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ENGLISH
HEMSPRÅK
ROOM 312!!
“Words. Words. I play with words, hoping that some combination, even a chance combination, will say what I want.”
— Doris Lessing
1. Introduction

Mother tongue instruction\(^1\) (henceforth MTI; Swe. *modersmålsundervisning*) is the name of Sweden’s heritage language program, through which students who speak another language in the home are accorded the right to maintain and develop that language in school. Previously called Home Language (Swe. *Hemspråk*), MTI has existed in some form in Swedish schools since the 1960’s. Today MTI is regulated by the Education Act of 2010 (SFS, 2010:800, §7), and is included in the national curriculum for compulsory school. It is an elective subject, regulated at the municipal level, and must be requested by parents or guardians. Students who attend MTI attend publicly funded Swedish schools. Though Sweden is often thought of as a monolingual country, it is, and always has been, a place where many languages are spoken. For the school year of 2016/2017, over a quarter of all students attending Swedish compulsory schools were estimated to be eligible for MTI\(^2\) (Skolverket, 2017b) in one of over 150 languages represented by the population of Sweden (Spetz, 2014) and this number is rapidly increasing.

Little is known about MTI. Lessons are not normally included in schools’ ordinary timetable and teachers are mostly employed by the municipality, not the individual schools. In practice, many teachers are peripatetic, commuting between schools after ordinary school

---

\(^1\) MTI is also called mother tongue tuition in Swedish policy documents. I will deal with terminology in Chapter 2.

\(^2\) Estimates are based on information collected by individual schools regarding the language(s) spoken at home, which means that this percentage is based only on what schools have knowledge about (Skolverket, 2017b, p. 9)
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hours and teaching mixed-age groups. Students also frequently commute to the lessons, when they are held at another school. Many municipalities do not offer the lessons to all those who are eligible (Skolinspektionen, 2010; Spetz, 2014). In short, MTI “live[s] its own life without connection to or cooperation with other teaching” (Skolinspektionen, 2010, p. 7, translation mine; see also Skolverket, 2008; Spetz, 2014; Wirén, 2008).

Similar forms of education for immigrant and regional minority languages exist across Europe, Australia (Extra, 2009), and North America, though few enjoy the legal protection accorded to MTI in Sweden. As in Sweden, those programs are frequently a topic of debate, generating polarized positions with respect to the value and purpose of promoting the maintenance of several languages (Extra, 2009; cf. Wingstedt, 1998; Spetz; 2014). Opinions surrounding MTI in Sweden are seldom based on first-hand knowledge nor established research (Hyltenstam & Milani, 2012; Hyltenstam & Tuomela, 1996; Spetz, 2014; Wingstedt, 1998). In fact, practice-based investigations into MTI are very scarce (see Chapter 2). Most of what is known about MTI is based on policy documents, surveys and interviews.

In contrast, interaction-oriented studies of other types of bi- and multilingual language classrooms have shed new light on the dynamic connections between pedagogy and the emergent practices through which teaching and learning occur. In other words, they have shown how various aspects of teaching and learning language are achieved in and through social interaction. Similarly, this thesis uses conversation analysis (CA) to investigate the ways in which teacher and students co-construct in situ what language is topicalized in the MTI classroom as well as how.

The thesis analyzes teacher-student interaction in three English MTI classrooms. The data that forms the basis for the empirical studies and the thesis as a whole consists of video-recordings of three groups of students ranging from six to fifteen years old who attended
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the hour-long weekly lessons with the same teacher. The lessons, held at two different schools, were filmed for the duration of one semester.

The overarching aim of this thesis is to contribute to a better understanding of the practice of MTI. According to the syllabus for MTI, the aim is to help students “develop knowledge in and about the mother tongue” (Skolverket, 2017a). How is this goal approached? The empirical studies in this thesis examine different types of instructional work that is carried out in MTI, more specifically the kinds of language work that are in focus in the lessons. By language work, I mean the practices by which various aspects of the target language – in this case, English – are topicalized and transformed into objects of instruction (cf. Seedhouse, 2004; see also Sert, 2015).

The thesis specifically aims to address the following questions:

- What is being taught and how?
- How does the language work arise in classroom interaction?
- In what ways is the language work developed and by whom?
- What is the role of the local availability of two languages in the in situ accomplishment of MTI?

Outline of the thesis

After the introductory chapter (1), I will provide a framework for my thesis by reviewing literature on MTI in Sweden and heritage language education (HLE) in other settings (Chapter 2). Chapter 3 reviews studies of social interaction in other kinds of language classrooms. Following that, the theoretical and analytical framework of the thesis is discussed (Chapter 4). Thereafter, I present the setting, data and methodology of the thesis (Chapter 5). A brief summary of the studies is given in Chapter 6. I round off the first part of the thesis
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by discussing the results and implications of the studies, as well as suggestions for future research (Chapter 7).

The second part of the thesis contains the three empirical studies that provide the basis for this thesis. As the empirical corpus of this thesis shows, much of the focus of the lessons revolved around vocabulary. For this reason, the individual studies examine how different aspects of word knowledge (cf. Nation, 2013) are topicalized and taught in and through classroom interaction. Study I analyzes translation practices, study II examines the structure of whole-class spelling rounds, and study III deals with spontaneously arising vocabulary sequences.
2. Heritage Language Education

Despite its comparatively long and stable history in Sweden, MTI has repeatedly been described as occupying a marginalized position at the fringes of mainstream schooling (Hyltenstam & Tuomela, 1996; Lainio, 2001, 2013; Skolinspektionen, 2010; Skolverket, 2008; Spetz, 2014), not least by MT teachers themselves (Svensson & Torpstein, 2013). It has also been noted that understandings of what MTI is and what it entails are somewhat obscure, both in Sweden and abroad (Reath Warren, 2013, 2017; Taguma, Kim, Brink & Teltemann, 2010). The same can be said for community or heritage language educational settings elsewhere (Isurin & Ivanova-Sullivan, 2008; Kagan & Dillon, 2011; Kondo-Brown, 2005), where this type of education generally does not take place within mainstream schooling. Though the individuals who take part in heritage language education are loosely described as bilingual, HLE has been found to adopt the same type of monolingual ideological orientation common in other types of language classrooms. This monolingual norm stands in contrast with the multilingual practices that are characteristic of these types of settings.

In this chapter, I provide a framework for my study by reviewing literature on (MTI) in Sweden as well as relevant literature on heritage language education in some other countries. The chapter outlines the sociopolitical background of MTI in Sweden and changes that have occurred until the present. Following that, it examines some of the practical challenges and ideological tensions that characterize MTI, including pedagogical and language ideological beliefs expressed by
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MTI and heritage language teachers. Some tentative attempts to examine learning outcomes in MTI are also considered. The final section discusses the limited body of literature that focuses on MTI and heritage language education in practice. But first, I will briefly address terminology.

Towards a definition

A host of different terms are used to describe the various types of educational settings aimed at maintaining or developing the language(s) of immigrant-background, ethnic minority and/or indigenous groups that exist in many countries. In addition, individual terms are often defined in numerous different ways. The term heritage language originated in Canada in the 1970’s and was adopted by the United States some twenty years later (see e.g., Cummins, 2005; García, 2005; Montrul, 2009). Heritage language “has been used synonymously with community language, native language, and mother tongue” (He, 2010, p. 66, italics in original). The rise in the U.S. of the multidisciplinary field of heritage language education has given rise to the construct heritage language learner, which replaced earlier terms like bilingual or native speaker (of, e.g., Spanish, Korean; (Leeman, 2015, p. 103) and mother tongue in the U.S. context (García, 2005). In the U.K. and Australia the term community languages has a long history (see, e.g. Hornberger, 2005; Li Wei, 2006). Home language is another common term (cf. García, 2009) and was officially used in Sweden until 1996.

There is still no consensus among researchers as to the exact meaning of heritage language, heritage language speaker and heritage language learner (HLL). Definitions vary greatly depending on whether they focus on the sociopolitical status of the languages, speakers’ proficiency, or cultural ties (Duff & Li, 2009; Hornberger, 2005; Kagan & Dillon, 2008; Leeman, 2015; Montrul 2009; Polinsky & Kagan, 2007; cf. Skuttnabb-Kangas, 1981). Generally speaking,
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definitions rely on either broad or narrow criteria to define heritage language and heritage language speakers. Broad definitions emphasize cultural connections and family ties relating to the heritage language, often independently of individuals’ ability to speak the language (e.g., Fishman, 2001; Van-Deusen-Scholl, 2003). Narrow definitions, on the other hand, focus on linguistic criteria. Polinsky and Kagan (2007) define heritage language as the language that “was first in the order of acquisition but was not completely acquired because of the individual’s switch to another dominant language” (p. 369). One commonly cited definition that combines both familial and linguistic elements comes from Valdés (2001), who defined an HL speaker as “an individual raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speaks or merely understands the language, and who is to some degree bilingual in English and the heritage language” (p. 38).

Clearly, none of the definitions given above is neutral, but rather reflects the particular fields of interest of those who create them. Constructs like home language, mother tongue, first language, community language, minority languages, and immigrant languages are inherently problematic not only because they are linked to ideas about the sociopolitical status of the language, the speaker’s identity, the context in which the language is used, the order in which it was learned or to conceptions of the speakers’ proficiency in the language, but also because they carry with them an assumption of monolingual competence, which often holds the idea that language is fully acquired (or not) (cf. Block, 2003; Grosjean, 1982; Skuttnab-Kangas, 1981; Valdés, 2005). Notably, such individualistic conceptualizations of a language fail to take into account the multifaceted, emergent and situated nature of language use.

For the sake of clarity and for the purpose of identifying an institutional practice tied to a specific context, this thesis employs the term mother tongue instruction (Swedish: modersmålsundervisning, also called mother tongue tuition), in line with current Swedish policy
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documents and established literature on this particular educational setting. According to the Swedish Education Act (SFS 2010:800), students with a parent or guardian whose mother tongue is a language other than Swedish have the right to partake in mother tongue instruction, provided: 1) the student uses the language on a daily basis at home; 2) the student has basic knowledge of that language. In the present thesis, I use the terms heritage or community language education when referring to a broader context, beyond Sweden.

Mother tongue instruction in Sweden: socio-political and historical background

Mother tongue instruction first came about in the context of sweeping changes in Sweden’s immigration and education policy that took place in the late 1960’s and 70’s (SOU 1974). Increased labor migration, particularly from Finland, and expansion of the welfare state led to new approaches to dealing with the larger linguistic and cultural diversity of the population (see e.g. Borevi 2002; Cabau 2014; Garafelakis 1994; Municio 1987; Papathanasiou 1993; Sahaf 1994; Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996). The Home Language Reform (HLR) of 1977\(^4\) (Prop. 1975/76:118) put in place a comprehensive plan to promote bilingualism among all speakers of national and immigrant minority languages in Sweden. Through the HLR, municipalities received government funding which required them to offer home language instruction and study guidance in the home language (Swe: studiehandledning; help in the mother tongue with other subjects), on a voluntary basis, from compulsory school all the way to adult education to all those for whom a language besides Swedish was “a

\(^3\) Students of one of Sweden’s five national minority languages (Finnish, Yiddish, Meänkieli/Tornedal Finnish, Romani and Sami) are exempted from this rule.

\(^4\) The year 1977 was also when the term heritage language was coined in Canada in the context of launching of the “Ontario Heritage Language Programs” (Cummins, 2005, in Kagan & Dillon, 2008, p.143).
living element in the home” (Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996, p. 46, *translation mine*). The intentions of the Home Language Reform were two-fold: to help immigrant-background children succeed in school while allowing them to preserve their ethnic identity through cultural and linguistic heritage (Hyltenstam & Milani 2012, p. 61). It represented a marked shift away from Sweden’s prior assimilationist stance, e.g. towards its indigenous minority population (Cabau, 2014; Gruber, 2002; Hyltenstam & Tuomela, 1996; Hyltenstam & Milani, 2012).

As early as the 1960’s, weekend or after-school lessons in community languages such as Estonian or Finnish had been organized by minority ethnic communities themselves, similarly to the U.K. and Australia. School-based support in developing the home language had also existed on a small scale before the HLR but it was at the discretion of individual heads of schools (Hyltenstam & Tuomela, 1996, p. 44; Spetz, 2014, p. 9). The Home Language Reform entailed a requirement for compulsory and upper-secondary schools to offer home language instruction to eligible students, in cooperation with the students’ parents/guardians and based on individual needs (Hyltenstam & Tuomela, 1996, p. 45-46).

The instruction could be carried out in different ways, such as allowing students who attended ordinary classes conducted in Swedish to attend home language lessons for part of the regular school day. It also allowed for two other models of bilingual education for early years compulsory education. The first was home language classes, where students who shared the same home language were placed together and taught mainly in that language, with the percentage of teaching in Swedish increasing in successive years (though not surpassing 50%). Home language classes existed in several urban areas in Sweden with large numbers of immigrant groups, e.g. in Finnish, Turkish, Greek, Arabic, Syrian, Spanish, languages of the former Yugoslavia, during the late 1970’s and ’80’s (Hyltenstam & Milani, 2012, p. 58). By the middle of the 1980’s, over
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10% of students eligible for home language instruction attended home language classes (Hyltenstam & Tuomela, 1996, p. 54). The second option was merged classes (Swe. sammansatta klasser), in which Swedish and non-Swedish-speaking students would share the same class and receive part of their schooling in their respective languages and part together in Swedish (Hyltenstam & Tuomela, 1996, p. 47-48; see also Lainio, 2001). Home Language was introduced as a school subject in the 1980 national curriculum. The main goal was to support students’ personal development and cultural identity by strengthening the home language and promoting “active bilingualism”.

A series of political and economic changes beginning in the 1990’s greatly reduced the scope of home language instruction. I will address the practical ramifications of these changes in more detail in the following section. The decentralization of Swedish schools in 1991, from state to municipality-run schools meant that funds were no longer ear-marked for Home Language, and municipalities were given greater flexibility in the distribution of funds. Combined with the economic crisis of the 1990’s, this change led to substantial cuts in MTI. Municipalities were no longer required to provide MTI if there were fewer than five students with the same language requesting it and a “suitable” teacher was not available (SFS 2010:800 §7,10). Eligibility requirements were made more restrictive as early as 1985, from MTI being available to those for whom the language was “a living element of the home” to being limited to students who had at least one parent or guardian who spoke the language “on a daily basis” (see Skolverket, 2017a). Guidelines as to the intended length and scope of the lessons were also removed in 1997, resulting in widely varying duration of MTI lessons, anywhere from 20 to 80 minutes per week (Tuomela, 2002; see also Lainio, 2001, 2013). Furthermore, the

---

5 It was never specified what was meant by this term (Lainio, 2013, p. 84; Spetz 2014, p. 23).

6 Children who speak one of Sweden’s five national minority languages have been exempted from this and other restrictions since 2000.
original formulation of the Home Language Reform, which stated that instruction was to be offered *according to need*, was removed in 1997. MTI was increasingly scheduled after school so as not to conflict with students’ ordinary school subjects. One of the practical repercussions of the legislative changes was the creation of increasingly mixed-age and ability groups. All of the above-mentioned factors have been linked to the decrease in enrollment in MTI that took place during the 1990’s (Lainio, 2001, p. 36; Spetz, 2014, p. 10).

In 1997, home language instruction was renamed mother tongue instruction. This discursive shift was already partly visible in the 1994 curriculum. The term “home language” had long been criticized for its implication that the language was confined to the informal, domestic sphere. The more linguistically oriented term “mother tongue,” which in the past had referred to the subject Swedish, was part of a discursive shift that highlighted MTI’s value as a language learning context (Spetz, 2014). Reflecting the changing demographics in Sweden and new generations of immigrant-background children born in Sweden, the 1994 syllabus no longer pre-supposed direct ties to the parents’ country of origin. Another discursive shift that is apparent in the 1994 syllabus is emphasis on the role of the mother tongue as facilitating learning of other subjects, including Swedish. Spetz (2014, p. 27) argues that these changes mirrored a shift in the political climate that emphasized integration over the multicultural goals of the 70’s and early 80’s. They also reflect changing paradigms in bilingualism research (see Chapter 4). The role of the mother tongue as a tool for acquiring knowledge of other subjects was further highlighted in the current syllabus (Skolverket, 2011).

As stated in the introduction of this thesis, statistics from the school year of 2016/17 report that 27% of compulsory school students

---

7 Interestingly, programs in Ontario, Canada discontinued use of the term *heritage languages*, re-dubbed *international languages*, around the same period. This is also when the United States adopted the term *heritage languages*. For a critique of ‘heritage language’ in the U.S. context, see García (2005).
(275,329 students) are eligible for MTI (see Fig. 1; Skolverket, 2017b). This is a marked increase from the year 2000, when the figure was 12%. The National Agency for Education notes that these numbers only reflect the students known by individual schools to be eligible for the lessons. On average, just over half of students who are eligible for the instruction choose to enroll. Participation is much higher in urban areas than in rural communities.

![Number of students who were eligible for and who participated in MTI, 1999/00 - 2016/17](image)

*Figure 1. Number of students eligible for or who participated in MTI, 1999/01-2016/17 (Skolverket, 2017b).*

**Current challenges and tensions**

In the following sections, I discuss various kinds of challenges and tensions that have characterized MTI from its beginnings to today. These challenges are both practical and ideological and have been explored in several reports, surveys and interviews.
Organizational issues

MTI in Sweden has been and remains the most comprehensive example of heritage language education in the European context, and has garnered support across most of the political spectrum in spite of being a topic of controversy and despite shifting trends in education (see e.g. Bunar, 2010; Hyltenstam & Milani, 2012, p. 71; Reath Warren, 2017; Spetz, 2014). The right to MTI is also protected by the Education Act of 2010 (SFS 2010:800, §7) and the Ordinance for Compulsory School (SFS 2011:185). Nevertheless, discrepancies between policy and planning are a recurrent theme in the literature on MTI (see e.g. Cabau, 2014; György Ullholm, 2010; Hyltenstam & Tuomela, 1996; Hyltenstam & Milani, 2012; Municio, 1987). The encompassing changes to the educational system envisioned by the 1977 Home Language Reform required a level of preparation on the ground that proved difficult to carry out on the intended scale. Early studies carried out in the wake of the HLR showed how, in spite of huge efforts on the part of municipalities, the ambitious goals formulated by the plan were not systematically implemented in reality (Kostoulas-Makrakis, 1994; Municio, 1987). For example, Municio’s (1987) dissertation reveals a number of discrepancies between the provisions laid out by the reform and the way they were handled on the ground. For example, rather than basing home language instruction on students’ individual needs, students in the two municipalities studied were routinely given 1-2 hours of home language a week. Municio (1987) also points out that the intention to involve immigrant-background parents to a greater degree in their children’s education was not carried out in practice. Her conclusion is that individuals at various levels of municipal responsibility were simply not equipped with the necessary conditions to implement many of the aspirations formulated by the HLR.

---

8 The right to develop the mother tongue is also included in the curriculum for Swedish preschool (Skolverket, 2016).
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The lack of attention given to how the goals expressed by the HLR were to be implemented resulted in concrete, organizational problems. Many of these challenges were exacerbated by the financial cuts and policy changes made in the 1990’s, which saw a decrease in enrollment in MTI (Spetz, 2014). MTI teachers in several studies linked the decrease in participation in MTI to increased after-school scheduling of lessons as well as travel and waiting time for students, due to the need to create groups across several schools (Ajagán-Lester, 1996; Kostoulas-Makrakis, 1994; Johansson, 2000; Jonsson Lilja, 1999; see also Lainio, 2001). Some teachers suggested that only the most motivated students continue to attend MTI, rather than those who might benefit the most from the lessons (Ajagán-Lester, 1996). Teachers also expressed concern over the limited amount of lesson time in relation to curricular goals (Enström, 1984; cf. Reath Warren, 2013).

MTI’s position outside the ordinary timetable, along with the fact that it does not concern all pupils means that schools do not necessarily include the subject in their overall curricular planning (cf. Jonsson Lilja, 1999). MTI teachers, who are usually employed directly by the municipality and not by individual heads of schools, are often isolated from other categories of teachers (Skolverket, 2008). Commutes between many different schools prevent many MTI teachers from collaborating or discussing mutual students with ordinary subject teachers (cf. Jonsson Lilja, 1999; Skolverket, 2008; Spetz, 2014; Svensson & Torpstein, 2013). The precarious position of MTI can be gleaned from reports mentioning lessons taking place in classrooms ‘belonging’ to ordinary class teachers or extra classrooms lacking regular pedagogical equipment (Ajagán-Lester, 1996) or even in corridors or entrance halls (Johansson, 2000).

These findings can be linked to complementary school classrooms in the UK, where community language lessons have been organized by local ethnic communities since the late 1960’s and ’70’s (see Li Wei, 2006). The lessons often take place in the evenings or on
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Saturdays on the premises of local mainstream schools. In Martin, Bhatt, Bhojani and Creese’s (2006) study of two Gujarati complementary school settings in England, the Gujarati teachers reported experiencing the classrooms as a “borrowed space” (p. 9), both literally and figuratively, since they were unable to put any of the work the students did there on permanent display.

Clearly, the practical challenges examined in this section are interwoven with policy issues. They also have some bearing on matters of pedagogy. The next section addresses ideological tensions and language ideological positions of MT/heritage language teachers.

**Ideological tensions**

One way of understanding the challenges that have characterized MTI from the outset is in light of shifting ideological trends of the time (Hyltenstam & Milani, 2012, p. 63). Policy studies of MTI have highlighted how the pluralist aims embodied by the HLR conflicted with more conservative assimilationist societal discourses present in Sweden (Borevi, 2002; Garafelakis, 1994; Hyltenstam & Milani, 2012; Gruber, 2002; Papathanasiou, 1993. See Baker, 2011 for a description of conflicting societal views of bilingualism, i.e. as a problem, right, and resource). Paradoxically, the HLR, which was conceived as a measure to compensate immigrant background students for the loss brought about by leaving their country of origin, simultaneously conflicted with one of the Swedish educational system’s fundamental principles, namely a uniform and equitable education for all students (Spetz 2014, p. 16). In other words, the idea of treating students of immigrant background differently than others went against the notion that all students should be treated the same (see also Hyltenstam & Milani, 2012 on the historical tension between universal school and pluralistic society values).
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Lack of follow-up for the obstacles MTI has faced has given rise to sharp criticism, such as that of Hyltenstam & Tuomela (1996, p. 95) below:

The introduction of home language instruction must be understood as more of a symbolic act, within the framework of a (for the majority population) superficially understood and poorly known pluralistic ideology – something that looks good on the outside – than a step towards real pluralism.

The above quotation illustrates the symbolic value attributed MTI as an embodiment of more “incendiary issues of immigration, integration, and ethnicity” (Spetz, 2014, p. 49, *translation mine*; see also Hyltenstam & Tuomela, 1996). Conflicting popular beliefs as to MTI’s role as an instrument of integration versus a segregating practice were found to be a common topic in a study of letters to the editor of major Swedish newspapers (Wingstedt, 1998). A similar study conducted nearly twenty years later found that little had changed (Spetz, 2014). This idea is not confined to Sweden of course, and debates over multilingual and multicultural education have existed since at least the 1970’s (see, e.g., García, 2005 on changing policies in the U.S.; Li Wei, 2006, p. 79 on the role of complementary schools in the U.K. in the debate over mainstream education; see also Extra, 2009).

Conversely, studies that examine MTI teachers’ views provide a more nuanced view of the teachers’ understandings of their role and how they approach various aspects of teaching. One early study that focused on teachers’ views of the pedagogical practice of MTI was Enström’s (1984) interview study of teachers of mainly smaller language groups. A point of relevance for the teachers was the need to adapt the lessons according to individual students’ differing knowledge of the target language. Enström (1984) found varying attitudes as to the weight attributed to language goals and cultural aspects of MTI, along with differences in how much emphasis
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teachers placed on reading, writing, and grammar, compared to oral proficiency. Many teachers stressed the importance of developing students’ vocabulary. In a similar vein, Ajagán-Lester (1996) found that, in spite of different teaching styles among MTI teachers of different languages, lessons were, on the whole, student-centered. The teachers worked with vocabulary thematically and based on students’ experiences. Nygren-Junkin’s (1997) survey of Greek, Persian, Spanish, and Vietnamese students attending MTI in high-density foreign-background neighborhood highlights the positive role of MTI as a bridge between cultures. Her study found the teaching revolved in equal part around the parents’ countries of origin and about Sweden. This idea is reflected by the students in Hill (1996), who describes MTI as a “cultural freezone” (p. 82). Both studies highlight the role of MTI as a space that validates students’ diverse identities.

Another concern for many of the teachers interviewed in the Swedish studies was the availability of suitable teaching materials (e.g. Ajagán-Lester, 1996; Ekström, 1982; Kostoulas-Makrakis, 1994; Garafelakis, 1994; Sahaf, 1994). Age-appropriate materials that originate in countries where heritage languages not indigenous to Sweden are spoken may not be suitable for learners who have not attended their schooling there, since they will not have had nearly as much exposure to the heritage language in a school context as children whose primary schooling is in that language.

The relationship between the heterogeneous nature of heritage language learning groups and pedagogical considerations has been raised in literature across different national settings. For example, referring to heterogeneity within groups of heritage learners who participate in mother tongue lessons (Mutterspracheunterricht /MSU) in North Rhin Westphalia, Germany, Extra (2009, p. 183) writes the following:

These circumstances which put high demands on the teachers, who must reconcile the didactic principles of first, second and foreign language teaching. [...] MSU teachers must be well informed of the characteristics
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of their pupils and, in cooperation with the class teachers, they should shape the curriculum of the whole school.

Similar concerns regarding heritage language learners and the need for materials and pedagogies adapted to their unique needs have been raised in the literature in the United States context, where increasing numbers of adult HLLs are enrolling in college-level courses designed for foreign language learners (Carreira & Kagan 2011, p. 58; Kagan & Dillon, 2008, p. 151; Montrul, 2009, p. 195-196). However, as Leeman (2015) points out, much of the research in this area has imposed an identity “constructed largely by researchers, educators, administrators [...] rather than by heritage language learners themselves” (p. 104).

One of the most enduring and frequent topics of debate in the public arena concerning the value of MTI has been the relationship between the mother tongue/heritage language/first language and the acquisition of the majority language (Wingstedt, 1998; Spetz, 2014, p. 46-47; 52-53; see also Lainio, 2013). Opponents of MTI view time spent on developing the mother tongue as getting in the way of students’ development of Swedish, while proponents of MTI often take the position that developing the mother tongue positively affects the acquisition of the second language. Interestingly, as Spetz (2014, p. 53) points out, both positions make Swedish a central concern in the discussion of the potential value of the other language, which, she adds, is seldom referred to by name (cf. Cromdal & Evaldsson 2003). In other words, the target language of the lessons is seldom attributed any value in and of itself. The polarized public positions could be seen as reflections of paradigmatic shifts in the field of linguistics, applied linguistics and language learning (see e.g., Cromdal, 2000 on the monolingual norm informing studies of bilingualism).

The belief that participating in MTI might have a bearing on students’ acquisition of Swedish is also reflected in another part of Spetz’s (2014) report, namely in the answers of several representatives responsible for MTI in a number of municipalities,
who gave this as a reason for students or parents’ choice not to choose the lessons. By contrast, parents’ answers to the same survey did not view MTI in relation to other subjects (including Swedish); rather, they viewed MTI in terms of maintaining cultural identity and ties to extended family, as well as being beneficial to choices for future studies either in Sweden or abroad (Spetz, 2014; see also Ajagán-Lester, 1996; Kostoulas-Makrakis, 1995). In a study of Persian-speaking upper-secondary school students who had recently immigrated to Sweden, societal attitudes towards the value of maintaining the mother tongue were shown to negatively influence students’ choice to continue participation in MTI over time (Sahaf, 1994).

A recent study that focuses on pedagogical beliefs and language ideological assumptions is Gauza and Hedman’s (2015) ethnographic study of fifteen teachers of Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian and Somali MTI. The authors focus on the monoglossic ideology they argue informed the teachers’ pedagogical approach. In the interviews, conducted in Swedish, the teachers spoke favorably about the value of bilingualism, yet they tended on the whole to express the commonly held view that languages should be kept separate (cf. Creese et al., 2011, p. 1200; García, 2009; Li Wei & Wu, 2009) and therefore discouraged the use of Swedish among their students. The authors saw the MTI teachers as positioning themselves as representatives of the mother tongue which they linked to the “common heritage” they were in charge of transmitting and neglected to make use of the “cultural and linguistic hybridity of the pupils” (Ganuza & Hedman, 2015, p. 135). Despite “surface level observations of multilingual practices” (p. 1; see next section), the authors view the negative light with which the teachers framed these practices as evidence that they were not promoting translanguaging practices (Ganuza & Hedman, 2017a; cf. Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2009; García & Li Wei 2014).

This view of an essentialist relationship between linguistic competence and identity, Gauza and Hedman (2015) point out, is not
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limited to MTI but reflects the prevailing perspective in Swedish society and mainstream school. Indeed, they implicate a monoglossic ideology in the marginalization of MTI in the school system (Ganuza & Hedman 2015, p. 134). In other words they view the MTI teachers’ reproduction of such a norm as deriving in part from the peripheral status of MTI. It is a result of their “struggles for legitimacy” (Ganuza & Hedman 2015, p. 128; cf. Mercurio & Scarino, 2005).

Though Ganuza and Hedman (2017a) suggest the need to create more flexible linguistic practices in the MTI classroom, they also problematize the notion of pedagogical translanguaging in this context. As they point out, although the introduction of “purposeful pedagogical translanguaging” might be a more inclusive approach towards students from diverse backgrounds when it comes to ordinary subjects in Swedish schooling, which contain a content and language integrated element, it is difficult to fully embrace this type of pedagogy in a context devoted primarily to the development of language skills (Ganuza & Hedman, 2017a, p. 13).

The interrelatedness between MTI’s low status and its ability to meet goals is also addressed in Reath Warren’s (2013) examination of the current MTI syllabus for grades 7-9. While Reath Warren found the learning aims and assessment criteria to be internally aligned, she also argues that numerous external factors, such as MTI’s elective status, shortage of teaching materials, school personnel’s general lack of knowledge about and negative attitudes towards MTI all affect how well the MTI syllabus is able to be implemented. These structural, attitudinal and practical obstacles, Reath Warren (2013) argues, make up a “hidden curriculum” (p. 96) that negatively impacts the potential for enactment of the intended syllabus. Her conclusion is that there is a “significant gap between what the subject of mother tongue instruction aspires to do and what it is able to achieve” (p. 114).

The next section reviews what little is known about possible connections between MTI and other areas of school achievement.
2. Heritage Language Education

Outcomes

Given the polarized positions concerning the role of reinforcing the presumed mother tongue in relation to the development of Swedish, it is somewhat surprising that few attempts have been made to measure the learning outcomes of MTI. One Swedish study that looked into a possible link between MTI and outcomes in mainstream schooling was Margaret Hill’s (1996) interview study of 1st year high school students in Gothenburg. The study found a higher grade average in core subjects (Swedish, math, English) among students who had participated the longest in MTI from an early age. Those who had discontinued participation in MTI earliest had lower results than those who stopped taking MTI later on. Moreover, U.S.-based large-scale studies of bilingual educational contexts have highlighted the benefits of continuous, long-term development of the L1 (first language) alongside L2 (second language) acquisition (Thomas & Collier 1997; 2002). These studies and other well-established international research such as Cummins (1997) and García (2009) have been cited by Swedish literature promoting a more inclusive approach toward the use of languages other than Swedish in mainstream schooling (see e.g. Axelsson & Magnusson, 2012; Bunar, 2010; Nygren-Junkin, 2006; Spetz, 2014).

Mounting concern over low achievement ratings among foreign-background students prompted government-funded investigations into the ways Swedish schooling could provide a more equitable education (Skolverket, 2008; see also Wirén, 2008). Part of a 2008 quantitative study commissioned by the Swedish National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2008; Wirén, 2009) investigated the possible effects of participation in MTI on school results. The study found higher grades for foreign-background students who had participated in MTI, as compared to those who did not. The results were especially salient for those students who participated in the lessons over a longer period of time, regardless of social background. Furthermore, these students had higher overall grade point averages than their Swedish-
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background counterparts. Students who had only attended Swedish as a second language classes had lower overall grades. While the study was cautious about claiming a cause-effect result in relation to MTI participation, the results were used to renew efforts to improve schools’ handling of MTI, as reflected in the following quote from Skolverket, (2008, p. 20):

Thus far, the possible effect of participation in mother tongue tuition, apparent in the generally higher merit ratings, appears almost to be a frontal collision with the image of the tuition’s marginalised position in Swedish compulsory school.

More recently, experimental studies in Sweden have tried to pinpoint more specifically the ways MTI participation might have an impact on students’ language proficiency. For example, one such study explored possible effects of MTI on grammatical competence and overall L1 attrition⁹, particularly in light of the limited exposure provided by the weekly lessons (E. Bylund & Díaz, 2012). The results, which showed higher proficiency in the L1 in speakers who were attending MTI at the time of the study than their counterparts who did not attend the lessons, indicate that MTI might play a role in counteracting language attrition, at least in the short-term. Another study examined the development of vocabulary knowledge and reading proficiency among grade 1-6 Somali-Swedish bilingual children (Ganuza & Hedman, 2017b). Results of students who had participated in Somali MTI for at least one year at the time of testing were compared to others who had not participated in MTI. The limited amount of time allotted to MTI is also mentioned here. Of those attending MTI, a subset of students participated in a second round of testing one year later. Findings suggest a positive impact on Somali reading comprehension and a slightly weaker positive impact on

---

⁹ The authors of this study use L1 to refer to the target language of the lessons, or the (presumed) mother tongue.
students’ vocabulary development in Somali. The study also found a positive correlation on all measures with the same measures in Swedish (the language of schooling).

As the previous sections have shown, the bulk of knowledge generated about MTI has been based on policy documents, surveys, and interviews. Very few academic studies of MTI have included classroom observation as part of their research methodology (but see e.g., Ganuza & Hedman, 2015, 2017a; Municio, 1987; Reath Warren, 2013, 2017; Sahaf, 1994). As heritage language education has grown as a field, internationally, the potential contribution of classroom-based studies of teacher-student interaction has been increasingly recognized (Kagan, 2012). The next section deals with studies that focus on the practice of heritage language education.

**Heritage language education in practice**

As previously stated, studies based on classroom observations of MTI are scarce. One of these, dealt with earlier, is Ganuza and Hedman (2015, 2017a), whose study partially concerns itself with MTI teachers’ language and literacy practices. In both of these areas, they report differences between what the teachers expressed in the interviews and what the authors observed on the ground. With regard to literacy practices, the teachers stressed the importance of a balanced approach between oral skills, reading and writing. However, in their observations, the authors noted a large portion of time spent on reading, with less importance given to writing and oral fluency. The reading activities relied mainly on textbooks, in spite of teachers’ having expressed dissatisfaction with the types of textbooks available. Pronunciation, spelling, and word explanation occupied a central role in these activities. Studies of complementary schools have also pointed out the prominent place that literacy skills in the target language are assigned in those settings (He, 2004; Martin et al. 2006; Li Wei & Wu, 2009; see also Moore, 2017). Ganuza and Hedman
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(2015, 2017a) further found the lessons to be largely teacher-fronted, with few opportunities for pair/groupwork, despite teachers’ convictions in the importance of the latter. The authors suggest that the product-oriented pedagogy may be tied to have sense of having to prove the worthiness of MTI in the eyes of parents and others in the school environment.

As pertains to language norms, Ganuza and Hedman (2015) similarly found discrepancies between the positions taken by the teachers in the interviews and actual classroom practice. As discussed earlier in this chapter, the teachers in the study advocated a one-language-at-a-time approach (cf. Li Wei & Wu, 2009; see also García & Wei, 2014). Yet, frequent use of Swedish by both teachers and students was observed during the lessons. Swedish was used by participants when translating written tasks, during word explanation, or in comprehension checks (Ganuza & Hedman, 2015, p. 134). To be sure, teachers and students alike often policed each other’s use of Swedish (cf. Amir & Musk, 2014). Indeed, Ganuza and Hedman (2017a) argue that MTI teachers’ rigid attempts to control students’ choice of language contributed to “silencing students” (p. 10). Still, a variety of multilingual practices were found, such as teachers continuing to speak the target language but refraining from commenting on student use of Swedish, English or Somali (the target language). Similar patterns have been reported in other studies of HL settings (Martin et al., 2006; Creese et al., 2011; Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011) as well as in parent child interaction in bilingual families (Kheirkhah, 2016; Filipi, 2015).

The (dual) monolingual norm (see Grosjean 1982; Jørgensen & Holmen, 1997) that constitutes part of the institutional discourse of heritage language classrooms has also been addressed in studies of complementary schools in England (Creese et al., 2011; Li Wei & Wu, 2009; Li Wei, 2014b). In their comparison of four ethnographic case studies examining Gujarati, Turkish, Cantonese and Mandarin, and Bengali complementary school settings in England, Creese and
Blackledge (2011) found that the teachers in the interviews often positioned themselves as advocating an ideology of “separate bilingualism” (p. 1201). Another way this has been described is as an implicit One Language Only (OLON) or One Language at a Time (OLAT) approach (Li Wei & Wu, 2009; Li Wei, 2015; García & Li Wei, 2014).

However, despite more or less monolingual policies, classroom-based studies of heritage language settings all report a range of multilingual practices (Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2010; Creese et al., 2011; Martin et al., 2006; Li Wei, 2011, 2014, 2015; Li Wei & Wu, 2009; Wu 2001). Indeed, Creese and Blackledge (2011) argue that the ideology of separate bilingualism was “refuted in practice” (1201), and that it “was often at odds with the multilingual practices of the teachers, young people and parents, who found ways to neutralize and avoid such structures” (p. 1201). In practice, the schools were a site where “flexible bilingualism plays a part in structuring complementary schools as institutionally bilingual spaces” (Creese et al., 2011, p. 1199). This finding is in line with Martin et al. (2006) whose earlier examination of teacher-student interaction in two Gujarati complementary classrooms focuses on participants’ “bilingual interactional strategies” (p. 6). Martin et al. (2006) contest a deficit framework view of code-switching, highlighting the ways that participants “spontaneously and purposely juxtapose English and Gujarati to create learning/teaching opportunities” (p. 5). Creese and Blackledge (2011) view the “contradictory constructions of [separate and flexible] bilingualism [as] performed alongside each other in complementary schools” (p. 1197).

In many studies of heritage language classrooms across national settings, teachers express the sentiment that, not only is this a precious venue to counter-balance the omnipresence of the majority language, but also that opening the doors to increased use of the latter in the complementary/MT classroom may reinforce already existing signals about the inferior value of the heritage language (Creese et al., 2011,
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They also describe students as being already being more proficient in the majority language than in the mother tongue/community language; teachers therefore feel the need to reserve a unique space for practice of the latter (Ganuza & Hedman, 2015, p. 136; 2017a, p. 5; Li Wei, 2006, 2015; Martin et al., 2006). At the same time, the highly diverse proficiency levels (and sometimes ages) of the students mean that teachers often recognize the value in more fluid arrangements (see, e.g., Creese et al., 2011).

Using sequential analysis to closely investigate student-teacher interaction in a French complementary school in Scotland, Bonacina and Gafaranga (2011) demonstrate how the “prescribed medium of instruction” does not necessarily correspond to the actual “medium of interaction” (p. 331). Studies of other types of language classrooms have shown that the language policies are not merely uni-directionally imposed in a ‘top down’ manner (see e.g., Amir, 2013; Slotte-Lüttge, 2005; see Chapter 3). Similarly, Li Wei & Wu’s (2009) study of teacher-student interaction in a Chinese complementary school reveals how students creatively navigate between Chinese and English to challenge the school’s Chinese-language policy. The detailed transcripts show how students resist the teachers’ locally constituted, monolingual norm, and thereby “break the boundaries between the old and new, the conventional and original, and the acceptable and the challenging” (p. 193).

Martin et al. (2006) view complementary schools as a place where the ”different worlds” of the children can meet (p. 8), in contrast to mainstream school’s and (British) society’s tendency to separate children’s linguistic and cultural competencies. Similarly, Li Wei and Wu (2009) argue that “complementary schools provide a ‘safe space’ for multilingual children to practice not only their multiple identities but also their multilingual creativity” (p. 208; see also Martin et al., 2006; Li Wei, 2014a, 2015).
Practice-based investigations of identity construction in heritage and community language classrooms have contested essentialized understandings of HL learners by illuminating the dynamic and local ways that identity is constructed in interaction (Leeman, 2015; cf. He, 2004, 2010). These studies are also shedding light on students’ agency and the ways that ideological positions are continuously shaped and reshaped in interaction (cf. Lo, 2009). They supply empirical evidence for the ways that students adopt monolingual and monocultural norms pertaining to the value of varieties of the heritage language into their own discursive identity constructions (Showstack, 2012). Other studies have explored the potential of complementary schools to provide a unique environment where participants’ different types of linguistic and cultural “funds of knowledge” (Li Wei, 2014a, p. 162) provide rich opportunities for knowledge construction and developing the identities of both teacher and students in these settings (p. 186). The translanguaging practices (Li Wei, 2014b; García & Li Wei, 2014; cf. Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012) that arise in these settings can permit teachers and students to exploit the different types of knowledge and competence they bring to the heritage language classroom in new and transformative ways (Li Wei, 2014a, 2015).

**Summary**

In this chapter, I have discussed some prominent themes present in literature on MTI and community/heritage language classrooms. MTI’s long and comparatively stable placement within the national education system makes it a unique example of heritage language education. As the chapter has shown, much attention has been devoted to the socio-political dimensions of MTI and its symbolic value within differing conceptions about the role of multilingualism and cultural and ethnic diversity in society. We are also beginning to gain more knowledge about how the monolingual bias in bilingualism research that is still prevalent in mainstream education and foreign language
2. Heritage Language Education

learning (see Chapter 3) is reflected in heritage language education. Reports and surveys on MTI have awarded some insight into the numerous practical obstacles with which MTI has had to contend. In addition, studies incorporating the views of MTI teachers are further illuminating the potential ways policy, pedagogy and practical concerns intersect. Classroom observations of heritage language contexts have shown that multilingual practices are characteristic of these settings. As of yet, there is little knowledge of how different types of multilingual practices actually manifest themselves on the ground. Only a few studies of community language classrooms in the U.K. and heritage classrooms in the U.S. have examined situated language and identity-construction practices in these classrooms. In contrast to the above-mentioned literature, my interest does not lie with language choice per se; rather, I set out to gain knowledge about situated action in MTI. The present thesis aims to fill a substantial gap in knowledge about situated teacher-student interaction in MTI.
3. The Language Classroom

Introduction

As the previous chapter has shown, few studies of heritage language education – and none of mother tongue tuition in Sweden – have focused on social interaction. By contrast, socially oriented approaches to the study of various types of second, foreign, and additional language classrooms have in recent years uncovered a wealth of information on how interaction is organized in these types of educational settings and the ways that learning opportunities emerge in situ. These empirically grounded, micro-analytic inquiries have brought to the forefront the thoroughly observable, local practices by which participants deploy a multitude of verbal and embodied resources at their disposal to accomplish the interactional goals of the language classroom. This work also illustrates how elements of the language classroom such as norms of language use and focus on specific features of language that arise in the ongoing interaction are co-constructed and contingently managed by the participants.

The present chapter will therefore review interaction-oriented studies of “instructed language learning setting[s]”, often referred to under the umbrella term of L2 or language classrooms (Sert, 2015, p. 1). The findings highlighted in this chapter are part of a growing body of research that has challenged the individual-focused, cognitivist paradigm of classical Second Language Acquisition (cf. Atkinson, 2011) since the 1990’s (see, e.g., Firth and Wagner, 1997; Block,
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The substantial contribution of conversation analytic (CA) studies to the ‘social turn’ lies in part in their action orientation, which anchors the analysis in the local sequential context of talk rather than in the minds of speakers. Moreover, from a language pedagogical perspective, they refute the “landing ground perspective” (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 93) that would have pedagogical intentions – the task-as-workplan – translate directly into pedagogical outcomes (Breen, 1989). Instead, CA approaches focus on the task-in-process (Breen, 1989), or the space in between ‘input’ and ‘output’ (Williams, 2011).

The findings of this literature provide a background for the contribution of the present thesis, which applies a CA framework to the study of mother tongue tuition in Sweden. The theoretical implications of the CA approach are dealt with in more detail in chapter 4. This chapter discusses the findings of some recent interaction-based work that focuses on LA in the language classroom.

I begin by discussing the interactional organization of the language classroom and the ways that different types of instructional practices create affordances for learning. Following that, I will discuss findings of practice-based studies on policy and norms in language classroom and bilingual educational settings. The next section addresses language alternation and how participants make use of the availability of more than one language in the L2 classroom. The final sections of this chapter review both mainstream and interaction-oriented research on vocabulary teaching and learning.

Social interaction and learning in the language classroom

Teacher-student interaction can be characterized as unequal speech exchange systems (Markee 2000; see also Markee & Kunitz, 2015). This asymmetry is not something that is assumed a priori, with reference to external power structures, but rather manifested in turns
3. The Language Classroom

at talk where “differential participation rights and obligations” are made visible through participants’ behavior (McHoul, 1978, p. 211). For example, research across several paradigms has long been interested in the most basic structure of classroom turn-taking involving the three-part sequence known as the triadic dialogue or Initiation-Response-Evaluation (or Feedback) structure (IRE/F; Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard 1975). Over the past twenty years or so, ethnomethodological conversation analytic (EM/CA) studies have added much-needed nuance to views of the IRE/F structure, demonstrating for example that the third-position feedback turn may perform a far greater range of actions than simply confirming or repairing a student answer to a known question. Lee (2007), for example, shows how the third turn responds to a variety of local contingencies of the immediate preceding turn, propelling the interaction forward.

In his extensive examination of English as a Second Language (ESL) education across a wide range of national settings, Seedhouse (2004) describes the “interactional architecture of the language classroom,” i.e. the organization of turn-taking and sequence in the language classroom. Seedhouse (2004) illuminates how the core goal of the language classroom, which is that “the teacher will teach the learners the L2” (p.183) is accomplished on a turn-by-turn basis, in much more complex and dynamic ways than the static IRE/F structure suggests. The first fundamental principle that derives from the core goal of the language classroom regards the dual role of language, which is “[b]oth the vehicle and the object of instruction” (Long, 1983, p. 9), i.e. it is both “process and product” (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 184). The dual role of language in the language classroom is responsible for the second interactional property, which is the reflexive relationship that exists between pedagogy and interaction. The organization of interaction will vary depending on the type of pedagogical activity taking place, since participants display their analysis of the evolving pedagogical focus in their turns at talk.
Seedhouse (2004) thus argues that sequential patterns and turn-taking differ depending on whether they take place in a form-and-accuracy, meaning-and-fluency, task-oriented tasks or procedural contexts (p.102). The third interactional property that derives from the core institutional goal of the language classroom is that “all learner utterances are potentially subject to evaluation by the teacher” (Seedhouse, 2005, p. 2, italics in original). This does not mean that everything students say in the classroom will receive explicit verbal feedback; however, this property highlights the normative character of classroom interaction as well as the differing epistemic rights and responsibilities that reside therein (cf. Heritage, xxxx).

Respecifying the triadic or three-part IRE/F structure as a series of adjacency pairs (see Ch. 4), CA research has devoted much attention to question-answer sequences, since they are central to carrying out the goal-oriented work of the language classroom (Markee, 2000; Sert, 2015). In a traditional classroom structure, much of the interaction is teacher-fronted and it is the teacher who is mainly in charge of the topic of talk (Markee, 2000). Indeed, Walsh (2006) has claimed that the teacher’s role is particularly strong in the language classroom, in spite of communicative or task-based pedagogies that advocate greater student involvement. Teacher questions may be designed to create learning opportunities, as in the case of Designedly Incomplete Utterances (DIUs), which target trouble sources and may serve to provide hints and elicit self-correction from students (Koshik, 2002). Learning opportunities may also arise out of teacher feedback, which creates zones of interactional transition (Markee, 2004), important sites for displaying the transformation of task-as-workplan into task-in-process (Seedhouse, 2004; cf. Breen, 1987, 1989; Coughlin & Duff, 1994). Interactional shifts are also achieved as students begin and end tasks (Hellerman, 2007; 2008; Hellerman & Cole, 2008). Other studies have focused on learner initiatives and the ways in which teacher management of student contributions either shuts down interaction (Waring, 2008, 2012a), or involves the entire
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cohort (St John & Cromdal, 2016), such as through teacher counter-
questions that build on individual student contributions (Markee,
1995; see also Payne & Hustler, 1980). The traditional asymmetry of
the IRE sequence may however be overturned and student agency
demonstrated when students contest teacher activity shifts and take
control of the first turn in post-expansion sequences (Schegloff,
2007), as shown in Jacknick’s (2011) study of ESL classrooms.

Students’ nonverbal signals of interactional trouble, such as long
pauses or withdrawal of gaze following teacher questions, may be
oriented to verbally by teachers through epistemic status checks
(ESCs, e.g. ‘you don’t know?’, Sert, 2013; see also Waring, 2012b).
Similarly, Sert & Walsh (2013) have analyzed the interactional
unfolding of students’ verbal or embodied claims of insufficient
knowledge (CIKs) and the ways the claims are managed, most often
by allocating the turn to another student rather than providing an
answer directly.

Student turns may thus be analyzed as ways of handling or
displaying knowledge states and hence learning (Jakonen, 2014).
They are also the site for the emergence of “instructibly achievable
phenomena” that become subject of temporary pedagogical focus
(Majlesi 2014, p. 17). Majlesi’s (2014) study of interaction among
adult learners of Swedish as a second language and their teachers,
explored how verbal, tactile, gestural or material objects emerge as
“learnables” (Majlesi & Broth, 2012; Majlesi & Broth 2014) during
on or off-task activities. Crucially, a learnable in this sense is not
conceived of as a premeditated, individual, cognitive phenomenon but
rather as observable behavior that is “brought into being in that
activity” (Majlesi, 2014, p. 19).

Participation (Goffman, 1961; M. H. Goodwin, 1999) is a key
concept in social approaches to classroom research, since it is closely
related to the idea of learner involvement in the interaction and hence,
the creation of learning opportunities (see, e.g., Kasper & Wagner
2011). Indeed, L2 competence may be conceptualized as the “ability
to participate using the L2” (Hellerman & Lee, 2014, p. 58). EM/CA approaches examine participation in relation to the social organization of the classroom (cf. Mehan, 1979) as it is constructed on a moment-to-moment basis. Mortensen (2008), for example, examines the role of teacher instructions in adult Danish as second language classrooms, showing that different ways of organizing the interaction facilitate different types of student participation. The public nature of teacher-student interaction creates a specific type of participation structure in the classroom, which is always potentially a “multilogue” (Schwab, 2011). Schwab suggests that meaning-and-fluency contexts may be particularly conducive to learner involvement (see also Seedhouse, 2004). This is closely related to the notion of classroom interactional competence (CIC), which Walsh (2011) defines as “teachers’ and learners’ ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning” (p. 158). According to Walsh (2012), teachers can provide interactional space for learners by, for example, allowing more time for learners to respond or through the ways in which they respond to, or shape, learner contributions (see also Can Daşkin, 2015).

Language learning may thus be conceptualized as “the development of interactional skills, and interactional resources” (Brouwer & Wagner, 2004, p. 32). This is an inherently social process which is far from traditional Second Language Acquisition (SLA) models of ‘ideal’ input leading to discrete forms of output (Seedhouse, 2005, p. 175). Participants in the classroom make use of a range of verbal and multimodal resources to accomplish interactional goals. Some studies have examined young learners’ L2 interactive competence through playful language use (Cekaite & Aronsson, 2005, 2014). Others have focused on how adult learners use language play to challenge norms of acceptable language use in the classroom (Pomerantz & Bell, 2007; Waring, 2013).

Reflecting the wider trend among interaction studies focusing on a broad range of modalities aside from verbal interaction, studies of L2 classrooms are increasingly attending to the embeddedness of gaze,
gesture, the use of artifacts and other types of embodied behavior (e.g. Belhiah, 2013; Majlesi, 2014, 2018; Majlesi & Broth, 2012; Mori & Hayashi, 2006; Mortensen, 2008, 2009; St John & Cromdal, 2016). Multimodal resources have also been examined in studies of Content and Language Integrated Learning classrooms (CLIL; see e.g. Kääntä 2010; Morton 2015). These studies have demonstrated the finely-tuned coordination between talk and multimodal resources in the joint accomplishment of interactional tasks in the L2 classroom that have been largely ignored by cognitively oriented SLA studies (Lazaraton, 2004; Sert, 2015. See also section 3.5.2). The analyses highlight the complexity of classroom interaction, showing that multimodal practices such as, e.g., gaze, pointing and other hand gestures, nodding, whole-body enactment, use of the whiteboard are intricately interwoven with central aspects of the classroom such as turn allocation, directing attention, explaining, signaling willingness to participate or epistemic states.

Lastly, some studies investigate learning as a phenomenon that involves change over time, via longitudinal data. This may involve the observation of changing participation roles, such as Cekaite (2007), which shows how the participation roles of a seven-year-old Kurdish girl attending a preschool in Sweden evolved over the course of the school year. Others have longitudinally examined engagements and disengagements from dyadic task interactions (Hellerman, 2008) or displays of understanding of a single word over several days, as in Slotte-Lütte, Pörn and Sahlström’s (2013) study of a multilingual 7-year-old girl attending a Swedish language preschool class in Finland. Kunitz & Skogmyr Marian (2017) use learning behavior tracking (LBT; see Markee, 2008) to track a group of Swedish 7th grade EFL students’ epistemic orientations toward the spelling of the word “disgusting” through several stages of preparation and execution of an oral presentation and subsequent written assignment. Central to all the studies reviewed in this section is the emphasis on meaning as co-constructed rather than in terms of individual performance.
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Language policy and norms

In addition to dealing with participation frameworks and learning in classroom activities, analyses of interaction in the language classroom have focused on policy and language use, in particular on the relationship and tensions between policy and practice in minority language contexts (e.g. Heller 2007; Martin 2005; Musk 2006). Chapter 2 discussed matters of policy and practice in MTI and heritage language settings. This section briefly reviews similar types of issues in the literature on language classrooms or bilingual educational settings. Among this work, recent studies have moved away from the policy-practice dichotomy, instead examining practiced language policy, i.e. policies as they emerge in actual language use (Bonacina, 2010; Bonacina-Pugh, 2012; see also Papageorgiou, 2009). Amir’s (2013) study of micro-level policy-in-process in a grade 8 and 9 EFL classroom in Sweden, shows how teacher and students uphold an English-only policy in the classroom. That study found that policing was used by both teacher and students (Amir & Musk, 2013), that students also policed themselves (Amir, 2013), the teacher, and each other (Amir & Musk, 2014). Other studies have shown that language policy emerging at the practice level need not manifest itself as explicitly as in the case of policing. It may be seen in the tension created between the official language policy and teachers’ less restrictive pedagogical ideas supporting children’s free-play at recess times, as in Papageorgiou’s (2009, 2011) investigation of interaction between children and their teachers in an English-medium preschool in Greece.

10 For a more theoretically-driven classroom-based study of a similar type of setting, see Martín-Bylund (2017), which explores the material-semiotic tensions involved in maintaining a one-person-one-language policy in the course of
An important finding of practice-based studies of policy and language use is that policy is not necessarily something that is uni-directionally imposed ‘from above’ (cf. Cromdal & Evaldsson, 2003). As demonstrated in Bonacina and Gafaranga (2011)’s study of a French complementary school classroom (see chapter 2), the policy-prescribed monolingual medium does not automatically correspond to what participants in interaction do; nor are deviations from the prescribed policy always oriented to as deviant. In other words, participants may choose to employ a bilingual medium (see chapter 4 for a discussion of this term) to carry out the task at hand (see also Huq, 2018). Slotte-Lüttge’s (2005, 2007) study of 7 to 9-year-old students in a Swedish-speaking school in Finland shows how students and teacher jointly construct and maintain a monolingual classroom discourse. Students and teacher orient to the use of Finnish as dispreferred through various types of repair work such as avoiding its use or signaling the other-languageness of occasional code-switches. Slotte-Lüttge (2005; 2007) also highlights the role played by the locally constructed monolingual norm for linguistic identities and learning opportunities in the classroom. In Jakonen (2016), 14 to 15-year-old Finnish EFL students maintain “multiple norms” by neither fully aligning with nor openly contesting the teacher’s invocation of a local target language only rule. In this way, a monolingual norm of appropriate classroom conduct is continuously negotiated, co-constructed and reproduced through the participants’ behavior.

**Classroom code-switching and language alternation**

everyday activities such as playing a board game (Martín-Bylund, 2018) at a Spanish-Swedish bilingual-profile preschool in Sweden.
Building on pioneering work on bilingual talk in mundane settings (e.g. Auer, 1984; Gafaranga, 2000, 2005; Gafaranga & Torras, 2002; Grosjean, 1982; see ch. 4), interaction-oriented studies of code-switching (CS) and language alternation\(^1\) (LA) in multilingual educational settings have rapidly expanded over the past decades (see Cromdal, 2000; Jørgensen & Holmen, 1997; Li Wei, 1994; Musk, 2006 for some early examples). Recent work on language classrooms has provided long-overdue practice-based understandings of the many ways that both teacher and student language alternation contribute to joint meaning-making in these types of settings. For example, by explicating the ways that language alternation unfolds in the language classroom, the studies foreground the interactional work that the use of more than one language accomplishes in terms of organizing talk, aligning with the pedagogical focus, displaying or scaffolding understanding of the target language of instruction.

The role and place of the L1 (first language) in the L2 classroom has historically been a contentious topic in second and foreign language teaching (see, e.g., Martin-Jones, 1995; Mori, 2004; Üstünel, 2016). Second and foreign language pedagogy has long been informed by cognitivist research promoting maximal L2 input while keeping the presence of the L1 at a minimum. Code-switching in this view is at best “unfortunate and regrettable but necessary” (Macaro, 2005, p. 68). Categorical exclusion of learners’ L1 has been increasingly challenged on ideological (Canagarajah, 1995; Pennycook, 1999) as well as theoretical and pragmatic (Cook, 2001; see also Cummins, 2007) grounds. Furthermore, increasing awareness of English as a global means of communication has entailed less focus on producing ‘native-like’ (monolingual) speakers (Canagarajah, 2006; cf. Ur, 2012).

Policy matters notwithstanding and as discussed in the previous section, language alternation is, *de facto*, a frequent occurrence in the

\(^{1}\) See chapter 4 for a clarification of these two terms from an interactional perspective.
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language classroom (Baker, 2009; Cook, 2001; Üstünel, 2016). CA’s emic approach (see Ch. 4) anchors its analysis in the local organization of participants’ actions. Language alternation is thereby viewed as one of many verbal and multimodal resources used by speakers in the language classroom to achieve communicative tasks. It is also a site for transition spaces, or shifts, through which participants contingently manage emerging interactional problems (Filipi & Markee, 2018). For example, learners may demonstrate their interactional competence by using LA as a resource for problem-solving, as when students switch to the L1 to perform repair or display candidate understandings of a task (Lehti Eklund, 2012).

LA may also be used as a way of organizing interaction between speakers. For example, Mori (2004) shows how intermediate learners of Japanese as a foreign language carrying out an oral activity in pairs temporarily suspend the task and switch to L1 to search for suitable words in the target language. On the other hand, Kasper’s (2004) analysis of a conversation for learning between a beginning college student of German as a foreign language and a native speaker of German shows how LA may function both as a resource to propel the conversation forward or to invoke the situated identities of novice and expert. Importantly, however, other CA studies have demonstrated that not all instances of the use of more than one language or language variety among speakers are oriented to by the speakers themselves as instances of language alternation (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002; for studies of peer interaction in an educational setting, see Cromdal, 2005; Kunitz, 2013).

Another way of viewing LA in teacher-student interaction is in terms of alignment or disalignment with the pedagogical focus. For example, some studies have focused on student-initiated LA in response to e.g. teacher questions (Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain, 2005; Ziegler, Sert & Durus, 2012; see also Huq, Cromdal & Barajas, 2017). Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) examine teacher-student CS in relation to pedagogical focus in an EFL classroom at a Turkish university (see
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also Üstünel, 2004; Üstünel, 2016). Rephrasing CA’s sequential device – “Why that now?” – to focus on language choice, the authors ask “Why that, in that language, now?” (p. 310). Their focus is on teacher-initiated CS, e.g., when the teacher uses Turkish to clarify an item for students or in response to lack of uptake by students. They also examine what they call teacher-induced CS, defined as instances when the teacher uses one language (the L1 or L2) in an effort to elicit an item in the other language from students. Building on the conversation analytic concept of preference (Auer, 1984; Heritage, 1984; Seedhouse, 2004; see Ch. 4) and relating it to pedagogical focus, the analysis demonstrates that the L2 is not always the preferred language in the L2 classroom. Expanding on Ferguson’s (2003) sociolinguistic categories, Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) identify several functions of teacher and students’ CS (see also Waer, 2012). The most frequent of these fall under the heading *CS for curriculum access*, which includes topic shifts within a task or use of the L1 to aid understanding or to provide a prompt for L2 use. They also found examples of teacher-initiated CS for dealing with procedural trouble, such as comprehension checks or to elicit translations in the L1 or L2. Other categories that are briefly addressed are *CS for classroom management discourse*, to signal ‘off-task’ matters (cf. Canagarajah, 1995; Lin, 1996) and *CS for interpersonal relations*, as when teachers use the L1 to minimize perceived distance with students.

Building on the notion of label quests (Heath, 1986) and bilingual label quests (Martin et al., 2006), Bonacina-Pugh (2013) examines the possibilities of these types of vocabulary naming exercises in multilingual classrooms where the teacher does not have access to the students’ languages. Her sequential analysis demonstrates the productive use by the teacher of *multilingual label quests* to draw on students’ L1 repertoires in the French compulsory school induction classrooms (cf. Creese & Blackledge, 2010). Finally, St John’s (2010) investigation of LA during French lessons at a compulsory school in Sweden demonstrates how teacher use of the L1 scaffolds sense-
making when students encounter a problematic lexical item in the L2. St John also argues that the use of both languages not only clarifies lexical items in the target language but also potentially affords new understandings of both languages, in relation to each other, a process he terms “lexical interillumination” (cf. A. Bylund & Björk-Willén, 2015).

**Vocabulary**

Though grammar and syntax have historically made up the foundation for most teaching curricula, the central role of the lexical dimension for language learning has been confirmed by researchers and practitioners alike (Laufer & Nation, 2013; Webb & Nation, 2017; Ur, 2012). As Webb & Nation (2017) put it: “Words are the building blocks of language” (p. 5). The MTI classes examined in this thesis are no exception and, as the empirical studies demonstrate, a wealth of various vocabulary-oriented practices were found in the data. The current section offers a compact review of research on vocabulary teaching and learning. I begin by outlining some of the central themes and findings of cognitively oriented research that has informed the literature on second and foreign language vocabulary acquisition and teaching. The next section discusses the ways that practice-based, interaction-oriented studies are contributing to understandings of how planned and unplanned vocabulary teaching and learning arise and play out on the classroom floor.

**Cognitivist perspectives on vocabulary teaching and learning**

Vocabulary research has seen a rapid expansion since the 1990’s.\(^\text{12}\) Like most linguistic and psycholinguistic research, cognitivist

---

\(^{12}\) Nation (2013) estimates that 30% of vocabulary research from the last one hundred years has been produced since 2001, making one fifth of the information presented in the second edition of his book (which first came out in 2001) new (p. 5).
investigations into vocabulary learning view lexical acquisition as an individual, mental process. Put simply, the aim is to measure what words individual (monolingual/‘native’) speakers of a language know, how this knowledge is acquired and therefore how it should be taught. The focus is therefore on strategies for incorporating planned vocabulary teaching into curriculum design.

There is a separate section devoted to vocabulary in most course books for English language teachers (see e.g. Ur, 2012; Lightbown & Spada, 2013; O’Keefe, 2012) and it is often remarked that while mistakes in grammar and syntax do not usually lead to a breakdown in communication, a lack of words or use of the wrong word may significantly affect one’s ability to understand or convey a message (Barcroft, 2018; Lightbown & Spada, 2013; O’Keefe, 2012; Webb & Nation, 2017; Ur, 2012). Vocabulary knowledge runs across each of the four skills of language learning (reading, writing, speaking, listening; cf. Nation, 2013). However, in spite of the prolific amount of recent research, there is still a great deal of dissensus in the field concerning what learners need to know and how vocabulary is best acquired and hence, taught (Lee, Tan & Pandian, 2012; Nation, 2013; Webb & Nation, 2017).

One area of research concerns mapping out the lexicon, defined as “a vast network in the individual’s mind/brain” (Barcroft, 2018, p. 2) containing all the words, word parts, lexical phrases that a (monolingual) speaker is thought to possess. Finding adequate ways to measure vocabulary size is key to understanding what learners need to know (Nation, 2005), including how many ‘words’ learners of a second language know and how this amount differs from the lexicon of L1 speakers (Laufer, 1998). However, Nation and Anthony (2016) note that there has been “considerable disagreement” concerning the vocabulary size of ‘native’ speakers of English (p. 356). They argue that vocabulary size is “one of the most poorly researched areas of applied linguistics” (p. 356), owing in particular to the numerous methodological challenges involved. For one thing, estimates depend
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... on what is being measured, i.e. how words are delimited and grouped. For example, measuring in terms of word types, lemmas or word families all result in varying estimates of receptive vocabulary size (Webb & Nation, 2017, p. 44; Nation and Anthony, 2016). The second methodological problem has to do with how vocabulary knowledge is measured, i.e. through various types of written and oral tests, which rely on the above-mentioned measures of vocabulary size and frequency. (See Nation & Anthony, 2016, for a critical review of commonly used tests of receptive vocabulary size). Moreover, we still have very little knowledge of how speakers use vocabulary knowledge, since reliable measurements of productive vocabulary constitute a far greater methodological challenge than tests of receptive ability (Nation & Anthony, 2016, p. 359; see also Laufer & Nation, 2011).

Another area that is poorly understood is L2 vocabulary growth and the ways in which L2 learners acquire new lexical knowledge (Nation 2013, p. 4; Webb & Nation 2017, p. 46). The L1 speakers’ knowledge is conceived of as being acquired through repeated exposure over time in mainly ‘naturalistic’ settings (Barcroft, 2018; cf. Krashen, 1982). L2 learners are faced with the challenge of acquiring this ‘implicit’ knowledge with far less time and exposure than children who acquire a first language, through ‘explicit’ learning via ‘conscious’ attention to, or ‘noticing,’ what is being learned (Ellis, 1994; Schmidt, 2000). From the 1970’s, communicative approaches to language teaching have sought to emulate native-like conditions for learning promoting learner-centered interaction via task-based instruction (Ur 2012, p. 8). Modeled on L1 acquisition, communicative approaches tend towards maximizing exposure to the target language (the L2) and consequently leaving little room for learners’ L1. Emphasis is thus on providing comprehensible input (through e.g. listening and reading) via modified interaction in meaning-centered activities (Long, 1983). Other research suggests that incidental learning is insufficient for L2 vocabulary growth and argues for the inclusion of more ‘deliberate’
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elements of vocabulary teaching (Nation, 2013; Ur, 2012, p. 9). Form-focused instruction (FFI), which involves active attempts to “draw learners’ attention to specific linguistic items” (Loewen, 2011, p. 577; cf. Laufer, 2010) within the course of other activities, is viewed as a complement to communicative approaches and may facilitate vocabulary learning, particularly when combined with L1 code-switching or translation (Laufer & Girsai, 2008, p. 709; Tian & Macaro, 2012). This hypothesis-based research is strongly product-oriented in its conception of language acquisition. It is a ‘task-as-workplan’ (Seedhouse, 2004) orientation that informs teaching methodologies and strategies involving vocabulary, though it has little to say about how this work is interactionally achieved (cf. Morton, 2015; Seedhouse, 2004, p. 249-251).

Part of the complexity involved in vocabulary teaching strategies involves the choice of which words to teach. Frequency is one measure that is used to determine the relative importance of which words will provide learners with the most effective entryway into the language (Nation, 2005, 2013). Vocabulary knowledge, however, is much more complex than acquiring ‘words’ (Nation, 2005, p. 594; Ur, 2012, p. 60). Words can be combined in ways that amount to more than the sum of their parts. In other words, there are many dimensions of word knowledge and hence many “degrees of knowing” a word (Nation, 2013, p. 44). Receptive knowledge involves basic recognition of spoken and written form and meaning, as acquired (mainly) through listening and reading ‘input’. Productive knowledge, linked to learner ‘output’ is required for speaking and writing. Nation (2013) divides word knowledge into three sub-categories: 1) form, 2) meaning, 3) use. Form includes pronunciation, spelling and morphology; meaning is partly derived from form, but also includes the multitude of concepts and referents connected with one word as well as associations with other words. Finally, use includes grammatical functions and patterns, collocations (what words commonly occur together with a word) and constraints on use, which
has to do with context, i.e. the pragmatic dimension of vocabulary. He argues that the challenge with deliberate teaching of vocabulary lies not only in delimiting the amount of words that can be dealt with at any given time but also in the decision of which aspects to include or to leave out so that learners will most effectively retain the information. The difficulty of learning a word – its “learning burden” (Nation, 2013) will therefore in part depend on these aspects and which of them a learner is expected to know. Furthermore, it will depend on whether any of them are regular or related to other words in the L2 the learner already knows. Lastly, L2 vocabulary acquisition is sometimes considered in relation to forms, meanings and use in students’ L1.

Interaction-oriented studies of vocabulary

As the previous section has shown, cognitivist approaches to teaching and learning vocabulary frame learning as occurring within the individual and consequently focus on course design, and planned vocabulary teaching in particular. However, in spite of an increase in the volume of vocabulary research and agreement as to the importance of lexical components of curricula, there is still a significant gap in our understanding of how vocabulary teaching and learning actually plays out in the complex dynamic of the classroom floor (Waring, Creider & Box, 2013; see also Huq et al., 2017). How are abstract concepts like “comprehensible input”, “negotiation for meaning” (Long, 1983; Swain & Lapkin, 1998) and “meaningful encounters with words” (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p. 62) enacted and displayed on a turn-by-turn basis in practice? Empirical studies of word searches in non-classroom settings have been followed by a handful of recent investigations of planned and unplanned vocabulary explanations as they arise in vivo in the classroom.

Early interaction-oriented examinations of word searches in native speaker talk (M. Goodwin, 1983; M. Goodwin & C. Goodwin, 1986)
examined the verbal and embodied practices used by speakers when they initiate repair and interrupt their own ongoing turns to search for a lexical item. Studies of ordinary conversations and conversations for learning between novice and expert speakers of a language have examined how word searches are conducted and how vocabulary learning opportunities are created in these types of conversations (Brouwer, 2003; Jung, 2004; Kim, 2012; Koshik and Seo, 2012). The findings show, for example, how L2 speakers orient to their L1 partners as ‘experts’ by carrying out word searches (Brouwer, 2003; Kim, 2012) or by initiating repair when faced with production problems, such as by asking ‘How can I say (X)?’ (Jung, 2004; see also Kasper, 2004). Koshik and Seo (2012) show how L2 speakers orient not only to the production of a lexical item when performing word searches but alternatively to aspects such as correct form, syntactic construction or pronunciation. They also note the prosodic and verbal cues L2 speakers use when presenting candidate solutions. In Brouwer’s (2004) study, L2 speakers orient to pronunciation difficulties by producing an item with raised final pitch.

While the aforementioned work mainly address the learners’ searches for a specific word, others have investigated teacher explanations in subject-based classroom environments, such as Koole’s (2010) study of math lessons in Dutch secondary schools. Koole found two main types of teacher explanation: “discourse unit,” in which the teacher offers the explanation directly to students and “dialog” which involves students in lengthier question–answer sequences. A growing number of valuable contributions focusing on vocabulary explanations are being carried out in content and language integrated learning contexts (CLIL). These studies have examined the ways that teachers navigate between teaching subject-specific ‘content’ and form-focused aspects of language (Morton, 2015), as well as illuminating the ways teachers of, e.g., science-related subjects engage in multilingual and multimodal definitional practices as an integral part of their orientation to the specific subject content
One early example of a study conducted in a language classroom is Chaudron’s (1982) examination of techniques and strategies used by ESL teachers in vocabulary ‘elaborations’, such as paraphrasing, defining, exemplifying and naming. Chaudron (1982) notes, for example, that teachers generally produce slightly longer pauses surrounding problematic vocabulary items. As with other aspects of learning, “vocabulary is embedded in specific conversational contexts” (Markee, 2000, p. 118). Furthermore, vocabulary work is not always fronted by the teacher. Markee’s (2000) single-case study examines definitions provided by ESL students involved in peer group discussions, explicating how the students displayed their understanding of a single lexical item.

In the language classroom, language-related aspects such as vocabulary are always subject to becoming topicalized as the focus of temporary teaching sequences (Mortensen 2011). Mortensen’s (2011) study of an adult Danish as a second language classroom examines the emergent nature of “doing word explanation” (p. 136) through close analysis of the sequential environments in which this type of activity takes place. The study shows how the teacher draws students’ attention to lexical items that are extracted in the course of larger meaning-focused activities through a range of prosodic and verbal cues and visual resources such as the blackboard. Mortensen (2011) also shows how students align with the pedagogical focus (cf. Seedhouse, 2004) by repeating the highlighted item and offering a word explanation following the teacher’s request. Waring, Creider, and Box’s (2013) study of an intermediate adult ESL class found a slightly more elaborate pattern of interaction than Mortensen (2011), in that the teacher sets a word in focus (verbally or multimodally) and then uses an “analytic” (verbal) or “animated” (embodied) (p. 251) approach to contextualize the item as part of the explanation sequence. The explanation sequence also involved engaging students by inviting
or offering explanations. The sequence was then closed via repetition of the word or by summarizing the information that had been made relevant.

In cases where students and teacher share more than one language, the ‘other’ language may be drawn upon as one such available resource (cf. Huq et al., 2017). Topicalizing lexical items in two co-available languages potentially affords more than just a convenient tool for maintaining intersubjectivity (cf. Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005; Üstünel, 2016). As St John (2010) shows, it may also allow learners “to fit an alien or difficult utterance meaningfully into their semantic networks where they can orient to it” (p. 215). Importantly, the micro-analytic investigation of these types of sequences provides valuable clues as to how such work unfolds, on a turn-by-turn basis.

One of the first studies to focus on the role of embodiment during unplanned vocabulary explanations is Lazaraton (2004), whose case study of one ESL teacher highlights how the teacher deploys hand gestures and full body enactments alongside her use of verbal resources as part of her “pedagogical repertoire” (p. 107). Recent work in a variety of L2 classroom settings has made use of detailed multimodal transcriptions to examine more closely the fine-tuned coordination of talk and multimodal practices in the enactment of vocabulary work. These studies have demonstrated how teachers use embodied resources such as recycling students’ gestures to highlight trouble sources and explain vocabulary (Majlesi, 2015) how gesture and gaze perform several functions that support meaning-making and form an integral part of definition work (Belhiah, 2013) or that co-participants’ use of gestures linked to specific lexical items evolve over time (Eskildsen & Wagner, 2015).

Waring, Box, and Creider (2016) further explore the unfolding of unplanned vocabulary-oriented sequences, focusing in particular on how teachers topicalize lexical items that arise within the course of larger sequences. According to the authors, items may be problematized either unilaterally or bilaterally. The former refers to
cases where the teacher selects an item as the focus of a vocabulary explanation sequence in the absence of student displays of trouble surrounding the item, such as when the teacher asks students “you know what x is?” (ibid. p. 92). “Bilateral problematizing” is when an item becomes the topic of a teacher-initiated vocabulary sequence following some type of display of learner difficulty. This category covers a wide range of displays of trouble, such as pronunciation difficulty, producing the incorrect form or use of a word, or displays of trouble producing a word.

A few studies in language classroom settings have directed their focus towards pair/group writing tasks and problems of spelling. For example, Cekaite (2009) and Musk (2016) have examined students’ joint management of spelling problems during collaborative writing on the computer. Skogmyr Marian’s (2014) study of a 7th grade English classroom in Sweden explores how students orient to spelling problems during a group word-labeling activity. Using multimodal analysis, the author demonstrates how students either treat lexical items as problematic before writing, or jointly correct spelling after writing items. The study also illuminates students’ negotiation of epistemic rights and responsibilities in relation to the task at hand. Spelling issues are approached by students in numerous ways, such as sounding out words or word parts, sometimes with the aid of Swedish phonics (Skogmyr Marian, 2014, p. 33). The findings suggest that students treat spelling as an important form-focused element of the collaborative task, which Skogmyr Marian (2014) argues stands in contrast with previous literature showing a general lack of attention given to spelling by teachers in Sweden (Längsjö & Nilsson, 2005). Students’ projected or retrospective orientations to spelling trouble are also illustrated in Cromdal’s (2005) study of a collaborative writing task by bilingual Swedish-English 4th graders at a Swedish school, where the two participants establish a local “division of labour” (p. 344) between the two shared languages to inform their work which, besides typing, involved dictating and negotiating content as well as
form of their written report. Finally, Kunitz & Skogmyr Marian (2017) track students’ spelling of a problematic lexical item throughout various phases of group oral and written task preparation.

Summary

In the above literature review, I have discussed some prominent themes and findings of interaction-oriented research on various types of second and foreign language classrooms. In contrast to the individual, cognitivist and product-oriented focus of classical SLA research, these studies illuminate the emergent processes of teaching and learning and how they are jointly achieved through social interaction. The findings provide an empirically grounded outlook on how various aspects of verbal and multimodal ‘input’ and ‘output’ in the language classroom, such as turn allocation, participation frameworks, language norms and language alternation are jointly enacted as accountable behavior by the participants. The discussion of the literature on vocabulary has shown how theoretically informed teaching methodologies chiefly focus on planning and curriculum design and therefore fail to take into account the ways that contingently arising difficulties are displayed and managed. Furthermore, the growing body of interaction-oriented work on various types of language classrooms has shifted focus from learner error and a deficit framework of bilingualism to the competencies that participants display as they accomplish different kinds of interactional projects. This point is further elaborated on in chapter 4.

Recent decades have seen a growing interest in heritage and community language education and how to meet the needs of this highly heterogeneous group of learners (Kagan & Dillon, 2008; Montrul, 2009; Valdés, 2001, 2005). Though “[t]he recognition of heritage language learners as a variable in second language research is recent” (Gass & Selinker (2008) p. 23), there is a growing body of literature that has adopted the experimental methods of cognitively informed SLA to explore the linguistic features that characterize
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HLLs with an aim to developing a theory of heritage language learning (Carreira & Kagan, 2011; Isurin & Ivanova-Sullivan, 2008; Kagan & Dillon, 2008, 2011; Montrul, 2009, 2012; Polinsky & Kagan, 2007; Valdés, 2005; cf. Lynch, 2014). This work relies mainly on comparisons that measure HLL ability against a baseline of native or L2 speakers (Lynch, 2014) with a focus on speaker error (Kagan & Dillon, 2011).

Heritage language acquisition has been conceptualized as sharing features of both L1 (Kagan & Dillon 2008, p. 143; Valdés et al. 2006) and L2 acquisition (Gass & Selinker, 2008, p. 23; Montrul, 2008). There is interest in exploring what existing knowledge on L1 and L2 acquisition has to contribute to understanding of HLLs (Montrul, 2008, 2009). Similarly, it has been proposed that more knowledge about HLLs may help refine existing theories within the field of SLA (Montrul, 2008, p. 500-501; see also Valdés, 2005, for a rather different take on why this may be the case).

However, as discussed in chapter 2, there is a conspicuous gap when it comes to classroom-based work that examines actual practices in heritage language classrooms (Kagan & Dillon, 2011; Kagan, 2012). There is an urgent need for knowledge about teacher-student interaction in the heritage language classroom (Kagan & Dillon, 2011) and the ways that these types of settings are similar or different to other types of bi/multilingual classrooms. The rich knowledge base provided by practice-based studies of L2 classrooms therefore constitutes a highly useful backdrop for the contribution of the present thesis, which applies a conversation analytic framework to mother tongue instruction in Sweden.
CA goes beyond methodology; it is a theory of a different kind, an ideology and a worldview that cannot be overlooked, trivialized or dismissed. (Li Wei, 2002, p.177)

This thesis employs ethnomethodological conversation analysis (henceforth EM/CA or CA) as a methodological framework and analytical approach. The previous chapter gave some insight into the wealth of knowledge generated by the upsurge of interactionally-oriented studies of various types of educational settings. In the present chapter, I examine more closely CA’s sociological background and “intellectual roots” in ethnomethodology (Li Wei, 2002, p. 160) and how they inform CA’s action-orientation and data-driven methodology. The chapter also addresses how the growing number of studies that direct their attention beyond talk and vocality to a wider range of multimodal resources are transforming the field. The next section discusses the unique contributions the CA methodology and analytical mindset have made to understandings of bilingual talk in everyday settings. Lastly, I review the ways that CA has, over the past twenty-odd years, established itself as a key player in process-oriented respecifications of the sub-field of applied linguistics known as second language acquisition.

Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis

The focus of ethnomethodology (EM) lies in uncovering the methods by which ordinary members of society participate in social
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life. Reacting to Talcott Parsson’s (1951) structural functionalism, Harold Garfinkel argued that ‘top-down’ approaches to sociological inquiry by-passed the agency and perspectives of social actors in situ, treating them as “cultural dopes” (Garfinkel, 1967, p. 68; see also Seedhouse, 2004; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). Garfinkel’s concept of the “missing whatness” in sociological studies calls into question mainstream sociology’s lack of interest in the “local, situated, real-time organizational specifics of social activity” (Hester & Francis, 2000, p. 3). Ethnomethodology instead adopts a ‘bottom-up’ approach that views social order as an emergent and locally produced achievement, i.e. it is produced ‘from within’ interactional encounters.

The aim of sociology should therefore be to explicate the methods that people use – the ethno methods – to produce and interpret their own and others’ actions as they go about their lives (Clayman & Maynard, 1995; Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Heritage, 1984; Hester & Francis, 2000; Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008; Li Wei, 2002). The challenge lies in making visible the taken-for-granted, “seen but unnoticed” (Garfinkel, 1967, p. 42) ways in which members of society display their understandings and hold each other accountable for their actions and the circumstances that give rise to them. This is what is meant by ethnomethodology’s pursuit of an emic, or participants’, perspective. The implication is that, rather than taking for granted members’ understanding, ethnomethodology respecifies all phenomena of everyday social life as topics of inquiry in their own right (Clayman & Maynard, 1995, p. 14; Hester & Francis, 2000, p. 1; Hutchby & Wooffit 2008, p. 27).

Now, Garfinkel recognized the centrality of language for social life; routine, everyday life is conducted via the medium of talk. But it was Harvey Sacks, together with Gail Jefferson and Emanuel Schegloff, who developed a method through which to gain access to members’ “commonsense knowledge and practical reasoning” (Clayman & Maynard, 1995, p. 3) via the systematic study of the natural use of language. Conversation analysis (CA) adopts
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ethnomethodological principles and an interest in common-sense reasoning, but applies them to talk-in-interaction (Clayman & Maynard, 1995, p. 4; Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008, p. 27-28).

The aim of analysis is to unpack the techniques participants in interaction use to organize their interaction, i.e. to show how they are being used by interactants as they go about the business at hand. Participants in interaction display their understandings of the activity they are engaged in and manage their actions moment by moment, i.e., sequentially (Schegloff, 1991; 2007), through turns at talk. The turn-taking system outlined in the seminal paper by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) describes the methodical organization of mundane, everyday conversation. For example, one way speakers in a conversation orient to the temporal unfolding of multiparty talk is by avoiding overlap with another speaker. Utterances are composed of turn construction units (TCU’s) which are designed in certain ways, to ‘do things’ – and whose completion can be projected by other speakers. In ordinary talk, overlaps are usually avoided and gaps between turns kept to a minimum; when instances of overlap do occur they take place at transition relevant places (TRPs), thus demonstrating the contingent ways in which speakers anticipate turns at talk. Turns-at-talk are produced in adjacency pairs and speakers display their understanding of prior turns through their own, ‘next’ turn. The analyst’s method to understand how speakers orient to prior turns is thus referred to as the next-turn proof procedure (Sacks et al., 1974).

A key resource through which participants signal some kind of trouble in speaking, hearing, or understanding is repair (Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 1979, 1992; Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977). Repair trajectories involve the identification of a trouble source (Schegloff 2007, p. 217), a repair initiation and a repair outcome. A distinction is also made between repair that is self-initiated or other-initiated; likewise, speakers may repair their own talk or that of another speaker. Repair-initiations occur in different positions
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depending on whether they are self- or other-initiated. Self-repair tends to occur within the turn that contains the trouble source and is often characterized by the presence of different types of “perturbations” through which the speaker signals the upcoming repair (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 367). Other-repair, on the other hand, usually takes place in the turn immediately following the trouble source. The fact that other-repair is oriented to as *dispreferred* in ordinary talk is shown when one speaker initiates repair without carrying out a correction, allowing the other speaker to self-repair. Other-repair may be also be carried out in a ‘discrete’ way by embedding the repair in the repair-initiator’s turn (Pomerantz & Fehr, 2011). A sub-type of repair that is common in pedagogical contexts is correction (Macbeth, 2004). While repair more overarchingly has to do with mutual understanding, correction carries with it the implication of error and the need to replace the trouble item with another item (Seedhouse, 2007, p. 530). So, for example, teachers may hint at the incorrectness of student answers while still leaving the work of correction up to the student (McHoul, 1990).

It should be pointed out that the procedures for turn-taking are by no means “rule-like formulations of proper interactional conduct” (Clayman & Maynard, 1995, p. 17); they are, rather, an attempt to dispel myths of the random, messy and disorderly nature of the details of social interaction. On the contrary, CA practitioners treat all interactional events as orderly, and “no order of detail is dismissed as a priori uninteresting or irrelevant” (Heritage, 1984, p. 241). Detailed transcriptions are made to allow the analyst to reveal the “machinery” of conversation as it comes into expression in the lives of social actors (Clayman & Maynard 1995, p. 17; Seedhouse, 2004). These interests contrast with traditional sociology’s focus on macro spheres of social structures. It also refutes the Chomskian view of language as a formal, self-contained system of competences that treats real-life spoken language as trivial and analytically uncapturable (see section on CA and bilingual talk, CA-for-SLA). CA does not deny the existence of
macro-level social structures; rather, it views talk as being reflexively related to context.

In other words, CA rejects a ‘container’ view of context and replaces it with a dynamic understanding that requires the analysis to be grounded in the details of interaction (Schegloff, 1992; Seedhouse, 2004 p. 44, 91-92). The underlying ‘machinery’ or “structural resources used in conversation are simultaneously context-sensitive and context-free” (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974, p. 699). They are context-free in that interaction-external variables are not included from the outset in the analysis of how members make sense of each other’s talk (Markee, 2000). Likewise, the techniques that participants use are independent of specific circumstances or instances of conversation; in other words, “the same kind of techniques are used by different participants in different circumstances” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p. 31). However, “the application of these organizations is context-sensitive in that participants use the organization of (for example) turn-taking to display their understanding of a context” (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 43). Strictly speaking, context is then “the immediate sequential environment of a turn” (Markee, 2000, p. 31).

Put simply, “the participants build the context of their talk in and through their talk” (Heritage 1997, p. 224). This is what is meant by saying that turns at talk are both context-shaped and context-renewing (Heritage, 1984). Each new contribution will be shaped by the one it follows and will simultaneously affect the contribution it precedes, thereby establishing a new context. CA’s pursuit of a participant perspective has its origins in the ethnomethodological principle of indexicality, whereby participants themselves display for one another which elements of their surrounding environment are relevant for the actions they are carrying out at any given stretch of talk (Clayman & Maynard, 1995). The analyst’s aim then is “to explicate the structural organization of talk-in-interaction at this interface between context-free resources and context-sensitive applications” (Hutchby &
Wooffitt, 2008, p. 32). As Seedhouse (2004) emphasizes, it is therefore not enough to simply produce a detailed transcription and then merely identify instances of turn-taking; analysis needs to take into account the context-sensitive ways in which members display their social actions (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 46-52). CA’s emic approach to analysis does not rely on the researcher’s rapport with participants to understand the actions they analyze (Markee & Kasper, 2004). Instead, as a methodology it goes to great lengths to demonstrate how findings are displayed through participants’ actions. A fundamental consequence of this is that “participant orientations, relevancies, and intersubjectivity are not treated as states of mind that somehow lurk behind the interaction, but as local and sequential accomplishments that must be grounded in empirically observable conversational conduct” (Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 495).

A growing range of interdisciplinary studies have applied the tools of CA to investigations of a wide range of institutional settings. CA’s emic orientation and the mechanisms underlying the turn-taking system derived from mundane conversation can be used to demonstrate how interactants orient to the specific type of activity they are involved in (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008; Drew & Sorjonen, 2011; Antaki, 2008). The strength of CA lies in its data-driven approach to context. Institutional features of talk are not assumed a priori, but rather must be talked into being by the participants (Heritage, 1997). Thus, if we are studying educational settings we would examine how the activities in the classroom are “produced as such in the first place, rather than having these ‘in place’ and then theorizing them” (Hester & Francis, 2000, p. 1).

**Multimodality**

Early CA work was primarily focused on analysis of talk, due in part to its reliance on audio recordings – with the notable exception of pioneering work by Charles and Marjorie Goodwin (C. Goodwin, 1980, 1981; M. Goodman, 1980), and Christian Heath (1984), whose
use of video-recordings drew attention to the multimodal character of human interaction. The Goodwins’ work demonstrated that speakers orient to a wide range of embodied features such as gaze, facial expressions, gestures, body position, movement as well as material artefacts as part of the contingent process of sense-making. Moreover, talk and other semiotic systems are minutely coordinated within the emergent interaction (Goodwin, 1997). In recent years, the development of new technology and smaller, more portable devices has led to a steady increase in CA studies that incorporate an even wider range of embodied features of interaction into the analysis, revealing in greater detail the finely-tuned ways that participants configure their actions not merely through talk but also multimodally (see, e.g., Broth & Mondada, 2013; Keevallik, 2014). This work has not only exposed the richness of whole-body involvement in social action but has also posed new challenges in terms of the organization of the turn-taking structure, i.e. in how temporal and sequential dimensions of interaction are conceptualized and represented when language is viewed as merely one of many modalities (Broth & Mondada, 2013; Markee & Kunitz, 2015; Mondada, 2014, 2016).

**CA methodology**

As outlined in section 4.1, talk and other actions are inextricably linked to the context of their production; hence CA’s methodological imperative to investigate talk as it occurs naturally in its endogenous setting, be it mundane or institutional. To this end, audio- and, more commonly today, video-recordings are resources that provide a record of the interaction that makes repeated viewing/listening and multiple analyses possible (Goodwin, 1994; Mondada 2006a, pp. 52-53; Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008, pp. 12, 69). CA understands action as socially constituted and as such publicly available and hence, observable and analyzable. High-quality video-recordings with a good level of audio uptake offer the best access to the type of micro-detail required for the systematic analysis of talk-and-other-conduct in
interaction. For CA-inspired studies, recordings constitute the primary data that makes up the empirical basis for the study and that will be subjected to intense and repeated scrutiny. This methodological imperative does not equate with a pretension of ‘capturing’ reality on video (Goodwin, 1994; Ochs, 1979; Slotte-Lüttge, 2005, p. 52, 80). A “praxeological approach to video practices” acknowledges that video-recording is not only a way to preserve the naturalistic features of the interaction, and also acts as a “configuring device” (Mondada 2006a, p.52, italics in original). Moreover, it is reflexively produced, involving the cameraperson’s “embodied analysis of the recorded event” both before and during the recording (Mondada 2006a, p. 56). A good recording therefore aims to preserve key dimensions such as time, participation framework and interactional space, multimodal details that support subsequent analysis (Mondada 2006a, p. 55).

Analysis is approached inductively, meaning that the corpus is scanned for instances of phenomena of potential interest without a pre-determined, or a priori, idea of what those specific phenomena will be. This is described as unmotivated looking (Psathas, 1995; cf. Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970). Once a phenomenon has been identified, a collection of instances of similar types of phenomena is made. Alternatively, a single case study, involving a longer sequence, may be chosen for detailed scrutiny of the conversational machinery. In the case of collections, the next step involves a closer look at the sequential organization of the phenomenon to establish potential regularities or patterns (Seedhouse, 2004). So-called deviant cases are of interest because accounting for them requires the analyst to reflexively revise and refine the description of a particular sequential organization before a generalizable pattern can be claimed (Hutchby & Wooffit, 2008). Hutchby and Wooffit (2008, p. 93) summarize the core analytical questions CA asks, as follows:
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1. What interactional business is being mediated or accomplished through the use of a sequential pattern?
2. How do participants demonstrate their active orientation to this business?

An indispensable part of analysis is the creation of highly granular transcriptions that make available the features of the sequential and temporal production of talk-in-interaction to which participants orient. Thus, beginnings and endings of turns, pauses, speaker overlap, prosody and other vocal features of talk (e.g., breathiness, laughter) are fundamental aspects to be included. In addition, as discussed in the previous section, multimodal resources such as gaze, gesture, use of artefacts, embodied movement are also transcribed. Though all CA transcripts are highly granular, the degree of granularity will partly depend on the particular phenomenon under analysis. Although, as previously stated, the recordings constitute the primary source of analysis and are available for multiple listening and viewing by more than one person (as during data sessions; see Kasper & Wagner, 2011, p. 124), transcription is a core part of the analysis process. For one thing, the painstaking work involved in CA transcription allows the researcher(s) to become intimately acquainted with the data. For another, CA transcriptions make visible the detailed ways that participants orient to each other’s actions in a way that may not be apparent in the fleeting moment of their actual occurrence, even for those involved in the interaction. Transcriptions are thereby a crucial step in moving from an “overhearer’s perspective” to an emic perspective (Ten Have 2002, p.13). As put by Ten Have (2002), transcription is a “technically informed” (p. 8) attempt to reveal the orderliness of the mechanisms at play in the interaction. Transcription conventions based on the work of Gail Jefferson (2004) are still a widely used standard across CA, while adaptations to include a broader range of semiotic resources reflect ongoing developments in the field. Similarly, the increase in data in languages other than
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English has spurred considerations of how to represent translated talk in transcriptions (see, e.g., Nikander, 2008), since analysis is always performed on the original language of interaction. Though the transcription process is inevitably theory-laden and bound to produce “selective reductions” of the original interaction (Ten Have 2002, p. 3; see also Goodwin, 1994; Ochs, 1976), the meticulous work involved in CA transcription and its availability to repeated scrutiny confers a high degree of transparency to claims proffered (Waring, 2016, p. 48), while the empirical grounding in naturally occurring settings is a marker of the ecological validity of CA studies (cf. Wegener & Blankenship, 2007).

CA and the study of language and bilingual talk

CA investigations of ordinary talk among speakers for whom more than one language is available have contributed a great deal to demystifying one of the key features of bilingual talk -- language alternation – by approaching it from the ground up, as a conversational activity in its own right. Rather than seeking answers a priori in structural factors or looking to theoretical models of the brain and its capacity to process two or more ‘codes,’ CA begins with the same starting point as interaction among monolingual speakers – by scrutinizing the sense-making procedures used by participants in the local context of their occurrence (Li Wei, 2005, p. 276; Auer, 1984). Though its micro-level focus implies the necessity for analysis of language, CA’s sociological or rather, ethnomethodological, background set it apart from other types of linguistically oriented analysis. CA is not primarily concerned with structural aspects of language (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008 p.12; Hellerman & Lee, 2014, p. 55; Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 495). Indeed, “CA has no special interest in language outside of its deployment in interaction, nor in specifying what it might be” (Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 495).
Though this lack of interest in defining language in structural terms may appear contradictory at first glance, CA nevertheless has a great deal to say about the nature of language (Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 495). As Li Wei (2002) argues, the CA approach “requires no less than a radical change in the focus of social scientific inquiry” (p. 160), inasmuch as it involves moving beyond the idea of language as a system for the expression of intentions and thoughts to a view of language as “a site for uncovering the method through which ordered activity is generated” (Li Wei, 2002, p. 160). In other words, CA and ethnomethodology provide “a respecification of language, where the semantic basis of meaning (i.e., the correspondence between sign and referent) is substituted by a procedural approach to intersubjectivity” (Cromdal, 2000, p. 31).

Like studies in linguistics, early CA work contained a monolingual and monocultural bias in that it focused on conversations between speakers of the same language and geographic background (Cromdal, 2000, p. 37-38). The ground-breaking work of Peter Auer (1984) applied CA principles to the study of language alternation among bilingual speakers, adding new understandings to the locally occasioned ways that speakers draw on more than one shared code to organize their interaction. By drawing attention to the sequential organization of language choice, Auer’s work challenged previous understandings of language alternation as inevitably linked to conversation-external notions of power relations within the speech community (cf. Myers-Scotton, 1993; Gumperz, 1982) or to the socio-psychological motivations of speakers (Li Wei, 2002). Auer’s work (1984, 1998, 2000) also illustrates CA’s rejection of analyst-imposed explanations about the meaning of code-switching as stemming from an “iconic relationship between language and identity” (Musk, 2006, p. 57). This is not to say that participants do not signal identity-related matters in their choice of language, but that the meanings must be sought in the examining members’ own procedures for the situated organization of their talk (Cromdal, 2013; Li Wei, 2002; see Musk &
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Cromdal (2018), for a recent overview of CA approaches to language alternation. In other words, “the broad why questions must come after full examination of the how questions (Li Wei, 2002, p. 172).

Auer’s work focused on meaningful switches in contexts where participants orient to a preference for same-language talk. A different type of sociolinguistic context was examined by Gafaranga (2000; 2005; 2009; 2012), whose work on members of bilingual Rwandese speech communities in Belgium goes a step further in pursuing an emic perspective by showing that the ‘base code’ – which he respecifics as the medium of a conversation – need not correspond to one language at all. Using members’ own interpretive schemes, Gafaranga (2000) demonstrates that language alternation, i.e. “alternating use of more than one language in the same episode of talk” (Musk & Cromdal, 2018) is by no means always oriented to by the participants themselves as something in need of repair, in which case they are simply using a bilingual medium (see Musk, 2010, for examples of a bilingual, or mixed, medium as the default medium among Welsh bilinguals). Conversely, one or more speakers may display an orientation to the “other-languageness” (Auer, 1999, p. 314) of a lexical item inserted into the sequence, thus occasioning medium repair, i.e. the translation of the problematic item (Gafaranga, 2000, p. 340). Gafaranga and Torras (2002) further develop this line of argument, challenging analyst-imposed views of code-switching and breaking down instances of language alternation in terms of how and whether they are oriented to as in need of repair by speakers themselves. As such, Gafaranga and Gafaranga & Torras’s work constitutes a significant departure from viewing languages as discrete entities.
A conversation analytic approach to second language acquisition

As the previous section has shown, CA studies of bilingual interaction broke ground in investigating language alternation as a defining feature of bilingual talk. CA’s entrance into applied linguistics and the field of second language acquisition (SLA) came a bit later, as part of a wave of several socially oriented approaches that began to challenge the cognitive stronghold of second language studies during the 1990’s. One of the catalysts in this movement was Firth and Wagner’s (1997) call for a reconceptualization of mainstream, cognitivist SLA to address fundamental gaps between theoretical aims and methodological incongruences. In particular, Firth and Wagner’s critique centered on SLA’s lack of attention to the “contextual and interactional dimensions of language use” (p. 286), while also calling for the need to adopt a more participant-relevant approach and to broaden the SLA database. In the current section, I discuss the conversation analytic approach to second language acquisition, known as CA for SLA (Markee & Kasper, 2004, Markee & Kunitz, 2015) or simply CA-SLA (Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Pekarek Doehler, 2010; see also Eskildsen & Majlesi, 2018) and the unique ways that CA’s emic and procedural approach has contributed to the ‘social turn’ (Block, 2003) in SLA. The section also addresses the impact of CA on a ‘bi/multilingual turn’ in SLA (Hellerman & Lee, 2014; Ortega, 2013).

At the heart of the CA approach to language learning is its ethnomethodologically derived view of language not as a stable system for the transmission of messages from one brain to another but rather as a “dynamic set of resources” (Mori, 2007, p. 850) used to accomplish social actions. While cognitivist perspectives conceptualize language learning as an individual, mental, process aimed at acquiring the formal structures of a language, socially-oriented approaches view knowledge as situated and learning as
socially distributed (Ortega, 2011). As previously discussed, CA aims to explicate the practices that participants use to achieve intersubjectivity in accountable and recognizable ways. Such a perspective views competence not as an abstract, idealized feature of the mind, able to be extracted and isolated from the context of its deployment. Rather, competence resides in the actual practices that members in interaction deploy to achieve mutual understanding (cf. Mehan, 1979). Importantly, it is both a prerequisite for participating in interaction (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970) and visible in the procedures that speakers use, moment-by-moment, turn-by-turn (Hellerman & Lee, 2014, p. 57; Kasper & Wagner, 2011). CA’s particular stance on context as not only pertaining to the setting in which interaction takes place (and which may or may not have a bearing on the interaction) but, crucially, as shaped by and shaping the local, sequential environment in which the interaction occurs (Heritage, 1984) is paramount to understanding the uniqueness of its contribution to studies of instructed language learning settings (Mori, 2007; see also Seedhouse, 2004). The locus of members’ interactional competence is in the procedures of situated interaction, which is why CA studies examine talk-and-other-conduct in situations of naturally occurring interaction (Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Mori, 2007). Speaker contributions to interaction are contingently negotiated and adapted to the circumstances of their deployment (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Hellerman & Lee, 2014; Mori, 2007).

All of the above has important implications in relation to Firth and Wagner’s (1997) critique of classical SLA’s deficit framework or “learner-as-defective-communicator mindset” (p. 290), which takes monolingualism as the benchmark against which second language learning is measured (Cromdal, 2002; Cromdal & Evaldsson, 2003; Jørgensen & Holmen, 1997; May, 2015). As we have seen, CA starts with the premise that, first and foremost, “talk is talk” (Greer, 2013, p. 238), meaning that categories such as native speaker (NS) and non-native speaker (NNS) are not assumed to be stable and fixed identities.
that permeate every aspect of NS-NNS conversations. They only become relevant when oriented to as such by the speakers themselves. Furthermore, CA’s focus on the joint construction of meaning brings to the forefront the competencies that speakers display as they engage in various types of communicative projects (Linell, 1998, 2009) and creatively adapt their actions to the activity at hand, be they in the L1, the L2, or both. Repair (discussed in the first section of this chapter) is a case in point. Speakers may use repair to deal with problems of intersubjectivity (not to be confused with learner error; see Gardner & Wagner, 2004, p. 10) or to index particular identities such as teacher/learner and so forth. What is important is that speakers display their competencies as participants in interaction and that this competence is visible in the ways that speakers hold each other accountable for their actions (Hellerman & Lee, 2014, p. 57). Thus, as Ortega (2011) points out, though other approaches in applied linguistics may concur “on an intuitive level” (p. 171) that deficit is not necessarily a part of language learning, CA’s attention to the micro-details of how participants in interaction deploy the resources at their disposal in pursuit of intersubjectivity has firmly anchored “the anti-deficit lens in the empirical realm” (p. 171; see also Hellerman & Lee, 2014, p. 63).

One of the criticisms directed at the CA approach to SLA concerns the extent to which it is equipped to demonstrate learning. CA studies have taken two broad approaches to conceptually addressing learning as something that develops over time. The first approach involves enrolling exogenous learning theories as a complement to CA methodology, whereas the second maintains EM/CA’s emic and behavioral methodological imperative and demonstrates how user-learners incorporate language changes into their existing repertoire (Markee, 2008; Markee & Kunitz, 2015, p. 430). Still, both perspectives view learning as a social accomplishment, “constructed in and through the talk of participants” (Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 496; see also Heritage, 1997). Actions are seen to be “socially
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constituted; visible; and therefore observable by the participants, and consequential for them” (Kasper & Wagner, 2018) Language is taught and learned in and through verbal and embodied interaction (Firth & Wagner, 1997; see also Eskildsen & Majlesi, 2018); hence, learning objects come into being through the interactional work of co-participants (Kasper & Wagner, 2018; Majlesi, 2014; 2018). The upshot is that, not only does CA refute the competence-performance dichotomy, the presumed boundaries between acquisition and use are so indistinguishable as to be entirely unverifiable and indeed, inconsequential (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 496).

As the numerous studies of language classrooms reviewed in chapter 3 of this thesis have shown, in addition to the wealth of knowledge concerning the orderly and ubiquitous nature of language alternation in multilingual classrooms, there has been a growing interest in the inclusion of multimodal aspects of classroom interaction in CA-SLA work. The laminated character of the classroom, where teachers and students make use of numerous bodily resources as well as material artefacts such as whiteboards, textbooks, worksheets and computers, makes this a rich environment for illuminating the complex interplay of verbal, vocal, bodily and material resources. Moreover, by investigating cognitive SLA concepts such as ‘noticing’, ‘negotiating’, ‘prompting,’ in the contexts of their occurrence (cf. Kunitz, 2018; Majlesi, 2018; Mori, 2004), and by revealing the verbal and embodied behavior that speakers deploy as they are achieved in situ and in vivo, EM/CA is able to provide empirical grounding for these types of theoretical and prescriptive notions. Together with a participant-oriented understanding of the organization of language alternation, this methodology is well-suited to bring to light valuable insights based on the dynamic reality of various types of (language) classrooms, including those involving the so-called ‘heritage language’, or ‘mother tongue’.
5. Data, Setting and Methodology

Data
The data for this thesis are video-recordings of three groups of compulsory school students, between the ages of 6 and 15, who attended English MTI with the same teacher. The MTI teacher was a native speaker of English who was employed by the municipality and commuted to the schools for each lesson. Each group of students met once a week for approximately 60 minutes. Lessons were held at two different mainstream compulsory schools located in a medium-sized city in Sweden. A total of 30 hours of video-recordings were made over the course of 12 weeks, for the duration of the autumn semester of 2014.

Setting and participants

Birch School
Two groups had their lessons at Birch School, a Swedish mainstream compulsory school for grades K-6. The first MTI group was comprised of students between the ages of 6-9, where the youngest member was enrolled in preschool class (Swe: förskoleklass) and the oldest was in third grade. The children had at least one parent who spoke English. At the start of the autumn term there were six

---

13 Names of schools and people have been changed to protect anonymity.
children attending the lessons. A few weeks into the semester, two children stopped attending the lessons and another boy started. All but the two who stopped attending commuted to the school from other places, usually accompanied by a parent or other care-taker.

The second group that had their lessons at Birch School was made up of two eleven-year-old girls, one of whom attended the school where the lessons took place. The second child commuted from her regular school and came to the lessons less frequently (see table 1). At the start of the term, a third girl of the same age came to the MT lessons, but she was unable to continue for the remainder of the term. According to the teacher, who had been in contact with the student’s mother several times, there were problems with the scheduling of the lessons in relation to siblings’ schedules and after-school activities. In sum, this lesson often ended up being an individual, one-on-one lesson for the term I was present.

At Birch School, there was a contact-person whom the MTI teacher could ask questions about practicalities. There was also a janitor who communicated with her concerning room changes and similar matters. During the autumn term I was filming the lessons, the location for the MT lessons was changed four times. Room changes were communicated on short notice. At the beginning of the semester, the lessons were held in a large classroom regularly used by another teacher during the day. For a few weeks, towards Christmas-time, the lessons were held in an even larger room that was otherwise served as a school library, music room, or small auditorium for gatherings. Use of that room entailed using a portion of the lesson time to re-arrange desks and chairs. In the final weeks before the Christmas break, the teacher and students were re-directed to a new room, the far end of which they were told was designated for MTI (English and other languages) from that time forward. However, since a whiteboard had not yet been put up on that side of the room when the first lesson was held there, the teacher used the front half of the room, which had desks
belonging to ordinary students. Time slots concerning the availability of the room affected the scheduling of the English MT lessons.

A recurring concern for the teacher was making sure everyone found the room, especially since the school was in a large building with several floors and the children came to the school from another place, accompanied by a caretaker. This problem was solved either by making a makeshift sign to be taped at the bottom of the stairs or by the teacher in some way communicating (e.g., via text message) with a student or the parent or caretaker accompanying the child. On one or two occasions, the teacher asked me to go out and look for delayed students.

In short, it was palpable that the lessons were held in a “borrowed space” (cf. Martin et al., 2006, p. 9). Every aspect of the classroom belonged to the mainstream lessons. Writing remaining on the margins of whiteboards by ordinary class teachers was in Swedish; the materials on the walls was in Swedish; desks were labeled with ordinary students’ names, to whom the contents in them belonged. On several occasions, the teacher reminded students not to touch items on the desk or anything inside the desks, explaining to them that the principal of the school had complained about things being moved or missing from the desks. All of the artwork or worksheets the students created during the lessons had to be taken home or kept by the MTI teacher, since nothing could be displayed in the classroom. As is commonly the case for MTI teachers who work in an itinerant fashion (cf. Gauza & Hedman, 2015), the teacher brought most materials, such as worksheets, pencils (graphite or colored), paper, scissors and so forth, with her. She gave students a notebook, to be used for the lessons, at the beginning of the term, and often reminded them (especially the younger children) to bring their own pencils.

Oak School

A third group of MTI was held at Oak School, a compulsory school for students in grades 6-9. These lessons also took place at the end of
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the school day, on a different day of the week from those at Birch School. The students in this group were in grades 6, 8 and 9 (12, 14 and 15 years old). Five of them were enrolled at Oak School. A sixth student commuted to Oak School from her ordinary school. Like the students in Birch School, these students had one or two English-speaking parents, though one of the students came to the lessons because he had previously attended an English-speaking school in another country. Lessons were held in the same classroom for most of the autumn term (with one room change towards the end of the term). This classroom (see Fig. 2, p. 77) was rather small, which was an advantage for sound quality (when the window wasn’t open) but made it somewhat difficult to place the cameras far back enough to take in all the participants. During the time I was there, we seldom crossed paths with any other teachers and never encountered another MTI teacher, at either school. See Table 1 for an overview of the participants and the corpus.

The following table shows the participants and their details:

| Name   | Grade | Age |
|--------|-------|-----|
| Stephen | 6     | 12  |
| Victoria | 9     | 15  |
| Cathy   | 8     | 14  |
| Mary    | 9     | 15  |
| James   | 9     | 15  |
| Fredrik | 8     | 14  |

Lessons recorded: 9 x 60 minutes
Lessons observed: 10
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| Birch School | Lessons recorded: 11 x 60 minutes | Lessons observed: 12 |
|--------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Sara         | 2                                | 8                    |
| Nathan       | K                                | 6                    |
| Lisa         | 2                                | 8                    |
| Jens         | 3                                | 9                    |
| Thomas       | K                                | 6                    |

Lessons recorded: 10 x 60 minutes
Lessons observed: 12

**On the choice of English MTI**

I chose to study English MTI primarily because I am a native speaker of English (as well as a fluent speaker of Swedish), and the ability to speak and understand English at a very high level has relevance in relation to my choice of analytical method. CA transcriptions of talk are highly detailed and granular; they include prosodic features that vary greatly in different languages as well as among national and regional varieties of the same language. They require repeated listening and perhaps even an intuitive ability to perceive slight differences in how utterances are produced vocally. This is a challenging process even for a proficient speaker of a language.

I would argue that, even beyond the choice of CA as an analytical method, the decision to study MTI in a language with which I am very familiar increases the validity of the study. A limitation of previous
classroom-based observations of MTI in languages unfamiliar to the observers has placed constraints on the selection of data that provides the empirical basis for the study (Reath Warren, 2013, 2016, 2017; Gauza & Hedman, 2015, 2017a).

I am, however, aware that English occupies a unique position, globally and in Sweden. Swedish was secured as the official language of Sweden by the 2010 Language Act (SFS 2009:600) partly in response to growing concerns regarding the increasing presence of English. (See also Boyd & Huss, 2001, on the challenges for Sweden as a nation-state with regards to the management of multilingualism; see also Cabau, 2014.) Although, as expressed by Melander (2001), most Swedes would be hard-pressed to use English for “more demanding purposes [...] for example, to read a complex text or participate in an intellectually demanding discussion in English” (p. 26), the strong position of English in Sweden has been criticized for weakening the position of other minority languages (Cabau-Lampa, 2007; Cabau, 2014; Hyltenstam & Milani, 2012).

English is a core subject in Swedish compulsory school, which means it is introduced in the early grades of school (usually grade 3). However, it should be pointed out that the curriculum goals for English in compulsory school are decidedly rudimentary compared to those in the MTI syllabus. The latter, which applies to MTI in every language, is more similar to the syllabus for Swedish, which encompasses a far greater number of hours weekly (see Reath Warren, 2013 for a discussion on the goals of Swedish in comparison with MTI; Lainio, 2013, for an estimate of hours taught in MTI in comparison to Swedish). Together with the role of English in popular culture, these factors could conceivably have a bearing on MTI students’ level of English. Yet it is hardly likely that the amount of English they had been exposed to at school could account for their skill level. As the results of the empirical studies in this thesis show, even the youngest children were able to follow and participate in the MT lessons without difficulty, despite them being conducted entirely
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In English. In addition, there were differences in terms of fluency among all the participants, which is in line with mixed abilities reported in other studies of MTI and heritage language settings (Ganuza & Hedman, 2015; Extra, 2009; Kagan & Dillon, 2008).

The current study takes an emic perspective on the use of languages and other multimodal resources to accomplish interactional goals in the MT classroom. Like students who participate in MTI in other languages, the students who took part in my study had heterogeneous backgrounds and experience with the target language.

Data collection

Contact with the English MTI teacher was established by email via the contact person for MTI in the chosen municipality in the early spring of 2014. After some further correspondence regarding the nature of the study and the type of involvement required, it was agreed that filming could begin after the summer break. I also contacted the heads of the two schools where the MT lessons took place for permission to film the MT lessons. Finally, a letter containing information about the study was sent to parents and children at the start of the autumn term of 2014.

Field work was undertaken during the autumn term of 2014, for a period of twelve weeks. The MT lessons began some weeks after the start of the ordinary school term, due to the work involved in contacting students, parents and schools on the part of the MT teacher, to arrange suitable scheduling for the lessons. The first two times I attended the lessons, I introduced myself to the students and explained why I was there. Students were given a consent form to be taken home to their parents. In a few cases, I met the parents/care-takers themselves when they dropped off their children at the lessons.

For the video-recordings, I used two cameras placed on tripods at opposite corners of the classroom. My primary interest in interaction between the teacher and students or between students meant
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attempting to capture as much talk as possible as well as, e.g. gaze and other embodied features of participants’ behavior (cf. Goodwin, 2000; Mondada, 2006). Although the small size of the groups was favorable to capturing both audio and video of the interaction, other factors such as the size and shape of classrooms and students’ seating choices posed challenges for the recording configuration (see Mondada, 2006).

The placement of the lessons after regular school hours and the teacher’s peripatetic role had a bearing on the study. Classrooms were either locked or occupied by ordinary class teachers prior to the commencement of the lessons. As previously stated, there were several occasions where a change of classroom was communicated by someone in the staff upon the MTI teacher’s arrival. These factors made it difficult for me to set up the video-cameras ahead of time, as I often entered the classroom at the same time as the students, which occasionally led to beginnings of lessons not being captured on video.

Another advantage of the use of tripods as opposed to hand-held cameras was the minimization of my presence; though I chose to remain present in the room, I generally sat at the back or in a corner of the classroom, where I took field notes, so as to cause as little interference as possible through my presence. The field notes do not form part of the subsequent analysis; rather, they served to note down activities and as an easily available reference when locating places in the recordings. They also gave me something to do and made me look ‘occupied’ during the lessons. Occasionally, when invited to do so by either the teacher or students, I briefly participated in the interaction, such as answering a question posed directly to me by a student or the teacher. Since I am a teacher and native speaker of English myself, as well as proficient speaker of Swedish, there were times when the teacher consulted me when searching for a word or other language-related matters. My choice to remain in the classroom was primarily motivated by a concern tied to the camera equipment. Practical matters such as battery time, finding outlets and placement of cameras
in large or small classrooms were one issue. As previously mentioned, the beginnings of MT lessons were somewhat more fluid than most ordinary school lessons. Students would drop in one by one, sometimes accompanied by a caretaker, and take up their seats upon arrival. Rooms were changed, furniture within rooms was found in new configurations, students would choose different seats, close or far away from the teacher. For a period of a few weeks, the two lessons at Birch School were scheduled with a fifteen-minute overlap, during which the teacher either moved between groups or involved both simultaneously. All of these factors entailed sometimes having to adjust camera angles during lessons.

![Figure 2. Classroom in Oak School](image-url)
Ethical considerations

In accordance with the ethical guidelines for research in the humanities and social sciences set up by the Swedish Research Council (2002), parents and children were informed of the purposes of the study as well as their rights should they choose to participate; among these, the right to stop participating, without giving a reason, at any time. A consent form was distributed to students and their parents, along with a letter of information regarding the nature and purpose of the study (see Appendices A and B). Names of students and places have been changed in this text and all publications to protect anonymity and screenshots were blurred. I began filming after the consent forms had been signed by parents and the children involved in the study.

Processing and transcribing the data

As I did not have a specific interest in a particular phenomenon when beginning the study, I began the inductive analysis process through unmotivated looking (Psathas, 1995). This involved watching the video-recordings several times and making notes concerning activities, actions and recurrent patterns that took place at each of the lessons. One recurrent phenomenon across all groups was found to be brief instances of language alternation. Since the teacher spoke English to students before, during and after the lessons and displayed her expectation for students to do the same, occasional switches to Swedish on the part of either teacher or students became a salient and easily recognizable action. The small size of the groups and the prevalence of a teacher-fronted teaching style meant that there was little observable student-to-student interaction without direct teacher involvement. Use of Swedish, especially by the teacher was overwhelmingly limited to single lexical items.

Following CA methodology (see Ch. 4), a collection of instances of language alternation between English and Swedish by teacher or students was made. It was found that there was a pattern of language...
alternation that was dominated by spontaneously-arising teacher-initiated translation requests and that these were a very frequent occurrence in the data, taking place at the very least once in every lesson. Clips of video-recordings that centered on instances of translation requests were made. The clips included the surrounding talk to determine how the action arose, what interactional work was being accomplished in the local context of its occurrence, how the participants displayed their orientation to this business, and how the sequence of talk surrounding that action was concluded (see Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p. 93). In this way, a number of sub-categories were created. A selection of clips was subsequently transcribed, following conventions created by Jefferson (2004), and analyzed (see Study I).

The phenomenon that forms the focal point of Study II similarly arose through observation of patterns in the data, whereby it was found that the teacher often drew hangman-like lines on the whiteboard to accompany word searches that became topicalized in various ways during the interaction. The action of drawing lines on the board was found to be connected to ‘doing spelling’ in the MT classroom. A collection of instances was made and grouped according to how the word search activities arose, developed and were concluded. These categories were then further refined to break down actions within each phase and find patterns. The use of the whiteboard together with the teacher’s use of embodied resources to elicit specific lexical items motivated the choice of a more multimodal style of transcript.

Study III thus grew out of the work with the previous two studies, since much of the interactional work being carried out in studies I and II was tied to the development of students’ vocabulary. To investigate vocabulary further, a collection of vocabulary-related instances arising out of students’ talk was made. These were further divided according to whether topicalization was initiated by the teacher or students. This process gave rise to three categories: teacher-initiated substitution requests, student-initiated naming or word-confirmation requests, and teacher or student meaning or translation requests. As
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the sequences were embedded in larger activities involving student talk and occasionally involved rather lengthy departures from the main activity, analysis was expanded to include the teaching trajectories as well. This step was particularly fruitful, as the exploration of the more complex trajectories revealed the extensive range of methods through which teacher and students explore aspects of form, meaning and use.
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Study I

What is it in Swedish? Translation requests as a resource for vocabulary explanation in English mother tongue instruction

Kirsten Stoewer (2018). In A. Filipi & N. Markee (Eds.), *Conversation analysis and language alternation: Capturing transitions in the language classroom* (pp. 85–108). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

The chapter sets out to examine language alternation in mother tongue instruction (MTI). Specifically, it investigates teacher-initiated translation requests and how they arise in the ongoing interaction. It also explores what the requests accomplish in relation to impromptu vocabulary teaching, as well as the types of transitional shifts that are created in the contingent deployment of multilingual resources. In the collection-based study, it was found that teacher-initiated requests of this kind were a frequent occurrence, in spite of English being the medium of interaction in the lessons. The availability of another shared language was exploited by the teacher for several purposes, e.g., to check students’ comprehension of lexical items and to prompt production of the target, or heritage, language (English). Translation requests going in either direction were also used to engage more than one student in the vocabulary-oriented work, while topicalizing lexical items. A request for translation could also invoke the monolingual norm of the lessons by performing medium repair (from Swedish to English).
The translation requests arose in response to as well as in the absence of student displays of trouble. Furthermore, requests for students to translate individual lexical items involved use of both the target language (English) and the majority language (Swedish). The results demonstrate how Swedish was drawn upon as one of several available resources to accomplish vocabulary teaching and learning. For example, by embedding a Swedish lexical item into an English utterance, the teacher could elicit a word in English. Conversely, the teacher utterance “What’s x?” in response to student display of difficulty producing a word in English could occasion either a word explanation (in English) or a translation. Indeed, translation requests were sometimes issued even after a lexical item had been correctly explained in English. This result suggests that the ability to supply a suitable equivalent in the ‘other’ language was treated by the teacher as proof that students understood the word. It also demonstrates how students’ bilingual competence was targeted in the MT lessons, thus providing further evidence of the skilful and complex ways teachers and students deploy multilingual resources in the language classroom. Finally, translation requests from English to Swedish were a way of including students’ everyday language of schooling and draw comparisons between both languages.

Study II
“Doing Spelling” in Bilingual Classroom Interaction: The Multimodal Organization of Spelling Rounds in English Mother Tongue Instruction.

Kirsten Stoewer and Jakob Cromdal. Submitted.

The article examines spelling practices in English MTI. Specifically, it explicates the structure of spelling rounds that take place within whole-class vocabulary activities in which the ability to spell a word
is treated as part of word knowledge (cf. Nation, 2013). The extracts presented in the study come from a group of students between the ages of 6 and 9 who attended the weekly lessons after ordinary school hours. Unlike previous inquiries into collaborative spelling practices, the focus here is not on corrections of misspelled words, but rather how routine vocabulary activities with a spelling focus are organized and carried out. The analysis begins by explicating how lexical items were established as the targets of spelling work and how slots for the letters were visualized on the whiteboard. This was done in different ways, such as writing out blank spaces on the whiteboard before the target words were identified. Notably, the blank spaces served as ‘place holders’, that visually configured the number of letters required, but also allowed for the possibility to bypass the normative left-to-right order in which the oral delivery of letters were expected to be delivered (cf. Macbeth, 2000). Another way items were established non-verbally was through the teacher’s embodied moves. An important part of the focus of the study is the spelling activity proper, where the teacher’s verbal or multimodal receipt of student suggestions as well as the clues she gave to prompt letters affected the progression of the activity. Another central element of this phase is in the different ways the participants worked out the phoneme-grapheme relationship. Students were encouraged to ‘sound out’ words, i.e. parse words into individual sounds, which in turn corresponded to different letters that make up the spelling of the word. Students were expected to provide the letters in English, the target language.

Once all the letters for a lexical item had been established on the whiteboard, the teacher or a designated student typically read the complete word out loud. In addition, the sequences were often extended by the teacher or a student by commenting on some aspect of the topicalized item, such as a silent letter and/or a similarity or difference to Swedish. These metalinguistic reflections, which involved crosslinguistic comparisons, demonstrate the bilingual nature of MTI and the ways that Swedish regularly served as both medium and topic, despite participants’ orientations to English as the preferred medium of interaction.
Study III
Impromptu vocabulary work in English mother tongue instruction

Kirsten Stoewer and Nigel Musk, (2018). *Classroom Discourse.*

This study deals with unplanned vocabulary work that arose out of students’ talk in the MT classroom. Furthermore, it shows how the teacher and students jointly contributed towards the ensuing teaching trajectories, whereby the vocabulary items were turned into teachables’, i.e. interactionally emergent objects of explicit teaching. The analysis is based on a collection drawn from a corpus of thirty hours of video-recordings of English MT lessons. Based on how vocabulary items emerged, the data yielded 21 cases. The extracts presented come from a group of students aged 12 and 14-15 and provide one example from each of the three categories of vocabulary activities, grouped according to how they arose: 1) teacher-initiated substitution requests of an incorrect or inappropriate word; 2) a student’s naming and word-confirmation requests; 3) the teacher’s or a student’s translation and meaning requests.

The study also explores what aspects of vocabulary knowledge were targeted in the teaching trajectories. The trajectories developed collaboratively and were tailored to the local context to address issues of meaning, form and use. Establishing the meaning of a word frequently involved (and could combine) requesting/providing, e.g., definitions and translations. Form could be targeted by carefully enunciating topicalized lexis or writing it on the board, and vocabulary use was typically elaborated by contextualizing words and sometimes by exploring collocations.

One further aspect of ‘knowing a word’ cuts across meaning, form and use, namely translation and comparisons with Swedish, which draws on and assumes both the students’ and teacher’s bilingualism. Thus, despite there generally being an English monolingual norm in place in these lessons, just over half of the targeted lexical items in the collection involved substituting Swedish words that were exploited by
the teacher as an additional source of pedagogical material. In line with the syllabus for MTI (Skolverket 2017a), she invited comparisons between Swedish and English form, meaning and use.

The multimodal EMCA approach adopted in this study allows one to home in on the vocabulary teaching and learning process and highlight the sequential import of all participants’ contributions. By explicating the sequential unfolding of vocabulary work *in situ*, EMCA also offers a data-driven approach to analyzing how participants display and interpret their understanding of what is being accomplished across each of the teaching trajectories.

The findings highlight the fairly advanced level of these MTI students, who displayed greater variation in vocabulary work than previous studies of intermediate-level adult L2 learners in their ability to participate in and contribute to the lengthy and quite complex sequences. The results also illustrate how the teacher involved the students in the vocabulary work as she built on their contributions and experiences to work with vocabulary in a contingent fashion.
6. Summary of Studies
The present thesis has investigated interaction in English mother tongue instruction in Sweden. Using the analytical tools of ethnomethodological conversation analysis, the thesis has explored how teacher and students achieve MTI in practice and in interaction, by analyzing video-recordings of three groups of students and one teacher of English MTI. With the help of detailed transcripts of talk and multimodal features deployed by the participants, the three empirical studies have examined the instructional work that is being carried out in the lessons. Focusing on different types of language work, the studies investigate what is being taught and how. This involves demonstrating how the language work arises and in what ways it is developed, by teacher and students. It also involves exploring the role of the local availability of two languages in the in situ accomplishment of MTI.

In the following discussion, I review some of the key findings of the thesis and explore their and theoretical and practical implications. The final section briefly addresses limitations and possibilities for future research.

Findings

The overall picture of the corpus found both similarities and differences with previous inquiries into MTI in Sweden. Similarly to what has been found for other MT classrooms, the lessons in my data were mainly teacher-fronted, particularly as groups were small (Ganuza & Hedman, 2015, 2017a; cf. Walsh, 2006). Lessons were
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held in English, the target language (TL). English was consistently used as the medium of interaction regardless of pedagogical context. For example, the teacher did not alternate to Swedish in procedural contexts, i.e., when giving instructions, or for classroom management (cf. Üstünel and Seedhouse, 2005; see also Üstünel, 2016). The students all attended mainstream Swedish schools and attended the MT lessons after regular school hours.

**Vocabulary**

Vocabulary work was found to be a central feature of the lessons. As the three empirical studies have shown, sequences of interaction that revolved around the teaching and learning of individual lexical items occurred frequently across the corpus. Some of these sequences took place within the context of activities recognizable as vocabulary-centered activities; a great many occurred as spontaneously-arising topicalization of lexical items within an array of other types of activities. The embedded sequences with a focus on a specific lexical item (or items) often arose as part of larger activities, such as during talk at the start of the lesson or during transitions from one activity to the next, during reading aloud activities, while reviewing homework, completing worksheets or other regular features of the lessons.

Lexical items were topicalized as the focus of vocabulary-related sequences in a variety of ways. For example, during lessons with the younger group of children, with whom topics were often approached thematically, work on seasonal colors, parts of the body, foods, holiday-related words was often a starting point for planned activities with a vocabulary-building orientation (study 1, 2). Other times, the teacher would initiate topicalization of lexical items that arose within other types of oral or written activities. These sequences occurred across all groups and were sometimes extended by the teacher building on the topicalized item and steering the interaction towards the production of semantically related items (e.g., vegetables, sports, things that can be built using Lego, etc.).
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As shown in study 3, many impromptu vocabulary-related sequences arose out of student talk. Both students and teacher initiated topicalization of lexical items, in the form of substitution requests, naming requests (‘what’s x?’), word-confirmation requests, or meaning requests, (‘what does x mean?’). In sum, spontaneously emerging lexical items that grew out of other activities were frequently seized upon as welcome arenas for the teaching and learning of the TL (cf. Mortensen, 2011).

By analyzing the organization of vocabulary sequences and the ways that lexical items were collaboratively turned into ‘teachables’, the studies (1, 2, 3) uncover the various aspects of word knowledge that were dealt with in the sequences (cf. Nation, 2011). Receptive and productive knowledge of form, meaning and use were variously developed, depending on the local context in which items arose. Issues to do with spoken form, i.e. pronunciation, though relatively uncommon, arose most often in the context of written text to be read aloud by the student. Pronunciation was generally dealt with through embedded repair, such as through the teacher’s careful repetition and articulation of the problem item. Productive trouble involving written words was occasionally treated as signaling problems of understanding and thereby became the topic of word explanation sequences (Study 1, ex 5a). Written form is addressed specifically in study 2, which examines spelling as an element of whole-class vocabulary sessions that involve writing items down, on worksheets or on the whiteboard. Meaning is central to all vocabulary work and was dealt with in a multitude of ways, notably through definition work, substitutions, clarifications, translations, exploring synonyms and homonyms (studies 1, 2, 3). The analyses also illustrate a range of verbal and embodied resources that participants deployed during the vocabulary work (studies 2, 3). Finally, use is addressed via contextualization, breaking down compound words and collocation work (studies 1, 3).
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Local availability of two shared languages

The three empirical studies also examine the role of the local availability of more than one shared language in the data. Teacher use of the TL across contexts constructed the classroom as an English-speaking domain (cf. Slote-Lüttge, 2005, 2007). Although there were no formal rules in place in this regard, breaches of the local monolingual norm were always potentially subject to being policed (cf. Amir, 2014). Though there were numerous instances of language alternation (LA) across the corpus, they were very limited in scope and mainly confined to or subject to what I have called translation requests (studies 1, 2, 3).

The translation requests arose spontaneously in the course of a variety of activities (studies 1, 2, 3). By spontaneously I mean that they were not part of activities geared specifically toward translating vocabulary lists or chunks of text\footnote{Over the entire term, I only observed a single written activity that specifically involved translating (irregular verbs) with one group.}. Some translation requests were student-initiated requests for word in English and were used as a way to appeal for the teacher’s help in completing an oral narrative (study 3\footnote{These instances were part of the collection for study 3 though not exemplified in the article.}). However, the overwhelming majority of translation requests were initiated by the teacher (studies 1, 2, 3). The requests occurred both in response to student trouble and in the absence of student displays of difficulty. They performed several different actions, such as checking comprehension of a topicalized item, or prompting production of the target language (studies 1, 2). The translation requests were thus closely tied to vocabulary work since they were used as a way of topicalizing lexical items. Moreover, the requests were bi-directional (studies 1, 2). That is to say, the teacher frequently either uttered a word in Swedish as a way of eliciting the English equivalent from students (cf. Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005, teacher-induced code-switching) or, conversely, requested equivalents in Swedish for words...
that had been established in English. To be sure, translation requests from Swedish to English also served to perform medium repair. Students’ ability to supply a translation was typically treated as an acceptable way of demonstrating their understanding of a topicalized item (study 1, sparris ‘asparagus’). Thus, despite a preference for TL use, student trouble producing an item in the TL could also lead to requests for an equivalent in Swedish (studies 1, 2, 3). Indeed, Swedish was treated by the teacher as proof of students’ understanding of a word. As such, it was exploited alongside or in addition to word explanation in English (studies 1, 2, 3).

On the other hand, translation requests used to perform medium repair, i.e. in response to student use of a Swedish lexical item embedded into an utterance in English, were one way the teacher oriented to preference for TL talk. Students also oriented to English as the preferred medium of interaction through pauses or perturbations (verbal or embodied) before producing a word in Swedish. In this way, the students displayed their awareness that they were accountable for producing utterances in English. Another way students oriented to the preference for TL talk was by pausing (e.g., in a narrative) and asking for help in producing a word in English, i.e. by producing a translation/naming request (from Swedish to English) inserted into their own narrative. Though there were instances where the teacher simply supplied the word in English, these types of trouble displays could be contingently transformed into vocabulary work.

Finally, although using translation requests to deal with spontaneously arising lexical items could function as a simple and efficient way to pinpoint meaning across the cohort, they did not always go smoothly. There are several examples where the zones of interactional transition (Markee, 2004) created by teacher-initiated translation requests led to contingent complications (studies 1, 2, 3). This happened in cases where there were problems of intersubjectivity regarding the word in English the teacher was trying to elicit via a translation request, either because the student was unfamiliar with that
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word, in Swedish or in English (studies 1, 2), or when more than one translation was possible. An additional complication in spelling sequences arose when the teacher elicited spelling or promoted sounding out before the target word in English had clearly been established (study 2).

Theoretical and practical implications

In this section, I discuss the significance of my study in relation to the fields of MTI and heritage language education (HLE). In addition, I explore the ways the present thesis contributes to knowledge generated by interaction-oriented studies of other types of bi- and multilingual classrooms and, by extension, to the broader field of conversation analysis (CA).

Mother tongue instruction and heritage language education

As discussed in chapter 2 of this thesis, MTI in Sweden is an under-researched form of education. Previous inquiries into MTI have focused almost exclusively on its sociopolitical dimensions. Not until recently have classroom-based studies of MTI begun to shed light on teachers’ views and “the black box” (Long, 1980) of MTI, that is, the classroom floor. These ethnographic studies of MTI in Sweden have used classroom observation and interviews of teachers to highlight the structural challenges that MTI teachers face (Reath Warren, 2013, 2017) as well as the interplay between the language ideological positions of MT teachers and classroom practice (Ganuza & Hedman, 2015, 2017a; Reath Warren, 2017). Unlike these studies, the present thesis takes its starting point in practice and thus examines the ways that teaching and learning in MTI is enacted as a joint accomplishment between participants. Video-recordings and transcripts of actual practice, in the language(s) used by participants themselves, provide insights into the ways that students and teacher ‘do’ MTI. By
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examining teacher-student interaction, the present thesis therefore constitutes a significant contribution to knowledge of MTI.

The present thesis also situates itself within the wider field of heritage and community language education (HLE). Practice-based studies, notably in Britain and Australia, have investigated language ideological positions and questions of identity in various types of community language classrooms. This thesis thus contributes to that body of literature by examining practice in a similar type of classroom in a different national setting.

In the United States, the recent rise in heritage language speakers who have enrolled in tertiary foreign language courses has spurred cognitively-oriented researchers to consider the ways that knowledge about heritage language speakers or learners can contribute to existing theories of SLA (Carreira & Kagan, 2011; Lynch, 2014; Montrul, 2011, 2012; cf. Valdés, 2005). HLLs have been described as sharing traits with both native speakers and second language learners (Gass & Selinker, 2008; Kagan & Dillon, 2012; Kondo-Brown, 2005; cf. Valdés, 2000). They have been characterized as neither-nor, or “lost in between” the two (Isurin & Ivanova, 2008, p. 100). Determining the language-specific characteristics of this particular category of speakers has been at the heart of interest in developing a theory of HL pedagogy (Kagan & Dillon, 2011; Montrul, 2008). This work has predominantly relied on the same experimental methodology as classical linguistics and SLA (Kagan & Dillon, 2011). Evaluations of HLLs’ language skills have therefore relied on comparisons with L2 learners on the one hand and native speakers on the other. Like mainstream cognitivist studies of L2 learners, the focus is on error. In other words, they derive from an idealized conception of bilingualism, which measures bilingualism against a monolingual norm. This is what Martin-Jones and Romaine (1985) have called a “container view of competence” (p. 32).

As Kagan and Dillon (2011) point out, emphasis on mistakes and narrow measures of linguistic ability runs the risk of overlooking the
range of knowledge and abilities that HLLs possess. While these types of studies may provide valuable clues regarding certain characteristics of HLL speech, they have little to say about the social dimensions of language use (He, 2004, 2010; Moore, 2017), or the contingencies of classroom interaction. In other words, by grounding the analysis in participants’ own understandings of interactional work in the MT classroom as it unfolds on an action by action basis, the present thesis provides valuable insights to both theory and practice of HLE.

Social interaction in the language classroom

As discussed in chapter 3, CA studies of a broad range of language classrooms have re-directed focus from viewing teaching and learning as an individual, mental process to attending to the observable conduct that members in interaction use to carry out the business of the classroom. In grounding the analysis in the observable behaviors of participants, this line of research has also challenged the “landing-ground perspective” (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 93; see Ch. 3) of pedagogy, which begins and ends at the task-as-workplan. Interaction-oriented studies instead home in on the procedures or processes through which teaching and learning take place, i.e. “the task-in-process or actual pedagogy” (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 93. Talk and embodied actions unfold contingently and participants use multiple resources to accomplish the goals at hand. By examining the teaching trajectories of unplanned vocabulary-oriented sequences, studies 1 and 3 of this thesis contribute to the growing number of studies of that seek to disentangle the interactional organization of vocabulary work in language classrooms, as well as to identify the instructional goals and upshots to which such work is oriented (see, e.g. Mortensen, 2011; Waring et al., 2013, 2016).

In line with findings from other studies of HL settings as well as other types of language classrooms (Amir, 2013; Creese et al., 2011; Huq, 2018; Li Wei & Wu, 2009; Musk, 2006, 2010; Slotte-Lüttge, 2005), the present thesis has shown that a monolingual norm was in
place in the data and that this norm was co-constructed in and through the interaction that took place in the classroom. However, in contrast to findings from foreign language classrooms, where the English-only rule was imposed from ‘above’ i.e. via the school’s or teacher’s explicit policy (Amir, 2013; Huq, 2018), in my data the norm was constructed in a somewhat more implicit manner. Paradoxically, it is precisely in the teacher’s distinct and structured inclusion of Swedish lexical items that constructs Swedish as the dispreferred language. Similarly, the students orient to the norm by avoiding use of Swedish (sometimes even when they are given license to do so by the teacher) and thereby reflexively partake in the co-construction of the norm (see Slotte-Lütte, 2005, 2007). The monolingual norm undoubtedly affects students’ possibilities for participation in the lessons and hence, learning affordances (see Slotte-Lütte, 2007, p. 118-119; Ganuza & Hedman, 2015; cf. Cekaite, 2006), as illustrated by the medium repair work discussed earlier in this chapter. It creates an environment where students who have stronger skills in the TL are more likely to be heard. However, the teacher’s repair work also provides opportunities for the learning the TL. By supplying the word in the TL it is made relevant and offered for others to hear as well (cf. Slotte-Lütte, 2005, p. 190).

Indeed, in contrast to the above-mentioned studies, an important finding of the present thesis has to do with the ways that the teacher’s inclusion of Swedish was instrumental in creating a multitude of opportunities for the development of both languages. Thus, far from being a compensatory measure, the language alternation examined in the present thesis shows that Swedish was exploited as a resource – not just a ‘necessary evil’. Previous research has argued that translation requests, or multilingual naming requests have the potential to create opportunities for participation and learning in diverse types of multilingual educational settings (Martin et al., 2006; Bonacina-Pugh, 2012). Moreover, the vocabulary work in my data grew out of and acknowledged students’ everyday lives and
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experiences. In line with what has been termed “macro approaches”
to HL pedagogy (Parra, Bravo, Polinsky, 2018), the teaching in my
data built on students’ funds of knowledge (cf. Li Wei, 2015).

As has been shown, the vocabulary work emerged within the
interaction and oriented to the core goal of the language classroom,
where language is both the vehicle and object of the lessons (cf.
Seedhouse, 2004). Sequences that arose out of student talk entailed a
shift in focus from content (of, e.g., a student utterance or narrative)
to form (i.e. the TL). As regards translation requests, similar patterns
have been found in language maintenance practices in bilingual
families, in which parents temporarily suspend attending to the
content of a child’s utterance (by either claiming lack of understanding
or producing translation requests) until it has been delivered in the
correct language (Kheirkhah, 2016; Kheirkhah & Cekaite, 2015). The
invocation of the heritage-language-only norm in these families
foregrounds parental strategies to broaden children’s communicative
repertoires but was also frequently resisted by the children as a way
of asserting their own agency (Kheirkhah, 2016). By contrast, in the
present data, students actually co-construct the sometimes lengthy
and complex side sequences (study 3) as part of the business of the
language classroom. This finding points to the significance of HLE as
an important component of HL maintenance outside the family (cf.
Jørgensen & Quist, 2009).

The studies also illustrate the various ways the teacher involved
students in the vocabulary work. For example, by contingently re-
distributing the participation framework from a teacher-student dyadic
interaction to a multiparty activity involving the cohort, through gaze,
counter questions and questions directed at more than one participant,
the teacher engaged students in the vocabulary work (study 3, plotting;
cf. Markee, 2000; Mehan, 1979; Payne & Hustler, 1980; Schwab,
2011). Translation requests from English to Swedish were another
resource used to engage more than one student in the interaction
(Study 1, Ex. 5b, 6), promoting participation before transforming the item into a ‘teachable’.

Furthermore, analysis of the teaching trajectories sequences illustrates how the vocabulary work itself is often framed as a collective project. This is shown most clearly in study 3 (‘plotting’; *ungdomsfullmäktige* ‘youth council’) highlights the high degree of collaborative work involved in arriving at a ‘good enough’ translation. The interactional work involves considerable negotiation, shifting roles of epistemic authority, etc. The teacher contingently builds on students’ contributions, adjusting and refining her own contributions, while maintaining control over the direction of the trajectories.

Another affordance of the vocabulary work involving translation has to do with the cross-linguistic comparisons through which form, meaning and use were explored in the data (study 1, 2, 3). Invoking comparisons between Swedish and English were common practices and involved aspects of form, such as word length (study 2, leg), spelling (including silent letters; study 2, knee; study 3, urn), pronunciation (study 2: knee, study 1: wreath). Semantic extension between items in Swedish and English are also explored (study 3: *ungdomsfullmäktige* ‘youth council’). Swedish could also be invoked without explicitly naming an item in order to prompt production of an item in English (study 1, green). Compound words in Swedish were broken down into their respective parts as a way to tackle establishing equivalents in English (study 1, sweet potato; study 3, *ungdomsfullmäktige* ‘youth council’) and explore use (study 3). The significance of these cases in relation to the MTI setting is that they often dealt with culture- or domain-specific lexical items arising out of students’ daily lives (studies 1, 3). As such, the teacher did not (and could not) have pre-prepared answers to what these items were called in English but rather, had to deal with them on the spot. Furthermore, the sequences highlight the teacher’s expectations of students’ competence and ability to follow along and contribute in English.
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Summing up, the present thesis adds new knowledge to research on MTI in Sweden and HLE internationally. By adopting a conversation analytic framework, the thesis provides an empirically grounded, emic account of interaction in this highly diverse educational setting, about which little is known. Rather than relying on accounts or measures of outcome, the present thesis focuses on how teaching and learning is collaboratively accomplished in this particular setting. The thesis also situates itself within the growing body of CA studies of multilingual classrooms across diverse settings. In so doing, the thesis crucially contributes to broadening and changing perspectives within the field of EMCA, which has by and large been a monolingual enterprise (see Ch. 4). Furthermore, by situating the results of the present thesis within interaction-oriented studies of other types of language classrooms, we may begin to gain a better sense of what characterizes the heritage language classroom.

Although the structural obstacles that continue to hinder MTI are real and consequential, the problems that MTI faces cannot all be solved through ‘top-down’ intervention. Before we can presume to ‘fix’ the problems of MTI, we must gain a better understanding of the object in question. The current thesis therefore offers an empirically anchored, emic perspective on MTI, which tries to unravel the orientations, relevancies and challenges of those who take part in it. Adopting a description-leading-to-informed-action stance (Richards, 2005) it also seeks to offer knowledge that will equip practitioners with a means to reflect about their practice. The knowledge is not only of relevance for those directly involved in MTI, but should help broaden understandings of all those who work with students, monolingual or otherwise.

Implications for future research

Given the scarce amount of practice-based research on MTI, more knowledge is clearly needed about a range of aspects pertaining to this particular setting. The main limitation of the present thesis is that the
three groups investigated are all taught by the same teacher. On the other hand, the range of ages represented by the groups is wider than many studies of educational practice. Moreover, the condition of teaching children of several different grades and ages likely reflects the reality of many MT teachers and differs in many respects from the circumstances under which most other subject teaching occurs at compulsory and secondary level in mainstream schools.

Another limitation of the present study could conceivably be the choice of English MTI. I have addressed this aspect and motivated my choice in Chapter 5. One advantage of studying English MTI is the large diversity in terms of language varieties and national backgrounds represented by speakers of English. For example, in the data for the current study there were times when differences between (here) British, Australian and American English were made relevant by the participants. Future research might consider the ways different varieties of language spoken by the students and teacher are oriented to by the participants and how this is managed by the teacher.

The relatively small groups in my data are fairly typical for the smaller language groups, of which there are many, across Sweden. It is possible that studying larger groups of MTI might yield more variety in terms of task types and student-student interaction, though this is an empirical question. Examining student-student interaction in MTI might provide new insights into the ways students manage, e.g., language alternation or matters of identity.

MTI in Sweden is an extremely heterogeneous setting, due to the way it is organized at the municipal level. Sweden’s decentralized school system and the flexibility with which MTI may be arranged, within each city and at each school, makes it difficult if not impossible to generalize about this setting. Furthermore, the vast amount of languages in which MTI is taught and the way communities who speak different languages are distributed across municipalities entail a great deal of variety across settings. The present thesis has merely scratched the surface of some of the possible ways that MTI may be
7. Concluding Discussion

different from other types of language classrooms and possible implications for pedagogy. Crucially, it has grounded the analysis in participants’ own orientations. Considering the vulnerable position of MTI and MT teachers, which made it difficult to enlist participants for this study, a methodology that aims at an emic orientation seems like a good place to start.
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Appendix A: Information letter to parents and guardians (English and Swedish)

Dear parents and guardians of children attending English as mother tongue lessons,

My name is Kirsten Stoewer and I’m a PhD student in Educational Practice at Linköping University. My research is on Mother Tongue Tuition (also known as ‘Home Language’). I’m writing to you regarding a study I would like to carry out involving your child’s home language lessons. I would like your permission to film the lessons over a period of time (probably about three months), as a basis for my doctoral dissertation.

Though multilingualism has received a lot of attention in school contexts in recent years, not much seems to be known about Mother Tongue Tuition. Indeed, very little research has been done on the subject as it is carried out in everyday practice. I would like to fill that gap and contribute to a better understanding of how these lessons are accomplished in interaction. I’m most interested in studying how children interact with each other and their teacher, how they understand each other, using language(s), gaze, gestures and other resources at their disposal during mother tongue tuition. That means that I’m not out to evaluate the lessons—much less the children, nor propose the best methods for teaching. My aim is to record the interaction as it would normally occur and not to disrupt or alter the lessons in any way.
All data, recordings will be handled with strict confidentiality, that is to say they will be handled by myself and used for research purposes only and I adhere to the ethical standards set up by the Swedish Research Council (http://www.codex.vr.se/texts/HSFR.pdf). Names of persons, schools, or any other revealing details will be changed when publishing articles, to guarantee participants full anonymity. Participation in the study is voluntary, and you and your children have the right to withdraw your consent at any time without explanation.

If you have questions or concerns or would like to know more about my research, you are most welcome to contact me! I’m most easily reached via email (see below). You are also welcome to contact either of my supervisors: Prof. Jakob Cromdal, tel 011 36 36 18, jakob.cromdal@liu.se, or Dr. Nigel Musk, tel. 013 28 18 69, nigel.musk@liu.se. Read more about research at Educational Practice on our web page at: http://www.isv.liu.se/pedagogiskt-arbete/samspel-och-interaktion-som-pedagogisk-verksamhet?i=en&sc=true.

Attached to this letter please find a consent form for participation in this study. I ask that you read through it, discuss it with your child(ren), then circle “yes” or “no,” and sign the letter. Please return the signed consent form to me in the included envelope as soon as possible!

Sincerely,
Kirsten Stoewer
kirsten.stoewer@liu.se.
Tel: 011 36 30 96 or 0700850706
Hej!

Jag heter Kirsten Stoewer och arbetar som doktorand i Pedagogiskt Arbete vid Linköpings Universitet. Min forskning handlar om modersmålsundervisning (även kallad ”hemspråk”). Anledningen till att jag kontaktar Er är för att be om tillåtelse att utföra en studie som involverar ert/era barn. Studien innebär att jag kommer att filma modersmålslektionerna under en period (ungefär tre månader). Materialet kommer att utgöra den vetenskapliga basen till mitt avhandlingsarbete.

Även om mycket uppmärksamhet har riktats mot flerspråkiga barn i skolsammanhang, finns det inte mycket kunskap om modersmålsundervisning. Det finns faktiskt väldigt lite forskning om hur modersmålsundervisning görs i praktiken. Jag hoppas kunna bidra till att fylla detta tomrum. Mitt primära intresse handlar om att utforska hur barn använder sig av språk och andra resurser i samspel med varandra och med sin lärare. Det vill säga att mitt syfte är inte i första hand att utvärdera lektionerna, ännu mindre att utvärdera barnens kunskaper eller fastslå bästa undervisningsmetod. Jag ämnar dokumentera samspelen så som det kommer till uttryck i vanliga lektioner utan att störa eller ändra lektionerna på något vis.

Allt material kommer att behandlas konfidentiellt, dvs. att inspelningar bara användas av mig och vår forskargrupp och endast i forskningssyfte och att jag i övrigt följer Vetenskapsrådets forskningsetiska principer i allt jag gör (http://www.codex.vr.se/texts/HSFR.pdf). Inga riktiga namn på personer, skolor, platser eller andra igenkännbara detaljer kommer att användas vid publicering.

Har du frågor eller funderingar eller vill du veta mer om min studie är du välkommen att Kontakta mig! Enklast när du mig via epost. Du kan även kontakta en av mina handledare vid LiU, Jakob Cromdal eller Nigel.
Musk (se kontaktuppgifter på andra sidan). Mer om forskning vid Pedagogiskt Arbete hittar du vid vår hemsida: (http://www.isv.liu.se/pedagogiskt-arbete/samspel-och-interaktion-som-pedagogisk-verksamhet?l=sv).

Bifogad finner ni ett samtyckesbrev för deltagande i studien. Jag vill be er att läsa igenom brevet, diskutera innehållet med ert/era barn, kryssa ”ja” eller ”nej” och skriva under. Vänligen skicka detta brev till mig i det bifogade kuvertet så fort som möjligt!

Med vänlig hälsning
Kirsten Stoewer
kirsten.stoewer@liu.se
Tel. 011 36 30 96 alt. 0700850706
Appendix B: Informed consent form in English and Swedish

Mother Tongue Tuition in practice
Informed consent form

I have read and understood the information letter explaining the purpose of Kirsten Stoewer’s study and how it will be carried out. I understand that this study is designed to further scientific knowledge, that all recordings will be used for research purposes only and that participants are guaranteed full anonymity. No real names of persons, places, schools, or any other revealing details, will be mentioned or used in this or any other study that results from these recordings. I understand that participation in this study is voluntary and my child and I have the right to discontinue participation at any time and will not be required to give any reasons for withdrawing.

YES
I give my permission for my child to participate in the study.

NO
My child may not participate in the study.

Student’s name: ____________________________________________

Student’s signature: ________________________________________
Parent/guardian’s name:
__________________________________

Parent’s signature:
__________________________________

__________________________________
(Date and place)
Modersmålsundervisning i praktiken
Samtyckesbrev

Jag har tagit del av information om Kirsten Stoewers studie och hur den kommer att genomföras. Jag förstår att studien ämnar främja vetenskaplig kunskap, att alla videoinspelningar kommer att användas endast i forskningssyfte och att alla deltagare är garanterade anonymitet. Inga riktiga namn på personer, skolor, platser eller andra igenkännbara detaljer kommer att användas i denna eller annan studie som utgår från detta material. Jag förstår att deltagandet är frivilligt och att jag och mitt barn har rätt att avbryta deltagandet när som helst utan att förklara varför.

JA
jag godkänner att mitt/mina barn får delta i studien.

NEJ
jag godkänner inte att mitt/mina barn får delta i studien.

Elevens namn: ___________________________

Eleven underskrift: ___________________________

_______________________________________
(Vårdnadshavares underskrift)
(Namnförtydligande)

_______________________________________
(Ort och datum)
LINKÖPING STUDIES IN PEDAGOGIC PRACTICES

1. MARKSTRÖM, ANNE-MARIE. Förskolan som normaliseringspraktik. En etnografisk studie. 2005. ISBN 91-85297-70-4.

2. WEDIN ANN-SOFI, Lärares arbete och kunskapsbildning. Utmaningar och inviter i den vardagliga praktiken. 2007. ISBN 978-91-85715-63-3.

3. BRÜDE SUNDIN, JOSEFIN. En riktig rektor. Om ledarskap, genus och skolkulturer. 2007. ISBN 978-91-85715-62-6.

4. HELLBERG, KRISTINA. Elever på ett anpassat individuellt gymnasieprogram: skolvardag och vändpunkter. 2007. ISBN 978-91-85831-92-0.

5. SPARRLÖF, GÖRAN. Vi manliga lärare Folkskolans lärare och lärarinnor i kamp om lönor och arbetsvillkor 1920-1963. 2007. ISBN 978-91-85831-38-8.

6. KARLSSON, YVONNE. Att inte vilja vara problem - social organisation och utvärdering av elever i en särskild undervisningsgrupp. 2008. ISBN 978-91-85895-28-1.

7. OLSON, MARIA. Från nationsbygghare till global marknadnomad. Om medborgarskapet i svensk utbildningspolitik under 1990-talet. 2008. ISBN 978-91-7393-890-7.

8. AYTON, KATARINA. An ordinary school child: Agency and authority in children’s schooling. 2008. ISBN 978-91-7393-834-1.

9. BOLANDER, EVA. Risk och bejakande. Sexualitet och genus i sexualupplysning och undervisning i TV. 2009. ISBN 978-91-7393-685-9.

10. JOHANSSON HARRIE, ANNA. Staten och läromedlen. En studie av den svenska statliga förhandsgranskningen av läromedel 1938-1991. 2009. ISBN 978-91-7393-616-3.

11. HÖGBERG, RONNY. Motstånd och konformitet. Om manliga yrkeselevs liv och identitetsskapande i relation till kärnämnen. 2009. ISBN 978-91-7393-543-2.

12. HEGENDER, HENRIK. Mellan akademi och profession. Hur lärarkunskap formuleras och bedöms i verksamhetsförlagd lärarutbildning. 2010. ISBN 978-91-7393-526-5.

13. SEVERINSSON, SUSANNE. Unga i normalitetens gränsland: Undervisning och behandling i särskilda undervisningsgrupper och hem för vård eller boende. 2010. ISBN 978-91-7393-402-2.

14. WIDÈN, PÅR. Bedömningsmakter. Berättelser om stat, lärare och elev, 1960-1995. 2010. ISBN 978-91-7393-372-8.

15. SANDLUND, MONICA. Lärare med utländsk bakgrund. Sju yrkeslivsberättelser om möten med nya skolsammanslag. 2010. ISBN 978-91-7393-371-1.

16. LILJA, PATRIK. Contextualizing inquiry. Negotiations of tasks, tools and actions in an upper secondary classroom. 2012. ISBN 978-91-7346-735-3.

17. FREDRIKSSON, KRISTINA (Licentiatavhandling). Drama som pedagogisk möjlighet. En intervjusstudie med lärare i grundskolan. 2013. ISBN 978-91-7519-613-8
18. BENGTSSON, JENNY. Jag sa att jag älskade han men jag har redan sagt förlåt för det. Ålder, genus och sexualitet i skolans tidigare år. 2013. ISBN 978-91-7519-560-5

19. SÖDERMAN LAGO, LINA. "Mellanklass kan man kalla det": Om tid och meningsskapande vid övergången från förskoleklass till årskurs ett. 2014. ISBN 978-91-7519-349-6

20. STENLIDEN, LINNÉA. Visual Storytelling Interacting in School. 2014. ISBN: 978-91-7519-338-0

21. ELFSTRÖM PETERSSON, KATARINA (Licentiatavhandling). Playing a part in preschool documentation – A study of how participation is enacted preschool documentation practices and how it is affected by material agents. 2014. ISBN: 978-91-7519-339-7

22. DALGREN, SARA (Licentiatavhandling). Förskolans pedagogiska praktik som interaktion. Frågor och svar i vardagliga förskoleaktiviteter. 2014. ISBN: 978-91-7519-262-8

23. HIJORT, SIMON (Licentiatavhandling). Kritiskt tänkande i klassrummet. En studie av didaktiska val och manifesterat kritiskt tänkande i samhällskunskaps- och filosofifundervisning. 2014. ISBN: 978-91-7519-166-9

24. BOO, SOFIA (Licentiatavhandling). Lärarens arbete med individanpassning. Strategier och dilemma i klassrummet. 2014. ISBN: 978-91-7519-157-7

25. JOHANSSON, MARITHA. Läsa, förstå, analysera. En komparativ studie om svenska och franska gymnasielärens reception av en narrativ text. 2015. ISBN: 978-91-7685-964-3

26. NORBURG, ULRIKA. Fängelse, skola uppfostranstalt eller skyddshem? Åkerbrukskolonien Hall för pojkar år 1876-1940. 2015. ISBN: 978-91-7685-980-3

27. ALBINSSON, ANDERS. "De var svinhögt typ 250 kilo". Förskolebarns måtande av längd, volym och tid i legoleken. 2016. ISBN: 978-91-7685-828-8

28. WINZELL, HELEN (Licentiatavhandling). Svensklärarens skrivdidaktiska kunskapsbildning: Blivande och tidigt verksamma gymnasielärare i svenska talar om skrivundervisning. 2016. ISBN: 978-91-7685-788-5

29. BODÉN, LINNEA. Present absences. Exploring the posthumanist entanglements of school absenteeism. 2016. ISBN: 978-91-7685-722-9

30. DALGREN, SARA. Att göra pedagogisk praktik tillsammans: Socialt samspel i förskolans vardag. 2017. ISBN: 978-91-7685-593-5

31. ELFSTRÖM PETTERSSON, KATARINA. productions and Products of Preschool. Documentation. Entanglements of children, things, and templates. 2017. ISBN: 978-91-7685-553-9

32. HARLING, MARTIN. Välja vara. En studie om gymnasieval, mässor och kampen om framtiden. 2017. ISBN: 978-91-7685-549-2

33. MARTÍN-BYLUND, ANNA. Towards a minor bilingualism: Exploring variations of language and literacy with early childhood education. 2017. ISBN: 978-91-7685-478-5

34. WALLNER, LARS. Framing Education: Doing Comics Literacy in the Classroom. 2017. ISBN: 978-91-7685-419-8

35. WINZELL, HELEN. Lära för skrivundervisning. En studie om skrivdidaktisk kunskap i ämneslärarutbildningen och läraryket. 2018. ISBN: 978-91-7685-179-1
1. SUSANNE SEVERINSSON (2010). Unga i normalitetens gränsland: Undervisning och behandling i särskilda undervisningsgrupper och hem för vård eller boende. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7393-402-2

2. KRISTINA FREDRIKSSON (2013). Drama som pedagogisk möjlighet. En intervjustudie med lärare i grundskolan. (Lic) ISBN: 978-91-7519-613-8

3. JENNY BENGTSSON (2013). Jag sa att jag älskade han men jag har redan sagt förlåt för det. Ålder, genus och sexualitet i skolans tidigare år. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7519-560-5

4. KATARINA ELFSTRÖM PETERSSON (2013). Playing a part in preschool documentation – A study of how participation is enacted in preschool documentation practices and how it is affected by material agents. (Lic) ISBN: 978-91-7519-339-7

5. LINA LAGO (2014). ”Mellanklass kan man kalla det”: Om tid och meningsskapande vid övergången från förskoleklass till årskurs ett. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7519-349-6

6. LINNEA STENLIDEN (2014). Visual Storytelling Interacting in School. Learning Conditions in the Social Science Classroom. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7519-338-0

7. SARA DALGREN (2014). Förskolans pedagogiska praktik som interaktion. Frågor och svar i vardagliga förskoleaktiviteter. (Lic) ISBN: 978-91-7519-262-8

8. MATS BEVEMYR (2014). Potentiella lärandesituationer och vardagliga matematiska begrepp. 4-5 åriga barns interaktion vid datorn under fri lek i förskolan. (Lic) ISBN: 978-91-7519-259-8

9. ANDERS ALBINSSON (2015). ”De var svinhögt typ 250 kilo” Förskolebarns mätande av längd, volym och tid i legoleken. ISBN: 978-91-7685-828-8

10. LINNEA BODÉN (2016). Present absences. Exploring the posthumanist entanglements of school absenteeism. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7685-722-9.
11. SARA DALGREN (2017). *Att göra pedagogisk praktik tillsammans: Socialt samspel i förskolans vardag*. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7685-593-5

12. KATARINA ELFSTRÖM PETTERSSON (2017). *Production and Products of Preschool Documentation. Entanglements of children, things, and templates*. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7685-553-9

13. MARTIN HARLING (2017). *Välja vara: En studie om gymnasieval, mässor och kampen om framtiden*. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7685-549-2

14. ANNA MARTIN-BYLUND (2017). *Towards a minor bilingualism: Exploring variations of language and literacy in early childhood education*. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7685-478-5

15. LARS WALLNER (2017). *Framing Education: Doing Comics Literacy in the Classroom*. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7685-419-8

16. KIRSTEN STOEWER (2018). *English Hemspråk. Language in Interaction in English Mother Tongue Instruction in Sweden*. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN 978-91-7685-182-1