus. This resembles what we have observed in other SFI classrooms (Norlund Shaswar, 2014; Wedin et al., 2018). Planned group or collaborative work was seldom part of observed lessons. The lessons analysed here, 1.5 hours from Mr Chris' class and 2.5 hours from Mr Philip's class, have the same topic, to listen to presentations made by students, followed by discussions.

5 Findings

At first, we realised that the cases of extended talk on the part of the students were few, while students' own initiatives in many cases put them in linguistically challenging situations. Also, on some occasions, teachers were observed to challenge students to stretch their language by asking them follow-up questions. As we found that the interaction patterns of the two classrooms differed in certain ways, we will present common patterns found in each classroom, respectively, starting with Mr Chris' classroom, before we discuss opportunities for the use of varied communicative roles and functions that students are given in interaction.

5.1 *Interaction patterns in the classroom of Mr Chris*

At the time when these lessons were observed, the students in Mr Chris' class had prepared their own presentations but not yet recorded them. Here, we are concerned with the phase after they finished listening to the recordings from the students in S school. The analysed lessons may be characterized as teacher-led with the IRE pattern visible. This does not mean, however, that the distribution of turns-at-talk is strict, and students for example do not raise their hand to be given the floor, as is common in traditional teacher-led classroom interaction with children or adolescents. Instead, they take the floor spontaneously and simultaneous talk and overlaps are frequent. In a few cases, the teacher takes initiatives to control the interaction. Although Mr Chris does not generally take the role of a teacher who distributes speaking turns, on a few occasions he claims that role by interrupting students who talk simultaneously: "En i taget Sara" (*One*

at a time Sara) and by giving the word to one student who does not often take the floor: "Vänta vänta Aron har du något att säga om det här?" (*Wait wait Aron do you have something to say about this?*) On some occasions, he seems to sum up what is said by students like when students try to express what one presenter has said about her children and he adds: "Vad sa du tre flickor och en pojke (.) är det så?" (*What did you say three girls and one boy (.) is that so?*).

After each presentation, Mr Chris attempts to control the discussion by asking questions about the quality of the presentations, and a few times he explicitly invites them to relate their perception of others' presentations to their own presentations that they are to record afterwards. However, while he asks questions like: "Vad tycker ni?" (*What did you think?*), "Var det här en bra presentation?" (*Was this a good presentation?*), "Var det nånting som kunde ha varit bättre (...) som var ett problem?" (*Was there anything that could have been better (...) that was a problem?*) and "Var det nånting som inte var så bra?" (*Was there something that was not very good?*), students in most cases do not respond by formulating an assessment but instead repeat what they remember, like in the following example

Example 1

1	Chris	Var det nånting som inte var så	<i>Was there anything that was not</i>
2		jättebra?	<i>very good?</i>
3	Masuma	Hon trivs här	<i>She likes it here</i>
4	Chris	Hon trivs här [ja	<i>She likes it here [yes</i>
5	Aron	[säkert	<i>[certainly</i>
6	Chris	e var det nånting som inte var	<i>uh was there anything that was not</i>
7		så bra	<i>so good</i>
8	Sara	A [hon-	<i>A [she-</i>
9	Chris	[i presentationen	<i>[in the presentation</i>
10	Masuma	Bra	<i>Good</i>

Like in this example, students in many cases do not respond to his direct questions about the quality, particularly his request for criticism. Perhaps this may be interpreted as a conflict between the teacher's pedagogical goal regarding students' own work with their presentations, while students' may have a more social goal with the talk. Criticism of other students may be perceived as negative. In a situation of formal language education, such as SFI, where students are required to reach some goals and there is a demand for rapid achievement, this may be something that can be perceived as threatening.

As is common in many language classrooms, words and expressions are frequently repeated both by students and by the teacher, such as in the following example when the name of the county where one student lived is discussed:

Example 2

1	Aron:	[Dalarna	<i>[Dalarna</i>
2	Chris:	[Var bor hon?	<i>[Where does she live?</i>
3	Aron:	Dalorna	<i>Dalorna</i>
4	Genet:	Dadla da	<i>Dadla da</i>
5	Chris:	Dalarna	<i>Dalarna</i>
6	Genet:	Dadlarna	<i>Dadlarna</i>
7	Chris:	Dalarna	<i>Dalarna</i>
8	Genet:	Dalarna	<i>Dalarna</i>
9	Aron:	Aa	<i>Yeah</i>

Here, Aron first says “Dalarna”, which is the name of the county, while Chris asks “Where does he live?” and Aron changes to “Dalorna”; Genet interposes “Dadla da”, followed by Chris giving the correct form “Dalarna”; which is repeated by Genet and affirmed by Aron. Also, in example 3 repetition is used when a student talks about what one of the presenters said.

Example 3

1	Kamal:	Hon bor med man eller	<i>She lives with husband or</i>
2	Chris:	Hon bor med?	<i>She lives with?</i>
3	Kamal:	Med man	<i>With husband</i>
4	Sara:	Man och [he hennes barn	<i>Husband and [he her children</i>
5	Chris:	[Med sin man	<i>[With her husband</i>

This is an example of other-initiated repair targeting a grammar structure, the use of the reflexive form of the possessive pronoun “sin” (*her*). First, Kamal provides a candidate outcome for the search, and by “or” signals word search. Chris repeats the first three words, requesting clarification. Kamal’s repetition of “with husband” could either be interpreted as a response to the teacher’s turn or a clarification if Kamal interprets the teacher’s question as request for information. Sara repeats part of the outcome and complements to the utterance with “he her children”. However the teacher does not respond to her complement but focuses on the grammatical aspect by correcting her “With her husband”. Note how the teacher tries to elicit the correct form but finally gives it himself “Med sin man” (*with her husband*).

There are no cases of extended talk from students during these two lessons in Mr Chris’ classroom. Only the teacher says anything that contains more than one sentence or that may be perceived as a monologue, and then mainly related to evaluating the presentations and how he wants the students to think about their own future presentations. However, students frequently take the floor for short talk turns such as talking about intending to become a bus driver like in example four.

Example 4

1	Sara:	Buk chefa vad heter	<i>Buk deva what’s it called</i>
2	Kamal:	Busschaufför	<i>Bus driver</i>
3	Chris:	Busschaufför	<i>Bus driver</i>
4	Sara:	Ja buk	<i>Yes buk</i>
5	Chris:	Busschaufför	<i>Bus driver</i>

In this case, both students and the teacher also scaffold the initiating student by giving the correct word. The Swedish word for “driver” *chaufför* is quite difficult to pronounce and on several occasions we have noted that students strive to say the word, as becoming a bus driver is a topic that is discussed frequently among the students. (Note that in the English translations we have tried to make pronunciations that depart from the standard visible as far as possible when they are necessary for the understanding.) After one presentation, Hussein takes the floor to state that the presenter lives in a small village outside the town where he studies. However, he does not remember the name of the village, which results in a discussion.

Example 5

1	Chris:	M exakt hon bor i en liten by	<i>M exactly she lives in a small village</i>
2	Kamal:	Aha	<i>Aha</i>
3	Genet:	X-town	<i>X town</i>
4	Chris:	En liten by utanför	<i>A small village outside</i>
5	Kamal:	Utanför	<i>Outside</i>
6	Chris:	Jag vet inte [närmare	<i>I don't know [closer to</i>
7	Genet:	[Gustaf Gustafsson hon säger	<i>[Gustaf Gustafsson she says</i>
8	Chris:	Va	<i>What</i>
9	Genet:	Gustafsson eller	<i>Gustafsson or</i>
10	Kamal:	Gustafsson	<i>Gustafsson</i>
11	Aron:	Gustaf	<i>Gustaf</i>
12	Chris:	Jag kommer inte ihåg vilken by det var	<i>I don't remember which village it was</i>
13	Kamal:	Gustaf	<i>Gustaf</i>

In this case, the student in the presentation had said that he lives in “Gustafs”, which is a small village and the name comes close to the male name “Gustaf” and to the surname “Gustafsson”. Some of the students remember the name of the village, and they seem to mix it up with the name and surname that resemble it, while it is not clear if the teacher understood the name of the village either from the presentation or from the interaction, but they finish with “Gustaf” which is close to the correct name, “Gustafs”. Unlike in example 3 and 4, where the teacher finalises by giving the correct expression, here a student repeats the name in an approximate form.

In a context such as this classroom where the floor is quite open for student-initiated talk by taking the floor spontaneously or interrupting, there is little room for planning the talk, such as to plan how to formulate oneself. Thus, many occasions occur where students ask for support, as in Example 6:

Example 6

1	Hussein:	Hon mina min e shu isma	<i>She my mine shu isma (Arabic for</i>
2		heter Mahmoud e	<i>“What is it”) name Mahmoud uh</i>
3	Rami:	Hennes man heter Mahmoud	<i>Her husband's name is Mahmoud</i>
4	Chris:	Ja	<i>Yes</i>
5	Basem:	Hennes man	<i>Her husband</i>
6	Hussein:	Hennes man?	<i>(to other student) Her husband?</i>

In this case, Hussein asks for help, and although the teacher confirms the expression given by another student, Hussein turns to a fellow student for confirmation.

To conclude, Mr Chris takes a role of the teacher by suggesting topics for the talk, assessing the quality of the presentations, and sometimes regulating the interaction. Still, he leaves space for students' initiatives and for negotiating both topic and linguistic form. Students are challenged in their output and the interaction includes student talk performing varied roles and functions, such as to initiate topic, turn-taking, repetition, reformulation, confirmation, asking for confirmation, asking for help, responding, affirming, clarification, contradicting and clarification. Students' speech turns are short, and challenges arise mainly on a word level.

5.2 The classroom of Mr Philip

In the classroom of Mr Philip, the presentations are also the focus of the lesson, but on this occasion the recordings from the other class are not yet available, so the

teacher decides that they first listen to each other's presentations. Thus, on this occasion, the presenters are themselves present, which allows for discussions where the content is extended. Student initiatives result in various linguistic challenges, when different communication strategies are used, both by students and the teacher.

In this classroom, students frequently take the floor and bring matters up for discussion. Mr Philip takes a more withdrawn role than Mr Chris, and after they have listened to a presentation, he invites students to comment. The more withdrawn role taken in the interaction by the teacher is contrasted, in the case of miscommunications or when questions are brought up that students do not manage to solve, when he takes the floor to help.

When the class has listened to one of the presentations from their own class, Mr Philip first gives the floor to the presenter asking what it felt like to listen to him-/herself and if there is something he or she wants to add. Then, he invites students to ask the presenter if there is something they did not understand or if they want to know more. Several of the students ask questions that the presenter answers. During the talk, many linguistic challenges occur, often when someone lacks a certain word or expression for something he or she wants to say. One example is when two of the students, the married couple Hasan and Salima, in their respective presentations have talked about how they came to Sweden, including having walked 3 300 km through six countries with their four children, two of whom they left in Turkey. Students ask many questions such as how they found food, how they could find the way, where they slept and if they had shelter in the case of rain. Awet has a question which needs some clarifications before it may be understood. In the example, it is not until lines 15–16 that the question is clarified by the teacher:

Example 7

1	Awet:	Där finns vahetere	<i>There is what is it called</i>
2	Salima:	Post	<i>Post</i>
3	Awet:	Post shnapar shnappar	<i>Post schnaper schnaper</i>
4		shätknappar shätknappar	<i>shitnaper shitnaper</i>
5	Philip:	Ja vad säger du?	<i>Yes what are you saying?</i>
6	Awet:	Shätknappar det finns	<i>Shitnaper there is</i>
7	Philip:	shätknappar dom e tar	<i>Shitnaper they e take</i>
8	Awet:	Kidnappare	<i>Kidnappers</i>
9	Arin:	Dom säljer ja det	<i>They sell yes that</i>
10	Awet:	Kidnappare	<i>Kidnappers</i>
11	Philip:	Shätknappare	<i>Shitnapers</i>
12	Awet:	Kidnappare	<i>Kidnappers</i>
13	Student:	[nappare	<i>[nappers</i>
14	Philip:	Kidnappare	<i>Kidnappers</i>
15		Fanns det kidnappare frågar	<i>Are there kidnappers asks</i>
16	Awet:	Awet	<i>Awet</i>
17	Salima:	Ja	<i>Yes</i>
18	Hasan:	Nej	<i>No</i>
19		Bara Tyskland var e först e	<i>Only in Germany where first uh</i>
20		i Tyskland första knappare	<i>in Germany first nappers</i>
21	Awet:	till kam eller e	<i>to cam or uh</i>
22	Hasan:	[camp	<i>[camp</i>
23		[E kamp jag e (skrattar) e	<i>[Uh camp I uh (laughs) uh</i>
24		efter dagar (...) jag e går till	<i>after days (...) I uh go to</i>
25		tågen e station e tåget till	<i>trains uh station uh train to</i>
26		vagn åker tåget till Sverige	<i>wagon go train to Sweden</i>

This is one of the few occasions where students also express something in the form of what may be referred to as extended talk. In the last turn, lines 19–21 and 23–26, Hasan’s expression may be interpreted as a monologue. In this sequence, the teacher initially manages to help in line 8 by guessing the word that is needed for the interaction, “kidnappers”, which is then repeated by several students. This may be assumed to be an important question for Awet, as he himself had to leave his newly wedded wife in their home country due to a fear of kidnappers from ISIS, who were said to kidnap women. In this case, the final answer does not become absolutely clear, but Hasan seems to say that there were kidnappers in the refugee camp in Germany. When there are no more questions, Philip suggests that they continue with another presentation but is interrupted by one of the students:

Example 8

1	Philip:	Då ska vi gå vidare då med	<i>Then we'll continue with</i>
2		[en annan	<i>[another</i>
3	Nattakan:	[Jag har sista fråga	<i>[I have last question</i>
4	Philip:	Ja jättebra att du säger till	<i>Yes great that you tell</i>
5	Nattakan:	Hur många land du går	<i>How many country you walk</i>
7		genom?	<i>through?</i>
8	Philip:	Ja hur många länder gick du	<i>Yes how many countries did you</i>
9		igenom gick	<i>walk through walk</i>
10		[genom	<i>[through</i>
11	Salima:	[Sex sex länder	<i>[Six six countries</i>

This is an example of how Philip leaves the floor for students’ talk, and also allows them to interrupt him, as Nattakan does here with her question while he intended to continue. Nattakan is one of the students who is less talkative in class, which may be one reason why he so willingly supports her initiative. In lines 8–10, there is a recast when Philip repeats the question about how many countries they passed through with the correct form. Hasan and Salima start to cite them one by one. After Slovenia, they say the Arabic “Nimsa”. Philip does not understand what country they refer to, so a discussion starts. Philip pulls down a wall map in front of the class and some of the students join him in trying to find the country referred to. Another of the students takes out his mobile and looks the name up in a dictionary app. He finds the Swedish word and first shows the mobile to the presenters before he walks up to the front of the classroom and shows the teacher and the fellow students. The teacher then tells the class that the country was Austria. This is another example of how meaning is negotiated using varied verbal resources and social interaction, involving the whole class, students and the teacher together in the solving of linguistic challenges. Also, in this sequence, students perform a variety of communicative roles and functions.

When they have listened to Awet’s presentation where he, among other things, says that he wants to become a bus driver after he has finished SFI, a discussion initiated by the students starts about the requirements to become a bus driver. Arin asks a question which he has problems formulating. This results in negotiation both about the formulation and about the content of the answer:

Example 9a

1	Arin:	Vet du hur mycket e (...) tar timme	<i>Do you know how much uh (...) takes hour</i>
2		det fi e tar om du blir busschaufför	<i>there i uh takes if you become bus driver</i>
3	Awet:	Vad sa du?	<i>What did you say?</i>
4	Arin:	Hur mycket timme är det inte	<i>How much hour is it not</i>
5		timme e hur e mycket e e	<i>hour uh how uh much uh uh</i>
6	Philip:	Hur länge	<i>How long</i>
7	Arin:	Ja ja tar när e som	<i>Yes yes takes when uh as</i>
8	Hasan:	Hur mycket tid eller hur mycket	<i>How much time or how much</i>
9		kostar?	<i>costs?</i>
10	Arin:	Ja tid (skrattar)	<i>Yes time (laughs)</i>
11	Hasan:	Aa tio tio månader	<i>Aa ten ten months</i>
12	Awet:	Jag fattar inte vad säger han vad	<i>I do not understand what says he what</i>
13		säger du?	<i>do you say?</i>
14	Maro:	Han vill fråga dig på hur my	<i>He wants to ask you on how mu</i>
15		hur mycket timme	<i>how much hour</i>
16	Arin:	Ja hur mycket tid	<i>Yes how much time</i>
17	Salima:	Tid	<i>Time</i>
18	Maro:	Eller hur lång många månader du	<i>Or how man many months you</i>
19		e behöver om du [vill e	<i>Uh need if you [want uh</i>
20	Hasan:	[Förför förför	<i>[Verver Verver</i>
21	Maro:	du vill e jobba om du jobbar	<i>You want uh work if you work</i>
22		chaufför buss	<i>driver bus</i>
23	Student:	Chaufför busschaufför	<i>Driver bus driver</i>

Here, Arin tries to ask Awet a question about the time needed to become a bus driver. When Awet does not understand the question, Arin tries to reformulate it (lines 4–5) and Philip gives the formulation “Hur länge” (*How long*) (line 6). Arin continues while being scaffolded by Hasan (lines 7–11) but Awet still does not understand. Then Maro, Salima, Hasan and another student (not hearable who) cooperate to scaffold them. After some negotiation, Arin reformulates his question once more:

Example 9b

24	Arin:	E jag vill veta om e hur mycket tid	<i>I want to know about uh how much time</i>
25		det tar det tar när man blir e buss	<i>it takes it takes when you become uh bus</i>
26	Maro:	Chaufför	<i>Driver</i>
27	Awet:	Aha det tar xx	<i>Aha it takes xx</i>
28	Maro:	Är det behöver kurs är det behöver	<i>Is it needs course is it needs</i>
29		träna flera månader och vill jobba	<i>training several months and want to work</i>
30		jag tror han [frågade	<i>I think he [asked</i>
31	Tesfa-Alem:	[hur länge	<i>[how long</i>
32	Awet:	Ja	<i>Yes</i>
33	Tesfa-Alem:	Man lär sig	<i>You learn</i>
34	Awet:	Hur länge lär sig du	<i>How long do learn you</i>
35	Tesfa-Alem:	Han måste studera mer	<i>He has to study more</i>
36	Salima:	Ja	<i>Yes</i>
37	Maro:	Han måste studera mer kurser	<i>He has to study more courses</i>
38	Salima:	Ja kanske	<i>Yes perhaps</i>
39	Awet:	Ja	<i>Yes</i>
	Salima:	Man studera tre månader utbildning	<i>You have to study three months studies</i>
40	Awet:	Ja	<i>Yes</i>

41	Salima:	Nie nie månader	<i>Nine nine months</i>
42	Tesfa-Alem:	Som du lär dig	<i>That you learn</i>
43	Awet:	I X-stad	<i>In X town</i>
44	Tesfa-Alem:	Min handläggare han säger tre	<i>My officer says three</i>
45		månader	<i>months</i>
46	Awet:	Det är bra	<i>That's fine</i>
46	Salima:	Innan man måste har bil e bil e	<i>Before you have to have car uh car uh</i>
47	Awet:	Körkort	<i>License</i>
48	Maro:	Hur många månader säger?	<i>How many months say?</i>
49	Awet:	Tre månader	<i>Three months</i>
50	Salima:	Fem månader	<i>Five months</i>
51	Maro:	Fem månader ja	<i>Five months yes</i>
52		(En längre paus)	<i>(a longer pause)</i>
53	Philip:	Ja det var en svår fråga men jag tror	<i>Yes it was a difficult question but I think</i>
54		att du sa så: Hur lång tid tar det	<i>that you said thus: How long does it take?</i>

Arin continues to reformulate his question (lines 24-25). In this excerpt, we see that students negotiate meaning and exchange knowledge about the topic, how to become a bus driver. The question asked by Arin initially (line 1) was about the time needed but during the negotiation Maro widens it to include whether courses are needed (lines 28-42), where they may be taken (line 43) and requirements (line 46-47, that you need an ordinary driving license first). Finally, the students finish the discussion and after a short pause Philip formulates a suggestion for Arin's initial question that he reformulated 3-4 times during the interaction: "Ja det var en svår fråga men jag tror att du sa så: Hur lång tid tar det?" (*Yes it was a difficult question but I think that you said thus: How long does it take?*). During the interaction, Philip held a low profile and through the final formulation one may perceive that he reclaims the role as teacher. This reclaim may, however, be understood as modest as students actually finish the discussion and there is a silent pause in between. Whether students listen to and understand that this is actually a formulation of Arin's initial question is not possible to know. It may only be Philip's way to reclaim the floor and his role as leader in the classroom.

In his presentation, Awet also talked about having had to leave his wife and now having waited for her for more than four years. This results in a discussion about marriage and culture, which inspires Maro to ask Philip:

Example 10

1	Maro:	Jag vill fråga dig	<i>I want to ask you</i>
2	Philip:	Vill du fråga mig?	<i>Do you want to ask me?</i>
3	Maro:	Ja i mitt hemland e kan man	<i>Yes in my home country uh man can married</i>
4		gift fyra kvinnor	<i>four women</i>
5	Philip:	Kan man vara gift med fyra kvinnor	<i>Can you be married to four women</i>
6		(skratt)	<i>(laugh)</i>
7	Maro:	Ja om man gift två eller tre kvinnor	<i>Yes of man married two or three women uh</i>
8		e och flyttar och flyttar till	<i>and moves and moves to</i>
9	Student:	[I Sverige	<i>[In Sweden</i>
10	Maro:	Sverige	<i>Sweden</i>
11	Philip:	Mm	<i>Mm</i>
12	Maro:	E i Sverige kan dom gifta samma	<i>Uh in Sweden may they also married or do</i>
13		också eller måste man skiljar två	<i>you have to divorce two</i>
14		(skratt) fruar och bo bara med en?	<i>(laughs) wives and live only with one?</i>
15	Philip:	Jättesvår fråga jag vet inte jag vet inte	<i>Very difficult question but I don't know</i>

16		exakt men jag tror inte man måste	<i>I don't think you have to</i>
17		skilja sig så men det är det är ju	<i>divorce each other but why that is</i>
18		väldigt det är väldigt svårt m det blir	<i>very difficult m it becomes</i>
19		väldigt svårt men men om man har	<i>very difficult but but if you have</i>
20		barn tillsammans och det blir	<i>children together and that becomes</i>
21		jättekomplicerat jag tror att Sverige	<i>very complicated I think that Sweden</i>
22		jag tror att man visst får och kanske	<i>I think that you may and perhaps</i>
23		måste leva tillsammans men det	<i>have to live together but why that becomes</i>
24		blir ju konstigt lite lustigt ja	<i>very awkward a bit funny yes very different</i>
25		väldigt annorlunda	<i>There are those who have four they have four</i>
26	Nattakan:	Det finns dom har fyra dom har	<i>wives they together in one house?</i>
27		fyra fru dom tillsammans ett hus?	<i>Uh no uh sometimes man marries three</i>
28	Maro:	E nej e ibland man gifter tre	<i>or four together but there are some</i>
29		eller fyra tillsammans men finns flera	<i>[xx</i>
30	Student:	[xx	<i>]man in Syria they married two for example</i>
31	Maro:	[mannen i Syrien dom gift två till	<i>but uh they uh live uh one women that house</i>
32		exempel men e dom e bor e en	<i>and other women on other house but uh before</i>
33		kvinnor det hus och annan kvinna på	<i>perhaps</i>
34		annat hus men e förut för kanske	<i>seven or ten years ago they live yes together</i>
35		mellan sju och tio år dom bor ja	<i>same house yes before</i>
36		tillsammans samma hus ja förut	<i>(laughs)</i>
37	Nattakan:	(skrattar)	

This is one example of a student initiative on a topic which engages students and the frequency of laughs indicates that the topic is sensitive. Philip seems a bit surprised by Maro's question, and by laughing gives an impression of being both embarrassed and amused. Talk about one's families is quite frequent in the class and the rapid support in line 9 by another student, "In Sweden" also indicates that this may be a topic discussed outside class among some of the students. Actually, the issue seems to be more topical for some of the students than for the teacher. Also, Nattakan's question about whether they live in the same house, in lines 26–27, seems to orient to the scenario as laughable.

In Mr Philips' classroom, student initiatives are many and so are the linguistic challenges that appear. Nor in this classroom are there many occasions of extended talk on the side of the students; only Maro, Hasan and Tesfa-Alem perform talk that may be categorised as extended, that is, including a longer stretch of talk. The examples are many where meaning is negotiated and varied communication strategies such as repairs, self-corrections, interrogations, paraphrases, clarifications and reformulations are used. Students also perform various communicative roles, such as initiating, responding and arguing. In this classroom, particularly long interaction sequences engaging students in extended negotiations of meaning are frequent.

5.3 Interaction in the two classrooms

The talk that takes place during the observed lessons in these adult education classrooms may be described as approaching natural and authentic talk, as students bring up topics from their everyday life and as there are variation and flexibility in interaction patterns including the flexible and varied use of communicative functions and roles. Being based on students' own presentations, the topics that are student-initiated, such as marriage, raising children, struggles on the way to Sweden and procedures needed to become a bus driver, relate to their lives outside school and it is clear that students are engaged in the talk.

Both teachers take a role that differs from what is common in education for children and adolescents, by not demanding students to raise their hands and allowing students to take the floor by interrupting both them and fellow students. In both classrooms, this results in active talk with frequent student initiatives, but also results in students that talk at the same time, and in some students dominating the talk. There are also 2–3 students in each classroom who do not talk much and who take few initiatives to talk although they seem to actively participate. One such case is in Example 8 where the student who settles the question of “Nimsa” in Swedish is a student who does not talk much in class but who shows that he is still engaged in the conversation through his use of his mobile phone. While Mr Chris takes more initiatives to regulate the talk, both teachers specifically address those students who are less talkative in class and encourage their talk. Although the difference may be due to the difference in the tasks between the two classrooms, with the presenters being present in one but not in the other, these patterns were also observable in other lessons. It is common that individual teachers vary in the degree and style of class management and of how they regulate students’ talk in class. It would be interesting to compare these presentations to textbooks’ non or semi authentic dialogues which often fail to engage students.

Through the interaction in the observed classrooms, students are involved in varied communicative tasks that include the negotiation of meaning and linguistic challenges. Although there are traces of IRE interaction in both teachers’ classrooms, the main part of interaction comes close to what resembles natural and authentic everyday talk and students are given the space to perform varied communicative roles and to use varied communicative functions. Through the particular task, with individual presentations, information gaps are constructed which result in a negotiation of meaning.

The student-initiated topics that relate to students’ everyday life in SFI give rich opportunities for interaction of the type that promotes language development. Students not only perform different communicative roles and functions, but also participate in meaning negotiation that includes a richness of communicative strategies. In the cases presented here, this occurs particularly when the presenters themselves are present and thus can extend their own narratives.

6 Discussion

We aimed to analyse interaction patterns in these two SFI classrooms focusing on students’ use of their verbal resources, and found that the interactions that were observed gave students rich opportunities to use the target language, Swedish, in ways that caused them linguistic challenges, resulting in a negotiation of meaning. Particularly in Mr Philip’s classroom, students engaged in formulating and reformulating their messages, scaffolded by the teacher and more frequently by their fellow students. We suggest that the opportunity to talk to other students about important things is what drives the (extended) interaction and results in learning opportunities. This is particularly important for those students who may have few opportunities to use Swedish outside class.

In these classrooms, talk was frequently enacted through what we would like to call *extended interactions*, rather than extended talk. While each talk-turn often only included few words and seldom more than one clause, the interaction sequences were extended in ways that resulted in a negotiation of meaning. This stresses the social aspect of interactions, which in these cases included the whole,

or nearly the whole, class, students and the teacher. The variation in communicative roles that students performed, together with the frequency of meaning negotiation and communication strategies may with Swain (1985), Long (1981), Ellis (1997) and Ellis and Shintani (2015) be understood as offering students relevant opportunities for language development.

However, in whole class teaching, the space for each interlocutor is limited, and in interaction of the type we saw here with teachers with a relaxed and sometimes withdrawn style, there is a tendency that some of the participants take a larger part of the speaking space, while others take less. There is also a tendency for several people to talk at the same time, which may be less comfortable for some students. Now, with Ellis and Shintani (2015), there is no evidence of a direct relation between an individual's amount of output and his or her language development. Some learners who do not talk much in class may develop language just as well or better than others who are more talkative in class. From the example with the student looking up "Nimsa" on his mobile, we see that students may be active participants without talking much in class. However, we see a need for teacher training on how to create more space for negotiation of meaning. As has been shown by García (2009) and Paulsrud et al. (2017), the conscious use of students' varied linguistic resources through pedagogical translanguaging is positive for language education. There is also a need for training on arranging group tasks in language education for adults that offer students a space for interaction that includes the negotiation of meaning and use of students' varied verbal resources and communicative strategies. The potential for knowledge gaps (Ellis & Shintani, 2015; Lindberg, 2004) to stimulate the negotiation of meaning was also visible here. In this context, the role of digital media, such as in this case software for communication between schools and students' mobile phones, in the language education of immigrants would also be relevant.

It would be interesting to investigate the role of teaching style in this context. The two teachers here took quite little control of classroom talk, which included not demanding students to express themselves clearly and explicitly. One dominant pattern was that students were left to negotiate meaning, which included using varied communication strategies and exercising varied roles. The teachers could have taken more active roles, such as in Example 9 where Philip could have challenged Arin to reformulate his question until Awet had understood it. With Swain (1995) we suggest that students' output in these two cases may not automatically lead to learning as neither students nor teachers seem to take notice of the words and phrases used or the communication strategies used. This stresses the importance of basing teaching on students' produced language, and that their language development needs to be made visible.

It seems reasonable to conclude that whole class interaction on its own is not enough for positive language development, but that there is also a need for group tasks. As has been shown in studies of school children (Gröning, 2006; Myklebust, 2018), collaborative work in small groups may offer students more opportunities for various forms of output and the risk is less prominent that few students dominate the talk space. As our experience from other classrooms suggests that group tasks are not frequent in SFI classrooms, there seem to be reasons for the development of teaching practices that include more frequent use of interaction in small groups. It also becomes clear that more research needs to be done on interaction in SFI classrooms and on the effects that different interactive patterns have on students' language development, as well as on the societal impact of classroom interaction.

Endnotes

¹ In the projects *Linguistic resources and digital tools in basic literacy education in SFI*, 2016, *Flexibility and increased individual adaptation in SFI-education*, 2017, and *Skriftbruk i vardagsliv och i sfi-utbildning. En studie av fem kurdiska sfi-studerandes skriftbrukshistoria och skriftpraktiker* [Literacy in Everyday Life and in the Swedish for Immigrants Programme: The Literacy History and Literacy Practices of five Kurdish L2 Learners of Swedish] 2014.

² Transcription

(Modified after Poland, 2004)

(...)	Three dots within brackets for pause between half a second and two seconds.
(pause)	The word “pause” within brackets for pause longer than two seconds.
(laughs)	Extra-linguistic information, for example that someone laughs, within brackets.
she-	Hyphen when the interlocutor is interrupted in the middle of a turn.
xx	xx for inaudible talk. Number of x:s corresponds to approximate number of inaudible words.
?	Question mark for talk with the intonation of a question.
Aron: [Dalarna	Square brackets for simultaneous talk
Chris: [Where does she live	
shu isma	Bold for talk in another language than Swedish.

References

- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. London: Sage.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). Ethnographic methods in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 153–169). Maiden, MA: Blackwell.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2018). The unit and focus of analysis in lingua franca English interactions: In search of a method. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(7), 1747–7522.
- Conteh, J., & Meier, G. (Eds). (2014). *The Multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Copland, F., & Creese, A. (2015). *Linguistic ethnography: Collecting, analysing and presenting data*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Creese, A. (2008). Linguistic Ethnography. In K. King & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed.) (pp. 229–241). New York: Springer.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2001). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Doughty, C., & Pica, T. (1986). ‘Information gap’ tasks: Do they facilitate second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(2), 305–325.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2015). *Exploring language pedagogy through Second Language Acquisition research*. London: Routledge.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Gröning, I. (2006). *Interaktion och lärande i flerspråkiga klasser* [Interaction and learning in multilingual classes]. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.
- Heller, M. (2007). *Discourses of endangerment ideology and interest in the defence of languages*. London: Continuum.
- Hornberger, N., & Johnson, D. C. (2017). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(3), 509–532.
- Lindberg, I. (2004). Samtal och interaktion: Ett andraspråksperspektiv [Conversation and interaction. A second language perspective]. In K. Hyltenstam & I. Lindberg (Eds.), *Svenska som andraspråk: I forskning, undervisning och samhälle* [Swedish as a second language: In research, education and society] (pp. 461–497). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Lindbladh, S., & Sahlström, F. (Eds.). (2001). *Interaktion i pedagogiska sammanhang* [Interaction in educational settings]. Stockholm: Liber.
- Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction and second-language acquisition. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 379, 259–278.
- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Disinventing and constituting languages: Critical inquiry in language studies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Martin-Jones, M., & Martin, D. (Eds.). (2017). *Researching multilingualism: Critical and ethnographic perspectives*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- May, S. (2014). Disciplinary divides: Knowledge construction, and the multilingual turn. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education* (pp. 7–31). New York: Routledge.
- Mykleburst, R. (2018). *Muntlighet i det flerspråkliga klasserommet: En studie av elevers samtaler på norsk i fem gruppearbeid på sjuende klassesetrinn* [Orality in the multilingual classroom: A study of students' talks in Norwegian in five group works in grade seven]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.
- Nakahama, Y., Tyler, A., & van Lier, L. (2001). Negotiation of meaning in conversational and information gap activities: A comparative discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(3), 377–405.
- Norlund Shaswar, A. (2014). *Skriftbruk i vardagsliv och i SFI-utbildning: En studie av fem kurdiska SFI-studerandes skriftbrukshistoria och skriftpraktiker* [Literacy in everyday life and in the Swedish for immigrants programme: The literacy history and literacy practices of five Kurdish L2 learners of Swedish]. Umeå: Umeå University.
- Norton, B. (2001). Non-participation, imagined communities and the language classroom. In M. P. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research* (pp. 159–171). London: Pearson Education.
- Paulsrud, B., Rosén, J. Straszer, B., & Wedin, Å. (Eds.). (2017). *New perspectives on translanguaging and education*. London: Multilingual Matters.
- Poland, B. D. (2004). Transcription quality. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns* (pp. 267–287). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Prop.2014/15:85. *Ökad individanpassning: En effektivare sfi och vuxenutbildning*. Retrieved from <http://data.riksdagen.se/fil/8FA06829-9827-42CF-9C1B-5F92BADA2964>
- Rampton, B., Tusting, K., Maybin, J., Barwell, R., Creese, A., & Lytra, V. (2004). *U.K. linguistic ethnography: A discussion paper*. Retrieved on August 28, 2018, from https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fss/organisations/lingethn/documents/discussion_paper_jan_05.pdf
- Rosén, J., & Wedin, Å. (2015). *Klassrumsinteraktion och flerspråkighet: Ett kritiskt perspektiv* [Classroom interaction and multilingualism: A critical perspective]. Stockholm: Liber.
- Sinclair, J. McH., & Coulthard, M. R. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Snell, J., Shaw, S., & Copland, F. (Eds.). (2015). *Linguistic ethnography: Interdisciplinary explorations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235–256). Rowley, Mass: Newbury House Publishers.

- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125–144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swedish Education Act 2010:800, 20 ch.2*. Stockholm: Utbildningsdepartementet.
- Thompson, P. (2008). Learning through extended talk. *Language and Education*, 22(3), 241–256.
- Vygotskij, L. S. ([1934]1999). *Tänkande och språk* [Mind and language]. Göteborg: Daidalos.
- Wedin, Å. (2004). *Literacy practices in and out of school in Karagwe: The case of primary school literacy education in rural Tanzania*. Stockholm: Centre for Research on Bilingualism, Stockholm University.
- Wedin, Å. (2011). Klassrumsinteraktion i de tidiga skolåren: Flerspråkiga elever i skolans språkliga vardag [Classroom interaction in the early school years: Multilingual students in the linguistic everyday of school]. *Nordisk Pedagogik*, 31(3), 210–225.
- Wedin, Å. (2017). Flerspråkigt skrivande: Identitet och engagemang [Multilingual writing: Identity and engagement]. *Nordisk tidskrift för andraspråksforskning*, 13(1), 45–61.
- Wedin, Å., & Norlund Shaswar, A. (submitted). Interaktionsmönster i sfi-undervisning på grundläggande nivå [Interaction patterns in SFI education on basic level].
- Wedin, Å, Rosén, J., & Hennius, S. (2018). Transspråkande multimodalitet i grundläggande skriftspråksundervisning inom sfi [Translanguaging multimodality in basic literacy education within Swedish for immigrants]. *Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige*, 23(1–2), 15–38.
- Zeichner, K. (2001). Educational action research. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 273–283). London: Sage.
- Zuber-Skerritt, O. (1996). Emancipatory action research for organizational change and management development. In O. Zuber-Skerritt (Ed.), *New directions in action research* (pp. 83–95). London: Falmer Press.

Received August 28, 2018

Revision received December 2, 2018

Accepted March 16, 2019