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Introduction

This dissertation concerns social interaction involving refugee and immigrant youth in a Swedish introductory language program. It sets out to explore how newly arrived students with relatively limited Swedish language skills manage their participation in a classroom community. While teaching and learning Swedish are the primary aims of the program, this dissertation explicates how the introductory course also involves the forming of a community of practice.

In academic discourse as well as in education policy discourse in Sweden, newly arrived is a social category used for students immigrating during primary or secondary schooling (Bunar, 2010a; Nilsson & Axelsson, 2013). Newly arrived students constitute a growing group in Swedish schools who (in most cases) are provided with an introductory language program in which they receive intensive tuition in Swedish as a second language (SSL) and other core subjects as well as study guidance in the student’s first language (L1)—a preparatory program for further education within the mainstream school system and in extension Swedish society at large.

Until recently, much research on classroom second language learning (SLL) has focused on cognitive aspects of L2 acquisition and considerable work on classroom talk has had what could be called a dyadic bias, namely, in focusing on isolated teacher-student dialogues (e.g., Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Loewen & Philp, 2006; Sheen, 2006), rather than on teacher-student-peer constellations, that is, multiparty constellations, situated in the full complexity of multiparty classroom conversations (on the importance of multiparty aspects, see, for instance, Cekaite & Aronsson, 2005; Jakonen & Morton, 2015; Majlesi & Broth, 2012; Markee & Kasper, 2004). A basic assumption of this dissertation is that L2 students will use and learn language through participation in a community of practice situated and formed in a school setting (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Yet in contrast to much of the literature on communities of practice, the community is not something already given, such as, for instance, a specific community such as “Alcoholics Anonymous” (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Instead, the community itself is here mainly analyzed as an emergent phenomenon. To become a skilled participant in an educational context, an SSL student, therefore, not only has to acquire linguistic structures, s/he also has to develop communicative competencies tailored to the tasks at hand. This involves communicative resources and the positions, identities, values, and ideologies that constitute, and are mediated
through, discursive practices (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Duff, 2012; Duff & Talmy, 2011).

This dissertation documents the classroom as a multiparty setting that in certain ways structures participation through communicative practices and language use, illuminating not only how the teacher but also other students (peers) are essential coparticipants in L2 classroom language learning. In this dissertation, the educational setting is also understood to produce and mediate culturally situated epistemological, moral, and affective stances, which at times lead to paradoxical positions that both the teacher and the students may negotiate, resist, or adopt. The dissertation thus explicates how the SSL introduction program is also about identity work in socialization toward L2 Swedish, local language ideologies, as well as Swedish school culture and society at large (Studies I and II).

Studies that focus on the socially constructed nature of SSL classrooms often highlight the teacher’s role in the classroom, or illuminate teacher-student dyadic constellations in language learning. This dissertation aims to contribute to research on the classroom as a multiparty site for language learning and socialization. It primarily focuses on joint accomplishments in talk-in-interaction and how the participants form a community of L2 practices. Through detailed microanalyses, the traditional scope of second language acquisition (SLA) research in multilingual L2 settings will here be broadened to include interactional analyses and participant-relevant (emically oriented) analyses (Studies II and III).

Language norms and ideologies

Broadly speaking, L2 learning and use are highly ideological and politicized issues in a societal context, embedded in government policies, media debates, and educational curricula (cf. Agha, 2003; Pennycook, 1994; Rampton, 2013). Linguistic anthropological studies have highlighted speakers’ beliefs and feelings about their language practices in relation to broader ideological contexts (Gal, 1989, 1993; Hill, 1985; Irvine & Gal, 2000; Kroskryt, 2004, 2009; Silverstein, 1979; Woolard, 1985, 1998). Silverstein (1979) influenced the emergence of this field of inquiry when defining language ideologies as “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (p. 193). Building on this definition, Errington (2001) referred to “the situated, partial, and interested character of conceptions and uses of language” (p. 110). Similarly, Kroskryt (2004) defined language ideologies as “beliefs, or feelings, about languages as used in their social worlds” (p. 498).

Gal and Woolard (2001) defined language ideology as “cultural conceptions of the nature, form and purpose of language, and communicative behavior as an enactment of a collective order” (p. 1). In a discussion on
various public debates on “appropriate” or “correct” language use, Cameron (1995, p. 222) argued that all language use is basically normative, and we should instead explore the underlying ideologies of any type of debate on “plain” language, “assertive communication,” or any other type of language use and language ideology presented as more natural or more legitimate:

I have never met anyone who did not subscribe, in one way or another, to the belief that language can be ‘right’ or ‘wrong’, ‘good’ or ‘bad’, more or less ‘elegant’ or ‘effective’ or ‘appropriate’. Of course, there is massive disagreement about what values to espouse, and how to define them. Yet, however people may pick and choose, it is rare to find anyone rejecting altogether the idea that there is some legitimate authority in language. We are all of us closet prescriptionists – or as I prefer to put it, verbal hygienists. (Cameron, 1995, p. 9)

In studies of social interaction, language norms are often discussed in terms of children and youth contesting adult or institutional norms of language use (Cekaite & Evaldsson, 2008; Evaldsson & Cekaite, 2010; Jonsson, 2007; Jørgensen, 1998, 2003; Madsen, 2008, 2013; Milani & Jonsson, 2012; Møller & Jørgensen, 2011). The study of language norms can also be articulated as the study of orientations to linguistic ideologies (Evaldsson & Cekaite, 2010; Kyратзис, 2010).

Language and diversity have been pervasive themes in Swedish debates on immigration. In the Swedish context, “Rinkeby Swedish” (RS) is a contested language category that has dominated the debate on SLA, multilingualism, and heterogeneity (Stroud, 2004; Milani & Jonsson, 2012). RS has been defined as a variety that originates from, and is developed especially by, youth in multilingual environments (Bijvoet, 2003; Kotsinas, 2001). As such, it is a concept that ostensibly refers to some recurring linguistic characteristics of, in this case, Swedish spoken by immigrants, which is part of “heterogeneous strategies and resources that invoke and reconfigure identities in competition” (Stroud, 2004; Rampton, 2000:8). Bijvoet and Fraurud (2006, 2012) pointed out that RS is, however, not equivalent to L2 Swedish, by defining the latter as spoken by people who have learned or are learning SSL, and where the speakers’ first language can be noted as an accent.” There have been somewhat similar debates in Denmark and Norway on urban youth varieties in multilingual settings (e.g., Jørgensen, 2005).

Cameron (1995) and Stroud (2004) highlighted that advocating the use of standard language may position adolescents’ colloquial speech in terms of deficiency. Puristic norms can be seen in public debates as well as in educational contexts where an expressed concern for speakers of youth registers “contaminating” the language of youth who speak a standard variety of the language is cast as an argument for a dominant monolingual standard language (Cameron, 1995; Stroud, 2004). Standard Swedish can then serve to differentiate and assess people, and by referring to RS as deficient linguistic
competence, the debate might create or reproduce alienation (Milani & Jonsson, 2011, 2012; Stroud, 2004).

Central to the Swedish debate on RS is where to draw the line between Swedish and non-Swedish speech practices, and how it is to be viewed: a case of learner errors or linguistic innovations (Stroud, 2004). Some scholars have emphasized its temporal and transient nature as a learner variety of Swedish (Kotsinas, 2001); others have foregrounded its standing as a developing conventionalized multiethnic variety of Swedish (Bijvoet & Fraurud, 2006). Its opponents have taken more of a moralistic or purist role, arguing that the speakers not only have a poor vocabulary and a restricted language, but society is also doing them a disservice by encouraging and accepting RS. Thereby the debate on RS has highlighted a range of ideological implications regarding what type of language is legitimate for public official spaces, such as classrooms, and about who may be a legitimate speaker of a language or register (Jonsson, 2007; Milani & Jonsson, 2012; Stroud, 2004).

A monolingual emphasis on standard Swedish in a Swedish L2 educational context can thus be seen as part of wider “societal and political processes that formulate integration as an issue of language, i.e., ‘proper’ mastery of the majority language” (Evaldsson & Cekaite, 2010, p. 590; Milani & Jonsson, 2012; Stroud, 2004). Talking about RS in school settings in regard to whether it is to be seen as a dynamic language process or as an example of deficient Swedish thus invokes cultural associations to, and opinions on, the social characteristics of its speakers (Stroud, 2004; Milani & Jonsson, 2012) and indirectly perhaps also of Swedish L2.
Theoretical framework

Several important contributions have called for a reconceptualization within SLA research (Block, 1996; Firth and Wagner, 1997; Peirce [Norton], 1995; Rampton, 1997) to enhance the awareness of contextual and interactional dimensions of language use and learning, as well as to achieve an increased responsiveness toward participant-relevant categorizations. As a response to those calls, there has been a shift in the field of SLL. During the past two decades, a “social” turn in SLA has yielded a substantial body of research contributions with sociocultural, language socialization, poststructural, and critical theory approaches that illuminate the relationship between language learners and the larger social world.

In line with such work, this dissertation focuses on identity in and through discursive practices in the context of SSL education. A basic assumption here is that language constructs reality rather than merely reflecting it and that conversation and other discourse genres and practices are embedded in, and constitutive of, larger social conditions.

In its ambitions to understand language socialization from an emic point of view, that is, from a participant perspective (Sacks, 1992), this dissertation draws on insights from interactional approaches through an integrative framework of the broader analyses of language socialization theories (e.g., Ochs, & Schieffelin, 2012) and the detailed analyses, as in conversation analysis (CA). It also adopts social interactional perspectives on speaker identities in talk-in-interaction (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Aronsson, 1998; Benwell & Stokoe, 2006; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Kasper, 2004). This means that identity is analyzed as it unfolds sequentially and temporally in social action and as it is displayed and invoked by the participants themselves on a moment-by-moment basis through talk and nonverbal action. Similarly, instead of taking the “nonnative speaker” (NNS)/“native speaker” (NS) or L2 learner identities as fixed or given entities, such identities must be made relevant in, or oriented to, talk-in-interaction (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2013). This is in line with other recent work in which traditional divides such as NNS and NS are questioned on the basis of empirical data where traditional demarcation lines do not hold up (Evaldsson & Cekaite, 2010; Rampton, 2013). The dissertation, further, sets out to expand the scarce work on newly arrived students in Sweden (Cekaite, 2006, 2007, 2012; Evaldsson & Cekaite, 2010; Nilsson & Axelsson, 2013; for a review, see Bunar, 2010a).
Language socialization

The study of language socialization examines how novices apprehend and enact the “context of situation” in relation to the “context of culture”. With its dual focus on linguistic form and sociocultural context, language socialization research integrates discursive and ethnographic methods in its emphasis on “the engagement of ‘experts’ and ‘novices’ in the constructing/responding to macro-level cultural-linguistic norms of conduct” (Atkinson, 2011, p. 17). More specifically, it focuses on “capturing the social structurings and cultural interpretations of semiotic forms, practices, and ideologies that inform more or less experienced participants in practical engagements with others” (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012, p. 1).

Language socialization is therefore best viewed as an interactional or multidirectional rather than unidirectional process where a community’s linguistic repertoires are seen as sets of resources for displaying stances and performing acts in which all parties to socializing practices are agents in the formation of competence (Pontecorvo, Fasulo, & Sterponi, 2001; Talmy, 2008; Duff & Talmy, 2011). From a language socialization point of view, valued knowledge, talent, action, and emotions are acquired and developed “through socially organized, fluid collaborative exchanges wherein displays of relative adeptness may shift among participants” (Ochs, 2000; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012, pp. 5–6). Language learning and use proficiency are thus seen as something practice-based, emergent and developed through “performance strategies, situational resources, and social negotiations in fluid communicative contexts” (Canagarajah, 2007, p.923). Moreover, language socialization perspectives cast language users as individuals with multiple subjectivities and identities enacted and co-constructed in and through language in everyday-life social experiences (Duff & Talmy, 2011). Language socialization thus emphasizes the role of individual agency. However, as socialization is seen as a complex series of events situated in broad social, historical, and ideological processes as well as in micro-level cultural norms and interactions, language socialization involves issues of power, contingency, and the multidirectionality of influences (Talmy, 2008). As a consequence, language socialization enables the study of how socially, culturally, and politically positioned individuals engage in socialization activities and how they, in interactions, (re)produce and transform the social order (Baquedano-López & Hernandez, 2011; Duff & Talmy, 2011).

Language socialization shares important theoretical linkages with discursive psychology and CA perspectives on learning as a socially distributed phenomenon, that is, “studying understanding and knowing as interactional discursive objects and practices rather than as cognitive states” (Koole & Elbers, 2014, p. 59). Within the language socialization paradigm, the focus has been on language socialization through recurrent communicative practices by exploring social members’ interactional competencies and their
methods to establish and maintain social order in their activities, and by relating microfeatures of interactions to sociocultural concerns of the language community (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). In other words, linguistic practice is understood as a social practice social actors do and perform vis-à-vis the sociocultural systems and structures that constrain them, but which they also enable.

Talk as social action: Interactional approaches

CA offers a systematic approach to detailed analysis of talk-in-interaction, with a focus on talk as social action (Edwards, 1997, chap. 4, pp. 84–113; Schegloff, 2007). By linking both meaning and context to the idea of sequence, a fundamental concept in CA is that social action is to be analyzed by paying close attention to how the conversation unfolds turn by turn on a moment-by-moment basis, where one utterance makes another relevant (Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 2007). Actually, social context is argued to be “a dynamically created thing that is expressed in and through the sequential organization of interaction,” as the meaning of an action is “heavily shaped” by the utterances from which they emerge (Heritage, 2004, p. 223).

Participants in a conversation interpret each other’s actions by taking into account relevant aspects of the social context, and actions are thus given a local situated meaning. As part of this meaning making, participants attribute intentions and knowledge to each other. These interpretations are then revealed in the next action, which, in turn, is interpreted by a coparticipant, who subsequently displays his or her interpretation in a responding action and so forth. In this way, the displayed intersubjectivity or meaning-making process proceeds sequentially (Heritage, 1984). For example, an utterance that would, isolated from its immediate context, be interpreted as a question could, depending on the uptake generated in the next turn, be analyzed as another type of action (e.g., a directive). This may reveal structural preferences for some types of actions over others (Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 2007).

The CA attention to and analyses of the nitty-gritty of naturalistic talk, in detailed analyses of the ways in which turn taking is organized, have been criticized for disregarding larger contextual conditions for conversations. While CA studies traditionally have favored mundane conversations as their object of research, a growing interest in institutional settings has emerged over time (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006; Drew & Heritage, 1992; Duranti & Goodwin, 1992; Koole & Elbers, 2014). Such studies of talk-in-interaction explore how specific institutional objectives and tasks are managed through talk (Drew & Heritage, 1992). Although institutional contexts are partly talked into being, Heritage (2004) pointed out that interpretative frameworks and procedures, designed for the specific institutional contexts in which they
take place, characterize institutional interactions, such as classroom conversations. According to Heritage (2004):

[I]nstitutional realities also exist in and as documents, buildings or legal arrangements, and studies of institutional talk are concerned with how these institutional realities are evoked, manipulated, and even transformed in interaction. (p. 223)

Analyzing the interactional design, how participants orient to what is said, allows us to explore how people in settings like classrooms relate to, contribute to, and ascribe each other situated identities or positions, rather than merely follow institutional norms. Through their talk, the participants thus orient to activities particular to specific institutions and thereby also produce an institutional order (Drew & Heritage, 1992; Heritage, 2004; Schegloff, 1992). By analyzing talk in institutional settings, aspects of ideologies, norms, or goals within that institution may thus be revealed as they are made relevant and displayed by the participants themselves.

Much language socialization research combines insights from CA and from Goffman (see, for instance, Goodwin, 1990; Goodwin, 2007; Goodwin & Heritage, 1990; Goodwin & Kyratzis, 2007). The CA approach to meaning making draws on Goffman’s concept (1983) “interaction order,” that is, how our interacting with each other forms the basis for the structure of society. Goffman’s analyses of social interaction (e.g., 1959) deployed a basic dramaturgical or theatrical metaphor (e.g., expressed in a focus on performance: frontstage, backstage) in defining the methods through which people present themselves to one another, grounding his analyses in readings of the participants’ displays of cultural values, norms, and beliefs.

The participants’ orientation in space is often the focus of Goffman’s multimodal analyses of social interaction, and his theorizing heavily draws on spatial metaphors, e.g., “footings,” “positions,” “positionings,” “frames,” and “participation frameworks.” In his treatment of participation frameworks, Goffman (1974) problematized social order through a discussion of frames and framing as a concept for the organization of experiences:

I assume that when individuals attend to any current situation, they face the question: “What is going on here?” Whether asked explicitly, as in times of confusion and doubt, or tacitly, during occasions of usual certitude, the question is put and the answer to it is presumed by the way the individuals then proceed to get on with the affairs at hand. (p. 8)

In his later theorizing on footing and alignments, Goffman (1979, 1981) argued that, in their social interaction, participants are not equally free to speak to someone at any time; instead, their participation has to be ratified by those present. The mutual structuring of face-to-face interactions may be understood as participation frameworks (Goffman, 1981), and he does not
merely refer to, for example, speakers and hearers; rather, he invokes more complex and specific participation frameworks in relation to the production and reception of an utterance in spoken language, involving the positions of animator, addressed or unaddressed recipient, or bystander. Goffman’s ideas (1981) on the participation framework as well as his concept of footing, which refers to different participant roles that interlocutors can take, can be traced back to his early division of the self into character and performer. Talk is viewed as a form of performance through which a person establishes his or her alignment, and the individual displays a self to others in social interaction.

Classroom performances are intricately dependent on community members’ changes of footing: cases where “participant’s alignment, or stance, or posture, or projected self is somehow at issue” (Goffman, 1979, p. 4), that is, alignments and disalignments (Aronsson, 1998; Cromdal & Aronsson, 2000; Goffman, 1979; Goodwin, 2007; Pagliai, 2012), both with each other and with target phenomena, indexing their affiliations and disaffiliations (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1989). For example, participants in interaction change footing when they shift from a personal to an institutional task or between different institutional positions, such as teacher and coworker. Footing also refers to shifts in voice quality or use of registers. In his original discussion of footing, Goffman (1979) actually illustrated changes of footing through an example where the local participants code-switched from a regional to a standard variety of Norwegian, simultaneously with a postural change of footing (from casual to more formal; drawing on work by Blom & Gumpertz, 1972). Changes of footing were thus marked both verbally and through embodied action. The concepts of participation, footing, and interaction order have been central to much contemporary understanding of how social relations are managed in talk-in-interaction. Goffman’s notions of footing and participation have heavily influenced interactional research, and later studies have through detailed analyses further developed the analytical concept of participation and participant roles, in terms of agency and to what extent participants might resist their roles or opt for others, by emphasizing and exploring the intrinsically situated nature of participation (Goodwin, 1996; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1992, 2004).

Also building on Goffman’s participation framework, Lave and Wenger (1991) have argued that learning is social and that it largely derives from experiences of participating in daily life. Their model of situated learning proposed that learning involves a process of engagement in a community of practice, which has an identity defined by a shared domain of interest. Membership, therefore, implies a commitment to the domain, and participants move from legitimate peripheral participation to full participation. However, as Lave and Wenger (1991) pointed out, the “newcomer” not only obtains knowledge from a community of practice, but s/he also adds new perspectives to the community through individual interpretations of the practice,
drawing on knowledge of, and experiences from, other communities of practices. Thus, learning is not seen as the acquisition of knowledge by individuals, more so a process of social participation, where participation “refers not just to local events of engagement in certain activities with certain people, but to a more encompassing process of being active participants in the practices of social communities and constructing identities in relation to these communities” (Wenger, 1998, p. 4). Legitimation and participation together thus define the characteristic ways of belonging to a community, whereas central/peripheral positions and participation are concerned with location and identity in the social world.

In language socialization models, proficiency is seen as something “practice-based, adaptive, and emergent” (Canagarajah, 2007, p. 923). This compels us:

[...] to theorize language acquisition as multimodal, multisensory and, therefore, multidimensional. The previously dominant constructs such as form, cognition, and the individual are not ignored; they get redefined as hybrid, fluid, and situated in a more socially embedded, ecologically sensitive, and interactionally open model. (ibid.)

So an instance of social practice, such as an SSL classroom, has to be understood in terms that include the interests, identities, and subjectivities of its participants and their role in its remaking.
Classroom practices in L2 settings

While L1 socialization research has traditionally focused on mundane, informal, routine events, drawing on links between ordinary events and the socialization of social and cultural skills (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012), there has been an increasing focus on institutional settings like schools and classrooms, not least in L2 socialization research, exploring how institutional events provide repeated grounding for the socialization of cultural meanings (Duff, 2002; Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Harklau, 2003; Talmy, 2008, 2009). L2 socialization research covers a range of age groups, educational contexts, and combinations of languages and cultures, which, in turn, focus on different aspects of socialization. But to a larger extent than L1 socialization research, L2 socialization research commonly addresses the manifold complexities of persons with already-developed repertoires of linguistic, discursive, and cultural practices as they encounter and participate in new ones (Duff & Talmy, 2011). Within a broader field of alternative approaches to SLA, CA has emerged as a method that may contribute to understanding learning as it has illuminated how language is used and learned through social interaction (Hellerman, 2006; Park, 2014; Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Seedhouse, 2004). From a CA perspective, a learner’s goal might be considered in terms of some type of interactional rather than purely grammatical competence (Hall, 1995; Young, 1999; Markee, 2000; Hellerman, 2006; Hall et al., 2011).

The following review primarily focuses on studies that explore and explicate identity work and the discursive resources which participants deploy to accomplish social actions in L2 classroom settings in a broad sense, including, for instance, both SL and foreign language (FL) teaching and learning (e.g., SSL, English as a foreign language [EFL]), and immersion programs.

Identity in second language education

In line with a general theoretical “social turn” (Block, 2003) in research on language and identity, language socialization theory views identities as constructed and performed through language. Speakers use language for interactional stances toward social categories (Ochs, 1993), indexing their affects, ideas, and opinions through various shifts in language use. This is related to
the ways in which identity is seen as a result of social action, as an emergent co-construction of socializing processes in interaction.

Several studies within the broader field of process-oriented research on language learning and identity in L2 settings have shown how prevailing societal or institutional norms on language use are subverted and reproduced in multilingual settings.

Much of this work has focused on formal educational institutions, exploring school curricula, social organization, and how students conform and resist imposed categorizations and identities. In illuminating how a given educational setting may have various and sometimes competing discourses, such studies have documented that educational socialization thus involves complex processes of negotiating identities, cultures, and power relations, rather than merely being a matter of acquiring pre-given linguistic knowledge and skills (Canagarajah, 2007, 2012; Harklau, 2000; Norton, 1997; Norton & Toohey, 2011; Morita, 2004; Rambow, 2013). Further, Norton (2013) has highlighted that while L2 learners may be highly motivated to learn the new language, their investment in language practices might be reduced if a given classroom is, for example, marked by racist discourse. As a result, despite being motivated, “discrepancies between a language learner’s conception of good teaching, and the practices of a given classroom” (Norton, 2013, p. 3), might lead to the student being excluded from, or not investing in, certain language practices of a classroom.

Several studies have documented how issues of L2 participation and socialization are related to identity, competence, power, access, and agency (Duff, 2002; Talmy, 2008, 2009). Focusing on language use and socialization in mainstream high school classes with L2 students, including both “newcomers” and “old-timers,” Duff (2002) explored explicit and implicit references to cultural identity and difference in teacher-led whole class discussions. Drawing on data from two lessons, the analyses show how the teacher by using inclusive specific course content and by allocating conversational turns prompted the students to mobilize cultural connections, drawing on their own backgrounds and experiences, to report on events, customs, and values in other countries. However, the analyses show that this did not yield the results the teacher sought. When implementing an official as well as a personal ideology of respect for cultural diversity and difference, and empathy for others, the teacher attributed identity positions to the students that they did not take up. Rather than producing personal or elaborated responses, the newcomer students’ contributions tended to be short and tentative in that they resisted publicly identifying themselves or their peers with certain cultural practices.

Also, Talmy (2008) foregrounded contingency and multidirectionality in socialization by exploring processes involving what might be considered “unsuccessful” or “unexpected” language socialization. The analyses show how the English as second language (ESL) students’ competing cultural
productions were constructed and enacted in interactions involving “local ESL” students and their “newcomer” teachers in a multilingual high school. The study documents how the students in their locally situated classroom performances negotiated and resisted a school-sanctioned or “official” ESL identity manifest in the ESL program structures and instruction. The socialization of local ESL students into this schooled identity was thus anything but predictable, as the students consistently disengaged in or subverted the acts, stances, and activities that constituted it, for instance, by avoiding assigned classroom tasks. Through their disalignments from the teachers and the classroom practices, the students produced an oppositional ESL student identity, which led to the teacher’s accommodating the students by, for example, eliminating homework and reducing the amount of and requirements for assignments. This paradoxically resulted in the students still being labeled as ESL and placed into what was perceived as a stigmatizing program. Talmy concludes that the students’ resistance to the imposed L2 identity thus often led to the reproduction, rather than disruption, of existing social hierarchies.

In a later study, Talmy (2009) has examined how the “stigma” associated with local ESL was produced in an ESL classroom at the same high school. More specifically, Talmy has analyzed stigma as it was framed in terms of teaching the students respect. The analyses show that local constructions of respect served as a powerful socializing resource to produce order, not only in the form of classroom control but also in hierarchies related to linguistic expertise and student identity positions. In juxtaposing the L2 students’ competencies and classroom behavior with those of the “regular (well-behaved) students,” the teachers reinforced an institutional hierarchy in which the mainstream students were the implicit models.

Style and language ideologies-in-action

A number of scholars have argued for language ideology to be understood as grounded in local language practices (e.g., Kroskrity, 2004; Wortham, 2006; Sargeant, 2009; Blommaert, 2010; DeCosta, 2011) because people’s language use is locally situated (DeCosta, 2012). Or as Kroskrity (2004, p. 196) put it, language ideologies are “constructed from the sociocultural experience of the speaker.” In line with this definition, Roberts (2001, p. 109) argued that “the notion of language as social practice . . . enable[s] us to see the ideological in interactions.” In classroom discourse, dominant educational language policies are often reflected and mediated in patterns of interaction (Razfar & Rumenapp, 2012). This view is consistent with research that has explored teachers’ and students’ explicit articulations regarding language use and actual language practices, language ideologies mediated discursively (De Costa, 2011, 2012; Milani & Jonsson, 2012; Razfar, 2005).
A number of studies have examined adolescents’ implicit stances toward language ideologies, focusing on identity work in interaction as styling, and stylizations (Bakhtin, 1981) as performances in multilingual settings (cf. Jonsson, 2007; Madsen, 2008; Milani & Jonsson, 2012; Rampton, 1995, 2011), that is, performances where participants exaggerate or stereotype the style of others. Much of the work on stylization has been conducted in relation to the notion of crossing or styling the Other which involves using out-group linguistic styles for identity claims (Rampton, 1999). Rampton (1999) treated crossing, which is closely related to stylization, as “focusing on a range of ways in which people use language and dialect in discursive practice to appropriate, explore, reproduce or challenge influential images and stereotypes of groups that they don’t themselves (straightforwardly) belong to” (p. 421; emphasis in original).

One such example is Jørgensen’s study (2005) of Turkish-Danish grade school students’ group conversations. The study explicates that, in addition to the participants’ use of their L1 and L2 languages, a number of varieties are represented by token one-word loans or by whole utterances as performative resources. In their conversations, the participants used English, French, and German in performing high-prestige talk, and a “stylized, stereotypical immigrant Danish reflecting the accented Danish of Middle East immigrants” in low-prestige talk (2005, p. 391). The study shows how the participants used and stylized these varieties not only to position themselves in keeping with evaluations ascribed to them in an educational discourse and in society at large but also how stylizations served to ironically distance the participants from certain varieties and norms of language use.

In a recent study of bilingual sixth-graders, Martinez (2013) explored the students’ own ideological contributions to the construction of classroom space by deploying Spanish-English code-switching, a language practice referred to by the participants as “Spanglish.” The study shows that the students enacted dominant language ideologies framing Spanglish in pejorative terms as well as counterhegemonic language ideologies that valorized and normalized their bilingual language practice. By focusing on the students’ performances, the study highlights how there may be considerable nuance and complexity reflected in language practices and ideologies in the classroom, which can neither be seen as simply a hegemonic one where dominant language ideologies are mechanistically reproduced, nor as a counterhegemonic space in which those ideologies are completely subverted.

Canagarajah (2012), however, elaborated on the notion of crossing as appropriations of lexical, grammatical, or phonological tokens from “out-groups” by introducing the concept of acts of self-styling (p. 126). The study focuses on how youth in the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora in Canada, Britain, and the United States construct ethnic identity by means of strategic language practices. While having limited proficiency in their heritage language, the participants appropriate the language markers associated with their “in-
group” for “in-group identity work.” In performing such acts, the participants are not styling the Other but “styling one’s own”, the difference being, according to Canagarajah (2012), that crossing, or styling the Other, is transgressive and ludic, while self-styling is affirmative and invested.

Analyses of L2 classroom interaction often cast students’ joking and other humorous talk, sometimes including stylizations, as disruptive off-task behavior. Also, some studies have documented that students’ use of humor may constitute opposition and resistance to, for instance, culturally insensitive and at times alienating classroom practices (e.g., Blackledge & Creese, 2009; Rampton, 1995, 2006; Rampton et al., 2008; Wortham, 2006). Further, such studies of language classrooms have explicated the ways in which participants engage in such practices and how those ways of interacting might hinder or facilitate learners’ L2 development (Broner & Tarone, 2001; Bushnell, 2009; Canagarajah, 1999; Markee, 2005, 2007; Pomerantz & Bell, 2007; Sullivan, 2000; Tarone, 2000). As Canagarajah (2004) noted, the aim of such research is both to “consider how learners negotiate competing subject positions in conflicting discourse communities” and to understand “how these struggles shape their practices of language learning” (p. 117). Then, students (and teachers) may use humor as a resource for negotiating personal identities, as well as play with institutional identities imposed on them (Lytra, 2007; Rampton, 2006).

This might be particularly important in L2 classroom interaction as it often places otherwise competent individuals in positions of powerlessness or deficiency, which humorous performances then can be employed to transcend or avoid (Poveda, 2005). Research on language play, or verbal play, has illustrated that using humor as a resource allows students to co-construct a broader and perhaps more desirable range of classroom identities (Poveda, 2005). Such work on classroom performance in FL and L2 classrooms has focused on various ludic aspects of talk, indicating that verbal improvisations, as in stylization, and verbal play, as in jokes and impromptu mis-namings, are constitutive elements in maintaining participants’ attention to, and sustained interest in, language learning (Cekaite & Aronsson, 2014). Also, such studies indicate that jocular talk occasions more creative and complex acts of language use than those normally found in L2 settings. This may, in turn, facilitate reflections on language and language use. Stylizations and verbal play can thus be seen as useful resources in increasing linguistic awareness and reflexivity (Cekaite & Aronsson, 2005, 2014; Pomerantz & Bell, 2011; Poveda, 2005), particularly in heteroglossic verbal practices, that is, “the use and differentiation of multiple codes and registers in the creation and negotiation of social distinctions” (Kyratzis, Reynolds, & Evaldsson, 2012, p. 457; see also Bakhtin, 1981 on heteroglossia).

However, as Evaldsson and Cekaite (2010) documented in their study of multilingual primary schoolchildren’s classroom and playground interactions, “paradoxically, such forms of playful heteroglossic peer group
practices tend to enforce power hierarchies” (p. 602), and the specific language varieties associated with minority children become subordinated and cast as deviations from an ideal standard.

In a study of L2 education, Pomerantz and Bell (2011) similarly presented a case for using humor as an empowering resource for both teachers and students by showing how a student and a teacher “were able to transcend their institutional roles and engage in an interaction that highlighted, exploited, and celebrated the ambiguity and polysemy of language” (p. 158).

In this brief review of classroom research, children’s or adolescents’ language use and performances, whether seen as styling the Other or as creative playing with linguistic features, have been in focus. The teachers in these studies mostly assume the position of authority (or are positioned as) authority disapproving of students’ enacted talk by refocusing their attention and/or reminding them of linguistic rules and regulations.

There are few studies in which also teachers produce creative, stylized languages, usually associated with younger speakers, in classroom conversations. A rare example is Jaspers’ study (2014) documenting how one teacher in a secondary class at a Brussels Dutch-medium school, by employing stylized heteroglossic speech, often appeared to lessen the friction between expected language use and pupils’ actual linguistic skills. The study further shows that those acts reinforced images of the relative value of particular kinds of multilingualism as, for instance, “corrections and stylisations appeared to be part of the same toolkit, sometimes used almost in close harmony” (Jaspers, 2014, p. 387).

Repair work

In language immersion settings or communicative FL or L2 classrooms, repairs and corrections are part of the actual business at hand: the students are to be taught the target language, and the teaching process is a public one where corrections are expected to be part of the regular business of teaching and learning. Hall (2007) writes:

From a CA perspective, the practice of repair is a fundamental organization of interaction for dealing with troubles in achieving common understanding about the interactional work that parties in an interaction are doing together. Correction is a particular type of repair in which errors are replaced with what is correct. (Hall, 2007, p. 511)

This is illustrated in the extract below, from the data corpus of this dissertation, where the teacher corrects one of the students, Emre, by repeating his utterance and replacing the nonstandard grammatical construction.
Participants: Teacher, Emre (pseudonym), and other students

1 Emre E:h jag ville bli i månen
   E:h I wanted to become in the moon

2 Teacher -> Du ville åka till månen
   You wanted to go to the moon

As can be seen, the trouble source ("bli i månen," boxed) is replaced by "åka till månen." Over time, corrections and repairs have been explored both in CA theory on sequential action in conversations (Jefferson, 1974, 1987; Schegloff, 1995; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977) and in work on young children’s repetitions as part of their learning of a first language (Brown, 2000; Forrester, 2008). These studies show that repetitions do not merely involve passive recyclings of prior talk but ways of aligning or disaligning with coparticipants (Goffman, 1979), that is, ways of displaying that someone has heard, understood, or taken a stance toward what has been said (Svennevig, 2008).

A classic study of corrections and repairs (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977) documented an overall preference for self-repairs rather than other-corrections. Work on early language development (Forrester, 2008) has also shown that self-repairs are indeed more common than other-corrections in young children’s communication with their environment. In classroom contexts, though, other-corrections are recurrent and correction trajectories with a focus on teacher-student interaction have been documented in sequential detail in various classroom contexts (Macbeth, 2004; McHoul, 1990; Park, 2014).

In L2 educational contexts, repetition and other-corrections are often discussed in terms of teachers’ recasts. Traditionally, work on teachers’ recasts in L2 classroom contexts has been a research area primarily inhabited by SLA scholars. This line of research has either been experimental (where a researcher has provided the recasts) or descriptive, using predetermined coding criteria (for a critique, see Hauser, 2005). But over the last ten years, this field has broadened. Several studies have documented classroom corrections in great sequential detail, based on the methods and analytical perspectives of CA (e.g., Hauser, 2005; Hosoda, 2006; Kasper, 2004; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004). This means that naturalistic discourse and participant perspectives (emic views) have been analyzed rather than the “effects” or experimental outcomes as in some of the early SLA work.
In CA-oriented work, recasts have been respecified as corrective recasts (Hauser, 2005) or corrective feedback (Lee, 2013), and the findings have documented and validated the interactional nature of repair work and correction in various institutional L2 contexts, such as language immersion programs, EFL and ESL teaching. There is a growing body of research on corrective practices concerning L2 learning; however, much attention has been paid to corrections or recasts focusing on initiation-response-feedback in dyadic teacher-student interactions. One such example is Park’s study (2014) on third-turn repeats in task-oriented conversations. Using data from various L2 classrooms (ESL and EFL), Park (2014) argued that the role of repeats differs depending on the pedagogical focus of the interaction. The study also shows that the teacher uses repeats in meaning and fluency contexts to invoke an account of a previous response (to the teacher) by a student without overtly displaying it as problematic in any way. In form-and-accuracy contexts, third-turn repeats instead confirm the response as being a correct one by maintaining an orientation to the instructional activity that the participants are engaged in.

While Hosoda’s study (2006) of conversations between Japanese L1 and L2 language speakers is not a study of classroom interaction but rather of informal conversations between peers, it is still of significance since it illuminates that expert-novice categories are not fixed but instead relative in regard to target language competences. This is, for instance, highlighted when L2 speakers invite other-correction (Hosoda, 2006).

Detailed sequential analyses of peer corrections at large are still relatively sparse. In their research on collaborative task work between Spanish L2 students, DiCamilla and Anton (1997) have documented the role of peer scaffolding in the interactional work of fellow students, and Dorner and Layton (2014) have recorded peer’s scaffolding of language in multilingual classroom contexts. Other scholars have illuminated the role of repetition and students’ spontaneous orientation to formal aspects of language (Cekaite & Aronsson, 2004; Rydland & Aukrust, 2005), and there is documentation of young migrant students’ other-corrections in the form of teasing in schoolyard play contexts (Evaldsson & Cekaite, 2010). But not much research has been done on multiparty correction work, including peer corrections in whole-group teaching or teacher-fronted classrooms. This dissertation can therefore contribute to research on classroom conversations concerning repair and corrections as multiparty accomplishments in which peers may constitute important co-constructive participants in each other’s language learning.
Aims

This dissertation explores how newly arrived adolescent students with relatively limited Swedish language skills manage their participation in a classroom community. It examines the social order of the SSL classroom as a multiparty accomplishment, and how Swedish L2 talk becomes part of, and is constructed in, the participants’ everyday school lives. In line with language socialization theory, this dissertation explores how cultural, social, and linguistic categories, boundaries, and identities are made relevant and managed in students’ social interaction in routine activities with teachers and peers.

In contrast to much dyadic work on teacher-student interaction, the focus is on multiparty interaction and the formation of a classroom community. Three studies closely examine different aspects of the dissertation’s overall focus:

Study I
The overall aim is to explore how ethnicity (and identity) is achieved and performed within everyday Swedish school practices, including how SSL students are positioned or position themselves as the non-Swedish Other.

Study II
The overarching aim is to document how verbal improvisations, such as stylizations and choral repetitions, in participant performances can be seen to play a role in the formation of an L2 community of practice in a classroom context.

Study III
The primary overall aim is to document and analyze conversational patterns in other-corrections through detailed sequential analyses of multiparty correction trajectories. The analyses concern both teacher and student contributions, including peer corrections of costudents’ talk.
Setting and data

This dissertation is based on six months’ fieldwork in a Swedish introductory language program in an upper secondary school. It involves an ethnographic approach, documenting and analyzing everyday student and teacher interactions. The data analyzed primarily consist of video-recorded interactions in an L2 classroom. In addition to these recordings, field notes from interactions in other areas of the school as well as from informal conversations with the students and the teacher serve as background data in all three studies (and also as primary data, particularly in Study I). The excerpts and field notes included in the specific studies were primarily chosen due to the prominence of various aspects of L2 socialization.

The language introduction program: Societal framework

Children and youth registered in Sweden are entitled to an education, as are minors without a residence permit. In Sweden, the latter group is entitled to a secondary school education if the studies begin before the age of 18. Language introduction programs offer newly arrived youth between the ages of 16 and 20 an education with an emphasis on the Swedish language. The Swedish National Agency for Education (2008) refers to newly arrived students as students who arrive near their school start or during their schooling in primary, secondary or special school and who do not have Swedish as their mother tongue and possess inadequate or no knowledge of the Swedish language.

In chapter 17, § 3, the Swedish Education Act states that the aim of the language introduction program is “[. . .] to provide immigrant youth who have recently arrived in Sweden an education with emphasis on the Swedish language that enables them to move on to secondary school or other education” (Skollagen, chap. 17, § 3, author’s translation). Regarding the subject Swedish as a second language, the Swedish national curricula for the compulsory school (Lgr11) states that “through teaching the pupils should be given the opportunity to develop their knowledge of the Swedish language, its norms, structure, pronunciation, words and terms, as well as how use of language is related to social contexts and media” (p. 227). And further, “teaching should also help to ensure that pupils obtain an understanding that the way in which we communicate has an impact on other people. As a result
pupils should be given the opportunities to take responsibility for their own use of language” (ibid.). The Curriculum for the upper secondary school (Lgy11) further states that schools “must help students to develop an identity that can be related to and encompass not only what is specifically Swedish, but also that which is Nordic, European, and ultimately global” (the Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011b, p. 4). Thus, the language introduction program is not only an education in the specific target language, Swedish, but also a learning site for communicative and cultural values inculcated in that language.

The setting

The research site for these studies was a municipal upper secondary school (grades 10–12), located in a large metropolitan area that can be described as middle or upper-middle class. The school offers four national programs, as well as a basic language introduction program (at the time called IVIK1), and a preparatory education program for immigrants (PRIVIK). The IVIK curriculum included SSL, English, mathematics and history, at the time the core subjects (these have recently been expanded to include eight additional subjects) required to pass in order to be eligible for higher education, such as upper secondary programs. Although situated in an upper secondary school with other students in the target students’ age group, the academic content of the core subjects is the equivalent of grade nine in the Swedish compulsory school system.

At the time of the fieldwork, more than a thousand students were enrolled in the school, of which about sixty in the basic language introduction program. The school ranks high among upper secondary schools in the Stockholm area and has a large number of applicants for their national programs each year.

The school has an international profile and partnerships with schools in Europe and Asia with the aim to broaden and internationalize courses within the national programs. However, the students enrolled in national programs and those in the introductory language program seldom took part in joint school activities. In addition, while not completely separated from the majority students’ classrooms, the SSL students’ homerooms were located in a designated and somewhat separate area of the school (for similar observations on spatial segregation, see Sharif, 2014, pp. 151–157).

The participants’ classroom significantly differed from all others in the school building. Their oblong classroom, previously used for storage, only

1 IVIK stood for Introduktionsutbildning för nyanlända elever inom ramen för gymnasieskolans individuella program (introductory upper secondary program for newly arrived pupils), and PRIVIK for “preparatory upper secondary program for immigrants.”
allowed for one line of tables and chairs along one of the longer walls and the shorter wall with a window. On the opposite longer wall, there was a whiteboard at which the teacher either stood or sat on a chair with her back against it. There was no room for a table for the teacher; she had her working material either in her lap or in a basket beside her. Apart from the whiteboard, the walls were bare; in sharp contrast to other classrooms where the walls were decorated with student-produced material, posters, or artwork. In one of the corners stood a single bookcase with some mother tongue–Swedish dictionaries.

The participants

The school’s newcomer students were often seen as a homogeneous group—the newly arrived students with SSL—even though they constituted a heterogeneous group in many respects. At the start of the data collection, the students’ ages ranged from 16 to 18. Between them, they represented eight nationalities (Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Cuba, Ghana, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Peru, Serbia, and Somalia) and spoke different native languages; some of the students were multilingual.

Although all students had at least nine years of schooling, and three had completed a high school education before migrating to Sweden, their school backgrounds still varied, not least regarding their respective school systems and as a consequence their experiences of different types of educational practices. In their classroom performances, some of the students show that they have been socialized into a traditional student identity in the context of rostrum teaching, where the teacher asks display or exam questions, to which the students must provide the “right” answers. Other students show that they have had experiences of classroom practices similar to the ones in this study, such as group work and discussions.

What the students have in common is that, at the beginning of the data collection, they had lived in Sweden for a relatively short time: between six and eight months. Nine of the ten students had previously studied SSL, but at most for one term. According to the teacher, the student participants in this study were “handpicked” due to showing “particularly good progression in the Swedish language” and formed a temporary group.

None of the students lived in the school area, all but one lived in various suburbs of Stockholm (one lived in the center of the city), and most of them had far to travel to school and to each other: a typical pattern of the ethnically segregated Swedish urban areas (Bunar, 2010b). At the start of the data collection, few of the students had a social life in the form of friends outside of school; therefore, the school also provided a central location for interaction with other students.
The teacher, who was the students’ mentor as well, was employed full time at the school. She is a qualified Swedish/SSL teacher and had previous experience of teaching SSL in upper secondary school as well as of training student teachers.

**Video recordings and field notes**

Language socialization research is ethnographic in providing descriptions of the social settings in which language is used and learned. Any understanding of the “recurring cultural and linguistic patterns of interaction that constitute processes of socialization” (Duff & Talmy, 2011, p. 99) tends to be based on regular observations across different activities and over an extended period of time (cf. Agar, 1996; Duff & Talmy, 2011; Duranti, 1997). In line with such an ethnographic orientation, this dissertation combines data sources, including participant observation and informal conversations, in an effort to document the participants’ recurring situated activities and interactional routines in specific contexts. The primary fieldwork method was videoed participant observation (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Goodwin, 2000; Silverman, 2006).

Most of the data analyzed in this dissertation consist of about forty hours of video recorded with a handheld camera, on two or three occasions a week during one (spring) term. All recordings were made during Swedish L2 lessons, and they focused on the student participants’ interactions with each other and teacher. The data include a number of different classroom activities, such as group work discussions, conversations based on textbook material, or reading aloud, as well as small talk and conversations unrelated to schoolwork. The data should be considered “naturally occurring” or “naturalistic” in that the classroom conversations would have occurred without the researcher being present as opposed to staged or elicited by the researcher (Potter, 1996, 2002).

Observations (without the video camera) and informal conversations outside the classroom during lunch breaks or other recesses were additional features of the fieldwork. Field notes were made either during the interactions or as close in time to the observations as possible. The observations and informal conversations have added to a fuller ethnographic knowledge of the school as an institution, and have provided a richer understanding of the students’ backgrounds and everyday lives in and outside the school setting.
Analytical procedures

The video-recorded data have been processed in several steps. While filming, brief notes were made, documenting and illuminating various phenomena, for later analyses. The studies in this dissertation all exemplify an emic approach to knowledge construction and highlight the construction of “meaning in terms of the local context of talk-in-interaction” (Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 493). A first “viewing,” with a focus on recurring phenomena made relevant by the participants, was conducted shortly after each video recording. All recordings were, at an early stage, transcribed somewhat roughly and then logged, based on the type of classroom practice where the conversations took place or what the participants talked about. Thus, the analytical process was primarily based on the participants’ perspectives (Garfinkel, 2002; Sacks, 1992) as revealed in their own actions within classroom interactions. As the analyses in the studies focus on both what is accomplished through talk-in-interaction and on how that work is being done (Potter & Wetherell, 1987), they all initially and principally draw on the recordings and repeatedly listen to them.

The selection of sequences for more detailed transcription and analyses has been guided by what the participants themselves made relevant, for instance, through laughter, emphatic prosody, recurrent conversational topics or themes, or classroom practices, such as correction work over an extended period of time. Moreover, field notes from the observations and informal interviews were, to various degrees, included in the analyses in order to develop the analyses in line with each study’s aim.

All three studies document different aspects of participation in an L2 socialization process situated in a Swedish language introduction program. In the first study, which examines the co-construction of an “inclusive school,” cases were selected on the basis that they illuminate how the participants, both the students and the teacher, orient to and position themselves and each other in discursive practices within a larger school setting. This study also draws on ethnographic data generated from observations and informal interviews to a larger extent than Studies II and III.

The second study focuses on language ideology in action. While viewing and logging the recordings, the role of stylizations and alignments emerged as a recurring phenomenon. The data analyzed in this paper were drawn from a single L2 Swedish lesson, chosen because it illustrates how the participants in the data at large recurrently used stylizations as resources for establishing local language ideologies in the formation of a community of practices.

The business at hand in an L2 classroom is learning a language, which includes learning grammatical structures of words or sentences and single verbal items, for instance, pronouncing or using words correctly. The third study focuses on analyses of how both what was called peer corrections (that
is, the students’ other-corrections) and the teacher’s corrections can be seen as a type of multiparty and multiperson work. After listening to all the video recordings, five lessons from the entire semester course were transcribed in detail in Swedish. A collection was put together from those transcriptions, and examples rich in both teacher and peer corrections were chosen. These examples were then analyzed in depth.

Another important consideration when choosing which excerpts to include was an overall aim to illuminate the participants’ various discursive resources and linguistic skills when tailoring talk and accomplishing complicated identity work in interaction.

Transcription and translation
Transcribing and translating video-recorded data, or rephrasing field notes from observations, are an essential part of the analytical work in that the choices the researcher makes while transcribing, guided by theoretical and analytical interests, shape and affect what is available for analysis, not least for the readers, who do not have access to the recorded data (Ochs, 1979). In research informed by CA, the recorded data are generally transcribed at a micro-level in great sequential detail (e.g., Jefferson, 2004). This is a time-consuming task, but detailed turn-by-turn transcribed sequences shed some light on the participants’ perspectives through their interactional organization of talk and different modalities as social actions (Heritage, 1984). However, there are no “neutral” transcripts (Psathas & Anderson, 1990) since transcriptions cannot fully represent all interactional details captured in the recordings. The researcher must therefore choose the level of detail, what features to preserve, and how to, for instance, spatially organize them when transcribing (Bucholtz, 2000; Jordan & Henderson, 1995; Ochs, 1979).

All analyses in this dissertation primarily draw on listening again and again to the original tapes in Swedish. The transcripts included were gradually refined. Depending on the aim of the different studies, the focus on specific phenomena such as pauses, laughter, or voice quality varies between the studies, as does the level of detail in the different transcripts. Generally, the transcripts deploy notational conventions informed by CA (Jefferson, 2004).

The Swedish transcriptions used in the three studies have then been translated into English in a relatively literal way, adhering as close as possible to the Swedish verbatim records. However, linguistic features that are part of the analyses can at times be lost in, or masked by, translation. When analytically motivated, the English translations have thus been adjusted to reflect the Swedish ones, for instance, word order and impersonal constructions. One of several such examples is the Swedish common impersonal pronoun “man” (“one” in English), whereas “you” might at times be an idiomatic
English translation. Yet, it would not reflect the impersonal construction in the Swedish original.

This also applies to translations of what the participants have identified as, for instance, a trouble source that generates other-corrections. Translating a mispronunciation literally is difficult and has therefore been constructed as not necessarily consistent with common mispronunciations in English, for instance, “svårtare” is a mispronunciation of “svårare,” which means more difficult. To capture the mispronunciation rather than any syntactic problems, the word has been translated to *more difficult*. On such occasions, the translations have been explicated in some detail in the analyses of the excerpt.

**Methodological reflections**

The advantages of having video-recorded the classroom interactions are many. The recordings capture the interactions as they unfold, enabling detailed analyses from the participants’ perspectives, that is, from what the participants show through linguistic actions (Ochs, & Schieffelin, 2012; Sacks, 1992).

Furthermore, having access to both audio and video facilitates the documentation and analyses of participation frameworks regarding participation and verbal interactional features: talk, prosody, pauses, and laughter, as well as nonverbal communication, such as facial expression, gaze, gesture, posture, ways of appropriating and inhabiting space, and other embodied displays of affects and meaning making (Broth, Laurier, & Mondada, 2014; Goodwin, 2000, 2007).

Moreover, the recordings allow the analyst to keep returning to target interactions “another next first time” (Garfinkel, 2002). Having access to video documentation has been especially valuable since there were multiparty conversations; without the visuals, it would have been difficult, if not impossible at times, to discern who says what or to whom the utterances are directed.

In line with many other studies (e.g., Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Evaldsson, 2005; Goodwin, 1990; Mondada, 2007), this dissertation emphasizes the benefits of using video recordings as data, particularly those of “naturally occurring” events. However, video-recorded interaction is not assumed to be unaffected by the researcher’s (and video camera’s) presence, which is, of course, true for any other data registered for research purposes (Potter, 1996, 2002; see the hypothetical question about “the dead social scientist test”: would the interaction have taken place without the presence of a researcher?). Depending on the methods used, different concerns arise. Using a video camera could be seen as a somewhat intrusive method that calls for specific analytical, methodological, as well as ethical considerations, much like using pen and paper might do (Broth, Laurier, & Mondada, 2014).
Methodologically, one such consideration is purely technical. The shape and size of the classroom offered the researcher limited options for including all participants in each video frame. Due to the narrow and not-so-efficient space of the homeroom, described above, the class at the beginning of the term, when possible, moved around and their lessons were held in other classrooms. But however cramped and spartan their designated room was, as the term progressed, the students asked for the lessons to be held in their homeroom. As most of the recordings were conducted in their homeroom, this had implications for how to place the camera—either in one of the classroom corners or behind some of the students. Hence, despite using a wide-angle lens, when all students were present, it was a challenge to capture all participants in each frame. When recording, the camera was therefore trained on the talking participants.

The corpus of video recordings includes instances of “camera behaviors” (Duranti, 1997, p. 118). Video-recorded data are socially situated, and the researcher as well as the camera should therefore be seen as coparticipants in interactions, and as such will inevitably have some type of effect on the documented social activity (Duranti, 1997). One advantage of video recordings is that they facilitate for the analyst the retrospective examination of his or her impact on the interaction (Sjöblom, 2011).

Occasionally, the students and the teacher explicitly commented on my presence and that of the camera in ways of acknowledging me as part of the interactional setting, or even more rarely, they drew on the camera as an available resource in social actions (Duranti, 1997), for instance, by using me as an example of academic work or, as on one occasion, when one of the students performed a song paraphrasing Gloria Gaynor’s song *I Will Survive*, dedicating it “to the professor”, that is my supervisor.

The analyst as a participant

When conducting fieldwork, the researcher becomes part of the socially situated community being documented. This poses particular challenges for the researcher, not least regarding what role(s) to assume (Agar, 1996).

During the fieldwork, my role as a researcher developed over time, and depending on where the observations were conducted, I alternated between a more and a less participatory mode of observation. In the classroom, the less participatory mode was relatively easy to maintain as I chose not to take an active part in the lessons. For instance, I never offered to help with the tasks and I tried not to engage in conversations. It would, however, have been odd not to respond when being addressed or not joining in laughing at jokes.

In the more informal contexts outside the classroom, the researcher role was more challenging and less clear-cut. I repeatedly reminded the students that I was taking notes on what they said for my research, and they, in turn,
occasionally asked questions about how the work was going. The more time I spent with the students, the more they would spontaneously speak about themselves and their personal lives (for similar observations in a Swedish school context, see also Ambjörnsson, 2004). And when they told me about their lives, I told them about mine. In such conversations, the students’ comments in many ways suggested that they viewed me as an authority figure, similar to a teacher or parent. Since the school staff areas and student areas were distinctly separated, socializing with the participant students outside the classroom was quite often observed by other students as well as personnel. Having lunch with the students was particularly noticed by the canteen workers since teachers and other school staff had their meals in staff rooms located in other parts of the building or in a separate dining area adjacent to the student canteen, as illustrated by this field note:

Today at lunch when the others had left and only Emre and I were still seated at the table, a man walked by. After going a couple of meters past us, he stops and walks back. He asks me if I work at the school and before I have a chance to answer him, Emre says that I am his mother. I laugh, introduce myself, and briefly tell the man why I’m there. The man puts out his hand and introduces himself as head of the school canteen. He stresses that another menu is served in the staff lunch area, an adjacent room to which the students don’t have access. Potato gratin and pork tenderloin instead of the sausage casserole we’ve just had, and at the same price. After the man has left, I turn to Emre and comment on his remark that I was his mother with an ironic “Nice!” Emre then says, “What? You could be.” And as it turns out, that is correct since I’m actually two years older than she is.

This is one of several instances of how the students, school staff, and I positioned me as someone other than the students or adults working at the school, and thereby at times directed my attention to my role as an observer.

With questions about the Migration Board, what Swedish people really think about immigrants, or whether I was married and had children, the students, as did I to some extent, also positioned me as a representative of Swedish society, as an adult, and as a woman. This highlights the fact that the researcher is, of course, part of the research process.

Ethical considerations

Ethical research questions particularly arise in research contexts involving children and youth. This dissertation has been conducted in accordance with the Act concerning the Ethical Review of Research involving Humans (SFS 2003, p. 460), and the Swedish Research Council’s guidelines for good research practice within the humanities and social sciences (2011), and especially the criterion that the individual participants may under no circum-
stances be harmed, which includes policies on information, consent, confidentiality, and how to handle research data.

The study participants were informed of its aim, the different data collection methods, and the fact that they all would be anonymized. Moreover, before they gave their written consent, I told them, as well as provided written information on, how the collected data were to be handled.

To gain access to the field, an initial meeting with the director of the school’s language introduction program took place, during which the aim of the study was presented and discussed. The director then contacted the teachers involved. One of them expressed an interest in participating, and as it happened, the start of the fieldwork coincided with her becoming a member of the regular staff. After informing her of the aim and scope of the study and discussing them with her, she gave her consent and invited me to talk to the students. During this first interaction with the students, I presented the project and myself as well as explained what my role would be inside and outside the classroom. I told them that I would video-record the classroom interactions and that I would like to join them during their lunch breaks and other recesses to talk to them about their everyday school lives. The students were also carefully informed that they would be anonymized in any presentation of the results, as well as that they had the right to withdraw at any time their consent to participate in the study. In addition, the students had the opportunity to ask questions and were thereafter given an informed consent form along with contact information. They were asked to consider participating and if deciding to do so, to bring the signed form back a week later. All students generously consented to participating in the study. The recorded data have been kept in a locked cabinet, along with field notes and other material collected.

During the writing process, I have taken great care not to refer to the students or teachers in a way that would reveal information about their individual identities. Moreover, I have tried to assume an emic perspective, documenting and recognizing the participants’ own perspectives as much as possible.

While it is, of course, essential to follow the ethical guidelines for research involving humans constituted by law, these guidelines mostly focus on the work before and after collecting the data. However, as Aarsand and Forsberg (2010a) argued, research ethics are not static, neither as a discipline nor as a practice, and during the fieldwork, the researcher is continuously faced with situations that require well-reasoned ethical decisions.

In this context, it should perhaps be pointed out that the classroom community in many ways might have been something of an intermediate space where the students generally chose not to discuss highly sensitive issues, and not to engage in more confessional kinds or private topics of conversation. Classroom conversations usually did not concern intimate or painful memories of war, dangerous escape routes, illness, or fear (although trouble talk
could at times be seen as elicited through, for instance, educational material: see Study I). Moreover, the examples included in this dissertation were chosen since they would not reveal unique or overly personal information about the participants.

However, on some occasions, I had lunch or took the same subway train alone with one of the students, who then initiated talk about his or her life circumstances or about traumatic experiences. Those conversations have for ethical reasons not been documented as field notes, which does not preclude my understanding and analyses of the data at large in the light of the fact that I carry these stories with me.
Summaries of studies

This dissertation comprises three separate empirical studies, which all primarily draw on most of the data described in the previous section, that is, the video-recorded Swedish L2 classroom conversations.

Study I, to a larger extent than Studies II and III, draws on informal observations and fieldwork notes. Moreover, Study I serves to situate the other studies in a societal context, drawing on macro issues more to a larger extent than on the detailed type of microanalyses at the core of Studies II and III.

All three studies focus on different aspects of identity, participation, and the participants’ positions and positionings in L2 socialization processes. Below follows a brief overview of each study.

Study I: Constructing the Other in the “inclusive school”: Paradoxical practices and identification in SSL education

The purpose of Swedish introductory language programs (SSL) is to prepare newly arrived students for integration in the mainstream school system. To participate in such a program primarily involves the learning of a new language and simultaneously being exposed to, and socialized into, the school’s situated conversational and cultural norms. The curriculum both recognizes and emphasizes cultural identity diversity. However, it also explicates that one of the responsibilities of the school as an institution is to support students in developing an identity that embraces and is related to Swedish values. In this context, this study explores how an official production of L2 identities might have implications for how the participating students and teacher co-construct local identities in SSL classroom conversations.

The analyses draw on video-recorded classroom data and ethnographical knowledge from observations of informal social interactions. From the entire corpus of data, three cases were chosen that illuminate the students’ and the teacher’s situated performances that can be seen to involve agency, negotiations, and resistance in ubiquitous, often-paradoxical, practices. The data were analyzed from a participant-relevant perspective, that is, how the participants orient to and position themselves and each other in discursive practices within a larger school setting.
Prior research on second language acquisition with sociological and anthropological perspectives documents relationships between L2 learning and use and the larger social world, illuminating how students conform to and contest imposed categorizations and identities in school contexts (Duff, 2002; Harklau, 2000; Norton, 1997; Rambow, 2013; Talmy, 2008, 2009). In line with such work, and drawing on performativity theory (Butler, 1999) and "identification" (Cameron & Kulick, 2003), this study emphasizes the significance of language use in identity construction. This directs our attention to the performatve effects of various linguistic recourses in interaction and thus illuminates how various subject positions emerge in communication contingent upon how students and teachers are addressed, what is possible or not to express, and what the classroom participants are encouraged to say about themselves. Since what is expressed and performed in talk is always linked to all that cannot be told or done in communication (Cameron & Kulick, 2003, p. 140), the analyses in this study take into consideration how students are addressed by peers and staff, how they respond in social interaction, what topics are encouraged to be talked about and performed, and what subjects or experiences risk not being spoken about.

The findings show that although the students are new to the Swedish school system, as adolescents with at least nine years’ education, they all have been socialized into “a student identity” of sorts. The analyses document how the students draw on past as well as new experiences as resources to perform the “regular student” both when being addressed as such and when being addressed as SSL students. However, this is not done uncontested, neither by the teacher nor the students.

More precisely, the study shows how the students and the teacher co-construct local identities in the following three cases:

(a) Preparation for a national test, where the students read a booklet of texts titled I gränslandet [In the Borderland]. The task gives rise to a classroom discussion on culture and identity as if those topics were of specific relevance to the students. The analyses show how the students deploy discursive resources to reject the ascribed position as students with migration-related identity struggles, and by reformulating the theme of being in the borderland and claiming it to be a universal matter.

(b) The celebration of an international day at the school, where the students are encouraged to bring food and perform, for example, a song or dance specific to “their culture.” The event has an explicit inclusive aim; however, the analyses show how it paradoxically excludes by way of the students’ contestation over, and resistance to, enacting the culturally and ethnically Other. Moreover, the analyses disclose how the teacher aligns with both the students in not endorsing the event and in still supporting the school administration by performing the task. She is thus placed in somewhat of a dilemma.
A classroom discussion on the topic of the ideal lesson where the SSL class is constructed as specific and different from the rest of the school’s students and programs. One of the participants makes epistemic claims regarding the larger school discourse, drawing on personal experiences from partaking in classroom practices in majority-student lessons. In response, the teacher tries to emphasize the uniqueness of the SSL students and the benefits of their educational setting. However, in so doing, she simultaneously foregrounds their positions as persons who do not have the same frames of references as “regular students” do.

In conclusion, the analyses thus document how SSL-student ethnic identity positions are not what the students themselves prefer to perform in the classroom, but should rather be understood as something that emerges as a performative effect, and as dependent on (i) how they are addressed as ethnic students with an ascribed different culture and (ii) how they answer, contest, or reproduce those calls. Despite many of the students striving to pass as “regular” or “mainstream” students, this position is not really an option for them. On the contrary, they are addressed within a democratic and inclusive school discourse as “students of ethnicity,” and whose perceived cultural belonging is worth being recognized, performed, and talked about.

Moreover, the analyzes reveal that identity construction in an SSL introduction setting is as much about constructing the “Swedish school” as it is about performing student identities. The study illuminates how the cultural production of newly arrived SSL students can be used as discursive resources for the school staff in the project of doing the democratic and inclusive school. In a well-meaning inclusive school, the SSL students are positioned as different and this conversely constructs a notion of a regular Swedish student as the model to be compared to.

Study II: Stylizations and alignments in a L2 classroom: Multiparty work in forming a community of practice

Community is a core notion in anthropologically oriented work on L2 socialization that often foregrounds apprenticeship processes and appropriations of local jargon, practices, and ways of acting (De Fina, 2007; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992; Holmes & Meyerhoff, 1999). However, much previous work has in many instances treated a community of practice (Lave, 1996; Lave & Wenger, 1991) as something given rather than as an emergent phenomenon (for a similar critique, see Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992, p. 473), and there is little microanalytic work on how communities of practices are formed through interaction in situated practices, such as L2 education (see also Haneda, 2006).
In this single case study (from one L2 Swedish lesson), a focus on the local co-construction of language ideology through classroom practices is related to performance (Bauman & Briggs, 1990; Pagliai, 2000) and the formation of a community of practice. This lesson was chosen since it accurately illustrates repeat participants’ stylizations and alignments in the data at large. The analyses focus on six extracts that illuminate both the students’ and the teacher’s contributions to classroom improvisations.

This study draws on Bakhtin’s notion (1981) of stylization as an artistic representation of the voice of others, for instance, another’s linguistic style, and how speakers when stylizing other people’s talk deploy accentuations invoking evaluative stances that reveal their attitudes to what is said. Stylization is thus not merely artistic but involves a highlighting of ideological elements that may also constitute subversive speech acts by, for example, drawing on the voices of authorities and recycling them for novel goals to challenge hegemonic discourses (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Martinez, 2013; Rampton, 2009, 2011). Language ideology is here seen as part and parcel of stylistic practices, and stylizations are viewed as entailing and deploying interpretations of a wider social context than the immediate interactional context in which the styling occurs. Personal and relational identities can then be forged and refined in more or less subtle ways through stylized talk as social action in conversations (Coupland, 2007). Consequently, language ideology can be analyzed through stylizations seen as ideologies-in-action (see Blommaert et al., 2006), for example, when participants disqualify some types of literacies but not others (Martinez, 2013).

Several ethnographic studies have focused on the role of stylization in settings where standard language varieties and urban youth registers are used by students as ways of doing identity work and constructing local language ideologies (cf. Jaspers, 2011; Madsen, 2013; Rampton, 2002). However, only a few studies have documented how teachers in interactions use stylizations as discursive resources (Jaspers, 2014; Milani & Jonsson, 2012). Prior research has often recorded stylizations or mock language in settings with majority curricula, where the teacher or school primarily enforces a majority language at the expense of other registers, and where the students use such registers as resources for challenging and resisting hegemonic discourses (cf. Duff, 2012; Evaldsson & Cekaite, 2010; Talmy, 2008; Jaspers, 2011, 2014).

In this study, the teacher’s stylizations of Rinkeby Swedish (RS) and her foregrounding of it as a subject qualified for academic research worked to endorse urban youth registers as a reasonable topic for classroom conversations as well as legitimate registers to use in conversations in an L2 classroom. In contrast, the students’ stylizations in these classroom analyses were co-constructed as laughables (Glenn, 1989; Sacks, 1992). By laughing at—and stylizing—the urban youth register RS as well as at registers that invoked teacher talk or Swedish colloquialisms, the students oriented toward a standardized Swedish as the target language of the classroom. The analyses
show how alignments (Goffman, 1979; Goodwin, 2007; Stivers, 2008) were successively built up through the participants’ accentuations and reaccentuations when performing in the voice of others. However, they did not laugh at anything. By disaligning with peers who, for example, sneeringly repeated students’ pronunciations, they did not endorse the mocking of L2 talk. Classroom performance can thus be seen as not so much a part of any individual contributions but rather a multiparty joint accomplishment by the participants. In such performances where participants display alignments with both each other and the target phenomena, the students could be seen to strive for greater proficiency in Swedish while forming a community of practice. Multiparty alignments and disalignments were thus also important resources in the co-construction of a local classroom language ideology.

The analyses also document that talking about, and in, different registers involves participants making both epistemic stances and claims, drawing on previous experiences and knowledge of language skills and use. In so doing, the students oriented toward standard language and correctness as the goals of teaching and learning, whereas the teacher, in this case, did not advocate correctness at the cost of communication. The classroom interactions involved a complex interplay between language norms and practices. Through their stylizations and other verbal improvisations, the participants could be seen to engage in the formation of a classroom community of practice.

In brief, the students managed to participate in classroom discussion through a series of semiotic resources where they aligned and disaligned with prior speakers using selective repetitions, stylizations, giggling, and laughter. Such verbal and nonverbal moves are seen as part of verbal improvisations (Duranti & Black, 2012) where the students simultaneously acquired a second language (Swedish) and formed an emergent community of L2 practices based on shared ideologies.

This study extends prior work on stylizations in L2 classroom contexts in showing that stylizations involve a heightened reflexivity of language and grammatical constructions and can thus be seen as a potential resource in second language learning (Cekaite & Aronsson, 2014; Jaspers, 2014; Poveda, 2005). Further, this study contributes to research on classroom performance and communities of practice by documenting in detail how a community is partly talked into being and shaped through stylizations and other alignments.

Study III: Corrections as multiparty accomplishments in L2 classroom conversations

This study focuses on the multiparty nature of classroom repair work, documenting other-corrections in L2 classroom conversations. Research on
other-corrections (or recasts) in L2 classrooms has often been conducted by scholars within the field of second language acquisition (SLA). Various studies, oriented to sociocultural or SLA theorizing, have explored corrective practices and how they can be seen as important devices in the teaching and learning of a new language, most commonly in regard to how recasts are linked to language acquisition and affordances (Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Hall, 2007; Rolin-Ianziti, 2010). Over the last ten or so years, research on L2 classroom talk has broadened to include perspectives from conversation analysis (CA). Several such studies have documented classroom repair work in great sequential detail (e.g., Hauser, 2005; Hosoda, 2006; Kasper, 2004; Lee, 2013; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004), focusing on corrections as interactional events. However, the focus of research on corrections in L2 classrooms has often had a teacher-student dyadic bias, more precisely, the focus has been on one student to one teacher (1:1 dyads); as a consequence, the role of peer corrections has largely been neglected. Still relatively few studies document repair work with a focus on other-corrections in multiparty or multiperson settings (Bolden, 2011; Egbert, 1997).

In line with studies with detailed sequential analyses of repair or correction work in multiparty conversations, this study documents the interactional nature and design of other-corrections, analyzing correction trajectories as a type of interactional accomplishment in classroom practices (Hauser, 2005; Koole & Elbers, 2014). In this study, participant contributions were at times analyzed as those of a party (Schegloff, 1995), rather than merely as individual contributions.

The analyses draw on a collection of correction trajectories. Five lessons, spread over the entire data set of video recordings, were chosen, and from those, ten sequences were selected that include both teacher and student corrections and that reflect the richness and complexity of the data at large. Correction trajectories were analyzed in line with the analyses of Jefferson (1974), where a prototypical repair or correction trajectory, including a correction of the target “error” or trouble source, recurrently assumes a three-part format: error–correction–acceptance/non-acceptance. In an extended discussion on repair work, Jefferson (1987) illuminates various ways in which speakers may highlight trouble in prior talk, producing exposed corrections, that is, explicit corrections, in contrast to embedded, i.e., more implicit corrections (e.g., what has been called corrective recasts; Hauser, 2005).

This study documents students’ agency in engaging in classroom correction work, illuminating the peers’, and not only the teacher’s, active roles in the attenuation of the correction trajectories. These trajectories defy any simple dyadic teacher-student patterns. The teacher produced more corrections than any individual student. But both the teacher and the students recurrently engaged in other-corrections, and in both exposed and embedded
corrections. The teacher’s exposed corrections were protests, clarification questions, or metalinguistic comments.

While accuracy or precision was a concern for both the students and the teacher, the two parties deployed somewhat different correction formats: (i) the students responded on each other’s behalf, producing vicarious responses (see also Kasper, 2004, on surrogate action formats), (ii) two or more students would repeat or validate the teacher’s or each other’s corrections as chorus responses, and (iii) the students would correct each other in the form of what we have called peer corrections. However, the analyses reveal that other-corrections were at times quite ambiguous in that correction work was repeatedly done somewhat implicitly. There is thus a balancing act between exposed and embedded corrections. Both the teacher’s and the peers’ exposed corrections were at times mitigated in various ways, for example, through multimodal resources like prosody (e.g., sotto voce delivery or hesitation) or laughter. Likewise, embedded other-corrections were on occasions disambiguated through, for instance, students repeatedly picking up the teacher’s embedded corrections (e.g., chorus responses) or through emphatic pronunciation.

The analyses document how other-corrections often generated a prototypical three-part sequence, but not necessarily within a dyadic teacher-student design. Vicarious peer responses in third-turn repeats illuminate how other-corrections in classroom conversations occur in multiparty constellations, something that adds to the complexity of correction trajectories.

In brief, the analyses illuminate the teacher’s sustained efforts to tailor classroom talk to students’ individually as well as collectively displayed understanding and varying skills. This involved a continuous balancing act between form accuracy and conversational progressivity. As this study documents, detailed analyses of correction sequences and trajectories at times resolve not only whether the language learner is actually attending to a recast but also whether s/he has indeed been able to identify “what is the trouble.” Correction sequences are therefore important sites for locating the growing pragmatic competence as well as language awareness of beginner learners. Moreover, in moving away from a dyadic bias, and documenting peer contributions and thus language learners’ affordances, this study not only contributes to situated analyses of the interactional nature of correction work but also to work on scaffolding.
Who is doing the tailoring of SSL classroom talk? This dissertation attempts to illuminate the interconnections between language, culture, and learning in language socialization processes in an SSL school setting. Drawing on a discursive approach, combined with language socialization features, the studies look at both language ideology and macro aspects (Studies I and II), and at micro aspects of classroom talk (Studies II and III). Overall, the focus is on different aspects of how ideologies, educational practices, and social identities are co-constructed and performed through both the teacher’s and the students’ talk-in-interaction.

Contemporary work on L2 classroom discourse foregrounds social interactional aspects (e.g., Hauser, 2005; Talmy, 2008). Yet, there is little research on how peer interaction plays a role in L2 classroom talk in secondary schooling contexts (but see Jakonen & Morton, 2015). The three studies in this dissertation show that language learning and teaching activities constitute a type of multiparty work with joint accomplishments. The classroom conversations are situated in an institutional setting with ideological and politicized educational values and goals. The analyses document how school activities are at times paradoxical in that they simultaneously work inclusively and exclusively, and thus produce schooled identities, such as the “regular student” and the “SSL student” (of ethnicity). This is, however, not done uncontested; the analyses reveal how the participants, both the students and the teacher, manage such paradoxical practices.

The student participants in this classroom are L2 novices, but knowledgeable ones. They all have at least nine years of education before migrating to Sweden, several of them are already multilingual speakers, and all aspire to enroll in higher education. Their educational experiences and academic skills vary, reflecting the heterogeneous group of the classroom community in regard to, for example, national background, migration status, age, and level of education. But they have all already been socialized into some sort of schooled identity.

Prior research (e.g., Talmy, 2008, 2009) has at times documented how the “L2 student” category within educational settings is commonly met with approaches where the students are not only seen as different but also as somewhat “deficient.” In their contestations of such positions, the students in this dissertation (Studies I and II) can be viewed as successively adopting the
positions of “regular” students: negotiating, contesting, and adapting values and practices in an inclusive school setting.

In their classroom performances (Studies I–III), the students’ agency can be seen in the many ways in which they draw on a variety of discursive resources. The analyses of classroom talk document how the students, as part of a classroom collective, through their use of language and other semiotic resources construct and negotiate social identities, and how they in so doing position themselves and are positioned as L2 learners. The studies show that such positionings take place not only through the use of lexical items but also through the socializing communicative practices of the classroom. The analyses of the multiparty conversations demonstrate how these practices are related to sociocultural aspects and values of a larger community that can be seen in both the teacher’s investments in students’ socialization into using the language through the language and in the students’ investments in SSL learning.

The detailed analyses reveal how the teacher’s classroom work is partly masked for the students in that it is largely embedded. The participants recurrently orient to the question, “What is going on here?” (Goffman, 1974, p. 8), co-constructing a community of practice regarding language-mediated socialization in and through a Swedish educational setting. As the analyses show, the teacher’s tailoring of classroom talk could be seen as a balancing act where the practices are repeatedly (re)negotiated and (re)produced in the local establishment of what SSL education should entail. For the teacher, this involves a constant juggling of the curriculum between the students’ performances and the school’s expectations, which at times led to paradoxical practices.

For instance, the teacher is more open to youth language varieties than the (adolescent) students (Study II). Moreover, the teacher often engaged in classroom corrections of nontarget constructions (Study III), but much of this work was invisible to the students in that it was implicit and embedded. A few students would even ask for more “teaching,” positioning themselves as students eager to learn. The students did not recognize that teaching and learning were at times accomplished in very subtle and implicit ways. This reveals a socialization aspect related to what is regarded as “teaching-learning activities.” The analyses, further, show that these activities are interactionally negotiated and locally achieved on a moment-by-moment basis, drawing on naturalistic conversations in forming a community of practice. Parenthetically, it can be noted that much of these teaching activities were initially also invisible to the analyst before engaging in detailed microanalyses of classroom talk.

Through the teacher’s work in tailoring talk to the students’ needs, classroom conversations were finely attuned to the students’ varying linguistic skills. Broadly speaking, the teacher would opt for conversational progression, supporting and soliciting classroom conversations in a number of
inventive ways, but at the same time she would often employ various embedded constructions to correct nontarget constructions. For instance, the teacher would merely correct grammatical “errors” if several students repeated the same mistake or if one student would do so time and again (Study III).

The teacher consistently strived for communication and progressivity in conversation (Jefferson, 1987; Stivers & Robinson, 2006), trying to make the students connect both to each other and to the Swedish L2. This involves a constant and complex balancing act between meaning making and form-focus in classroom talk (or between conversational flow and progressivity on the one hand and traditional teaching activities on the other).

In line with Goodwin and Goodwin (1992), this dissertation shows how the participants are actively engaged in building participation frameworks “through intricate collaborative articulation of the events they are engaged in” (p. 97). The students do not passively acquire Swedish language skills. The stylizations (including laughter, emphatic prosody, and other multimodal resources) reveal the students’ language awareness and sensitivity for the minutiae of language. Similarly, the peer corrections and the peers’ vicarious responses show some of the many ways in which the students continuously oriented to language and to each other’s contributions, initiating and scaffolding peers’ correction work. In the present classroom, the peers’ stylizations and peer corrections are thus important resources in the continuous classroom investments in L2 language learning and in the local regulation of norms for Swedish style and correctness. On another note, the analyses (Studies I–III) reveal some of the ways in which this classroom’s teaching-learning activities involve a twin building process where students are both engaged in L2 acquisition and in the building of a classroom community of practice. The analyses illuminate how the students—as participants in a multiparty socialization process—draw on a variety of resources when investing or not investing in the different classroom practices in this introductory language program.

Moreover, the findings document how the teacher tailored her talk to upcoming events in the classroom conversations with both the entire group and with the individual students in ways delicately designed to elicit and sustain the beginner learners’ interest and investments in classroom talk. The findings thus extend earlier work on L2 classroom talk in documenting in a number of ways how the students’ and the teacher’s contributions are intricably intertwined in ways that challenge the dyadic bias of much work on teaching-learning practices in FL and L2 classrooms.
Sammanfattning

Denna avhandling behandlar klassrumssamtal inom ramen för ett språkinduktionsprogram för ungdomar som nyligen har migrerat till Sverige. Avhandlingens syfte är att utforska hur svenska som andraspråk blir ett deltagardags och konstrueras i deltagarnas skolvardag samt hur de etablerar social ordning. Även om språkinlärning är ett primärt fokus i undervisningen dokumenterar denna avhandling också hur de sociala interaktionerna delvis handlar om att bilda en praktikgemenskap (community of practise, Lave & Wenger, 1991) i den lokala svenska skolmiljön.

Introduktion

I den akademiska diskursen såväl som i svensk diskurs om utbildningsspolicy är ”nyanlända” en social kategori som används om elever som nyligen har migrerat till Sverige och som är nybörjare i den svenska skolan (Bunar, 2010a; Nilsson & Axelsson, 2013). Skolverkets gemensamma definition av denna heterogena grupp är ”elever som inte har svenska som modersmål och inte heller behärskar det svenska språket och som anländer nära skolstarten eller under sin skoltid i grundskolan, gymnasieskolan eller motsvarande skolformer” (2008). Så kallade nyanlända elever utgör en växande grupp i svenska skolor. Alla nyanlända har rätt till utbildning och i de flesta fallen erbjuds dessa elever ett språkinduktionsprogram i vilket de får intensiv språkundervisning i svenska som andra språk och i andra kärnämnen samt studievägledning på sitt första språk (då fältarbetet för denna avhandling genomfördes var antalet kärnämnen fyra men har utökats till att omfatta tolv ämnen). Syftet med språkinduktionsprogrammet är att det ska vara förberedande för fortsatt gymnasie- eller universitetsutbildning eller annan högre utbildning och i förlängningen för det svenska samhället i stort.

Fram tills nyligen har en stor del av forskningen om andraspråkslärande i formella utbildningssammanhang fokuserat på kognitiva aspekter av andra-språkinlärning. Många studier har också haft en så kallad dyadisk bias (snedvidning) genom ett fokus på isolerade lärare-elev dialoger (t.ex. Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Loewen & Philp, 2006; Sheen, 2006) snarare än på lärare-elever konstellationer situerade inom ramen för flerpartsasamtal i klassrum (om vikten av flerpartsaspekter på klassrumssamspel, se till exempel Cekaite
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Ett centralt antagande i denna avhandling är att elever i svenska som andraspråksundervisning använder och lär sig språket genom deltagande i en praktikgemenskap (Lave & Wenger, 1991) som är situerad och som också formas i en skolkontext.

Metod och data


Ett central antagande i avhandlingen är att genom att analysera samtal ur ett deltagarperspektiv (Sacks, 1992) kan språksocialisationsaspekter situeras i elevernas klassrumssupplevelser och lokala samspel. Ett sådant antagande innebär att språkutbyten som relateras till elevers socialiserings in i institutionella ramar för deltagande i klassrumskonversationer. I denna avhandling ses inte praktikgemenskaper och institutionella ramar som något fast och enbart på förhand givet, utan istället som något som förhandlas och formas i tal–interaktion som äger rum i en sociokulturell skolkontext.

Analyserna i denna avhandling bygger på 40 timmar videoinspelade klassrumskonversationer i svenska som andraspråksundervisning samt på deltagande observationer och informella samtal i och utanför klassrummet. Videoinspelningarna har transkriberats i detalj med utgångspunkt i samtalsanalytisk metod (Jefferson, 1974; Sacks, 1992) vilket här har inneburit upp REPade genomgångar av det inspelade materialet. Fältarbetet utfördes under en termin. Tio elever och en lärare deltog i studien. När fältarbetet inleddes var eleverna mellan 16 och 19 år, alla hade minst nio års skolbakgrund och
tre av eleverna hade gått ut gymnasiet innan de migrerade till Sverige. Samtliga elever ansågs ”ha god progression i det svenska språket”. Alla deltagare har gett informerat samtycke till att delta i studien, och deras namn har anonymiserats i samtliga skriffliga dokumentationer av data.

I studie I inkluderas data från informella observationer och samtal i högre utsträckning än i studierna II och III. Den första studien, med mer makro-orienterade analyser, ger också något av en bakgrundsteckning till de två andra, som bygger på detaljerade mikroanalyser, i en samhällelig kontext. Samtliga studier fokuserar på olika aspekter av identitet, deltagande och deltagarnas positioner och positioneringar inom ramen för språkliga socialiseringsprocesser.

**Fynd och sammanfattande diskussion**

Denna avhandling belyser flerpartsaspekter av språksocialisation i andra-språksskolor. Analyserna visar hur både lärarens och elevernas investeringar i språkkompetens och lokala ideologier om korrekt svenska samkonstrueras genom deltagarnas sätt att tala, något som också kan analyseras som en viktig aspekt av lokalt identitetsarbete. Klassrumskonversationerna äger rum i en institutionell miljö med ideologiska och politiserade värderingar och mål i undervisningen. Analyserna dokumenterar hur skolans aktiviteter ibland är paradoxala i att de samtidigt fungerar som inkluderande och exkluderande och som något som därmed exempelvis producerar institutionella identiteter som ”vanlig elev” och ”andraspråkselever” eller ”IVIK-elever” (med etnicitet). Detta görs dock inte oemotsagt/obestritt. Analyserna visar hur deltagarna, både eleverna och läraren hanterar sådana paradoxala praktiker (Studie I).

Deltagaren orienterar sig återkommande mot frågan ”vad pågår här” (*What is going on here*, Goffman 1974:8) och samkonstruerar en praktikgemenskap där språkssocialisation medieras i och genom ett svenskt utbildningssammanhang. Elevernas aktörskap belyses genom de många sätt på vilka de använder sig av olika diskursiva resurser i klassrumskonversationerna (studie I-III). Analyserna dokumenterar hur eleverna, som en del av ett klassrumsskolaktiv, genom sitt talade språk och genom användning av andra semiotiska resurser, skapar och förhandlar sociala identiteter. Därmed belyser analyserna även hur eleverna positionerar sig själva samt blir positionerade som andraspråkselever. Analyserna i de tre studierna visar att sådana positioneringar inte bara äger rum i ordval eller typ av grammatiska konstruktioner utan också genom andra socialiserande kommunikativa praktiker i klassrummet. Vidare visar analyserna av flerpartsamtalen hur dessa praktiker är relaterade till sociokulturella aspekter och värden i ett vidare samhälleligt sammanhang. Detta kan ses i både lärarens investeringar i att socialisera eleverna in i språket genom språket och i elevernas investeringar i andraspråkslärande. Läraren strävade konsekvent i riktning mot ett kommunika-
tivt flöde och en progressivitet i klassrumskonversationerna, och möjlig-
gjorde därmed för eleverna att göra kopplingar både till varandra och till
språket. Detta innebar en i samtalen konstant och komplex balansakt mellan
meningsskapande och formfokus.

I linje med Goodwin och Goodwin (1992), visar denna avhandling hur
deltagarna var aktivt involverade i processen att bygga deltagarramverk
(participation frameworks) genom att gemensamt ge uttryck för de händelser
de var delaktiga i. Genom användandet av stiliseringar (stylizations), som
inkluderar skratt, emfatisk prosodi och andra multimodala resurser, visar
eleverna språklig medvetenhet och en lyhördhet för språkliga detaljer (Studie
II). Likaså visar eleverna att de orienterar sig mot språk och korrekthet ge-
nom att aktivt delta med korrigeringar av varandras språkliga yttranden
(peer-corrections) eller genom att svara i varandras ställe (peer’s vicarious
responses) när läraren eller någon av eleverna korrigerar någons grammatik
(Studie III). I de analyserade klassrumskonversationerna var således elever-
as stiliseringar och språkliga korrigeringar viktiga resurser i deras investe-
ingar i andraspråkslärandet liksom i formandet av en lokal språkideologi.

Fynden i de tre studierna bidrar till forskning om andraspråkslärande i
klassrum genom att de på flera vis belyser och dokumenterar hur eleverna
och lärarens bidrag är upplösligt sammanflätade på sätt som utmanar en
dyadisk bias i studier av lärandepraktiker i främmandespråk- och andra-
språksklassrum.

I en översikt om nyanlända och lärande, har Nihad Bunar (2010a) genom-
lyst tidigare svensk forskning om denna elevgrupp. Bunar pekade på att med
några få undantag (se t.ex. Cekaite, 2006; Evaldsson & Cekaite, 2010) har
mycket litet forskning gjorts som direktd handledar om till Sverige nymigrerade
elever och deras skolvårdag. Efter Bunars forskningsöversikt har ytterligare
studier om nyanlända publicerats (se t.ex. Nilsson & Axelsson, 2013;
Skowronsky, 2013; Svensson & Eastmond, 2013; Wernesjö, 2014) men
antalet studier som fokuserar elevernas egna handlingar och samspel i en
skolkontext är fortfarande få. Denna avhandling ska därför också ses som ett
bidrag till ökad kunskap om nyanlända elever i en svensk skolkontext.

Samtidigt är det min förhoppning att detta arbete ska ha implikationer för
andraspråksprocesser i vidare klassrumskontexter och på så vis vidga tidi-
gare forskning kring språksocialisationsprocesser i formella och informella
utbildningssammanhang (Duff, 2002; Harklau, 2003; Talmy, 2008, 2009;
Rampton, 2013).
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Appendix A: Transcription key

= continuing turn
_ emphatic
[ encloses overlapping talk
“ ” encloses talk in other voice
○ ○ encloses speech in low volume
> < faster than surrounding speech
: prolongation of preceding sound
(,.) pause
- cut off sign; self editing marker
(xxx) unhearable
↑↓ raising / falling intonation (preceeding syllable)
£ $ smiley voice

Appendix B: Swedish transcripts

Study I

Poem Både och och varken eller (Both and neither nor) by Özgür Kibar

jag är både och jag är varken eller
för jag är utländsk och jag är inhemsk
jag är en eldig turk, jag är en trygg svensk
jag är vitlök, oliver och kåldolmar
och jag är midsommarafton på skärgårdsholmar

Kajsa: Varför alla dessa motsägelser?
Fayad: För att han försöker förstå sig [därför vem han är
Aydn: [försöker förstå sin identitet
Misko: Han förstår inte sig heller eller?
Kajsa: Han har två kulturer [som ] inom sig så har han två kulturer som =
Ana: [Det finns skillnad ja
Fayad: [Sitter inne
Kajsa: = kämpar nästan det är en kamp därinne [(. en identitets- (. fråga =
Hadji: [((Skrattar))
Kajsa: = en stor identitetskris kanske vem är jag? Är jag turk eller är jag svensk kan jag vara både och?
Hadji: Eller?
Kajsa: Kanske min familj säger till mig du måste välja du kan inte vara svensk du är fortfarande turk en turk som bor i Sverige [det =
Hadji:  
Kajsa: = betyder inte att du är svensk (.) då kanske han säger till sig själv men jag- jag känner mig mer svensk jag pratar mer svenska än turkiska jag åter mer svensk mat jag har fler svenska vänner men betyder det att jag är svensk? Nej för att jag har Turkiet i mig också jag har den turkiska kulturen två kulturer två identiteter som han försöker tänka hur ska han göra för att leva med det här kan ni känna igen det? 

Fayad: Jo  
Kajsa: Ja  
Fayad: Fyra kulturer sitter här  
Kajsa: Fyra kulturer mm (.) fortsätt  
Fayad: Min mamma rysk kultur [och min pappa uzbekisk kultur och =  
Kajsa: [Ja  
Fayad: = kazakisk kultur där jag bodde [och nu bara svenska ((skämtsamt))  
Kajsa: [Ja  
Kajsa: [Och nu bara slänger vi på en svensk kultur [((Skämtsamt)) ja =  
Hadji: [((Skrattar))  
Kajsa: = hur tänker du då?  
Fayad: Det är svårt  
Kajsa: Ja: och vad är det som är svårt?  
Fayad: Att fira varje dag he  
((Alla skrattar))  
Kajsa: Fira varje dag?  
Fayad: Ja olika kulturer fester ((Skrattar))  
Kajsa: ((Skrattar)) Hela livet blir en enda lång fest ((Skrattar)) Ja det kan ju vara ett problem att hålla reda på vad är det vi firar idag? Någon annan som tänker runt det här? Ja ((Till Emre))  
Emre: Eh han gjorde ett stort problem det är inte ett stort problem om man är halvsvensk eller halvturk är jag den är jag den du är en människa ingen bara från vilken nation du är vad heter den nationalitet  
Kajsa: Mm precis skriv om det
The ideal class

Kajsa: Det handlar om att det pågår ett ständigt arbete med att försöka få det så bra som möjligt för alla elever eh vi pratar idag i skolan om att man ska se varje elev varje individ och vad just den eleven behöver men nu är ju ni special ni är ju tie stycken här så då går det ju och göra till viss män men dom på program när man är tretti trettitvå elever i klassen så ska man försöka hitta då ett arbetssätt som passar alla he ehm och

Misko: Men dom är tysta nästan alla i de andra klasserna är tysta räcker upp handen pratar bara när lärare ger tillåtelse lärare säger aldrig dom ska räcka upp handen dom bara gör det när lärare säger att ni måste vara tysta ingen pratar

Kajsa: Mm nej det måste fungera så när man är så många i klassen eh här inne vi har ju väldigt vi kallar det för högt i tak man kan prata vi behöver inte sitta och räcka upp handen utan vi pratar mer vi har ett pågående samtal [hela tiden]

Misko: [ja men det är alltid så att lärare säger ingenting utan när lärare ställer fråga dom bara räcker upp handen lärare säger inte ni måste räcka upp handen

Kajsa: Nej men alla vet ju det dom flesta har ju gått i svenska grundskolan i nio år det första man lär sig nästan är att räcka upp handen [det =

Hadji: [Jo: = tillhör så att säga skolkulturen

Kajsa: Men vi vill jobba med att göra lektionerna så bra som möjligt och naturligtvis ska ni vara med och tycka om det här också ni har inte riktigt samma referensramar ni har inte samma erfarenhet men det kan ju vara dubbelt så intressant att få höra då hur ni tänker vad är en bra lektion hur ska det fungera (.) vad betyder ideal? hur ser en ideal lektion ut? hej och välkommen ((elev kommer in i klassrummet))
International Day

I:

Hadji: Ingenting
Alan: Köttbullar
Aydin: [Dom ska titta bara lära oss]
Misko: [Köttbullar med xxx]
Kajsa: [Ja då får det vara peruanska köttbullar ((Suckar))

II

Kajsa: Som sagt var det här är en tradition jag vet inte hur många år om dom har hållit på å- åtta år eller tie år har dom haft den här internationella dagen
Hadji: Den här skolan?
Kajsa: Ja
Hadji: Vad bra
Aydin: Vad bra ((Fnyser))
Kajsa: Ja eh och det är naturligtvis det är inte bara elever från andra länder eller från en annan kultur det är också va he (skrattar till) vanliga det är också svenska elever som ska uppträda det är nån som ska spela gitarr och sjunga och sedan är det nån dans [och
Hadji: [Mhm

Study II
(Swedish transcripts are included in the article)

Study III
(Swedish transcripts are included in the article)