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Abstract

Ability grouping has become increasingly common in the teaching of English in Swedish secondary schools. This study was concerned with the effects of different group constellations on the more able pupils. The research questions involved the able pupils’ performance, their roles in mixed-ability groups and whether the learning environment is better for them when they work with other able pupils. The study used discourse analysis of group interaction in the target language between pupils in year eight. It was found that able pupils perform according to their pre-defined skill, regardless of what groups they were put in. They also supported and lifted the interaction to higher levels in mixed-ability groups. Finally, the results suggested that able pupils might have a greater chance to develop their English in tracked groups. It is argued that this has implications for the implementation of ability grouping in the teaching of second languages in Sweden.
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1. Introduction

In 2011, the Swedish School Inspectorate published a report on the current state of the teaching of English in Swedish secondary schools. By observing lessons and interviewing teachers and pupils at 22 different schools, the inspectorate discerned a number of areas where the schools needed to improve. One of these was challenging the more able pupils. It was found that while the classroom environment was safe, all pupils usually worked on the same tasks. Pupils who found these tasks easy and finished early were given additional tasks of the same type instead of being allowed to proceed. The able pupils at the studied schools reported that they seldom felt like they were properly challenged in their studies. Two of the 22 studied schools had classes which were organized based on ability, but this was not seen as a relevant factor in relation to the results. (Skolinspektionen, 2011)

It has become increasingly common to put pupils in different classes based on ability. The Swedish National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2010, p. 33) states that 21 percent of pupils in secondary school are taught English in classes that have been put together based on ability. The fact that one in every five pupils is used to differentiated teaching in English is noteworthy. The policy according to the school law is that the majority of lessons in compulsory school should be taught in integrated groups (Skolverket, 2010, p. 32). On the other hand, the curriculum states that every pupil has the right to develop their abilities in school and that the teacher should take every individual’s needs, conditions, experiences and thoughts into consideration (Skolverket, 2011, p. 16).

This study is concerned with whether there is a conflict between these two policies. A simple reaction to the criticism put forth by the inspectorate would be to increase the differentiation of pupils so that teachers more easily can assign tasks that are appropriate for the pupils’ current level. Yet, doing so would stand in violation with one of the previously mentioned policies. It is clear that the position of the school law is that all pupils on all levels should be able to develop in integrated classes and that teachers must find ways to make this possible.

The focus of this study is the different effects of group constellations on able pupils, including their interaction with less able pupils. By examining this it should be possible to further elucidate the inspectorate’s findings. Completion of an oral interaction task in groups of both mixed and same ability will be studied. The intention is not to generalize the results that are presented, but rather to closely analyse what happens in a limited number of instances.
1.1. **Aim and research questions**

The aim of this study is to analyse how the more able pupils are affected by the level of their classmates when working on tasks in groups. The focus will lie on the pupils that have been deemed by their teacher to be more able, but other pupils will play their part in this as well. Three areas of interest are defined in the following research questions:

1. Is the performance of the more able pupils affected by the ability of their classmates when taking part in tasks that are completed in groups?

2. Do the more able pupils support and lift the interaction to higher levels in mixed-ability groups?

3. Are the more able pupils given a greater chance to develop their English when they work with other able pupils?
2. Background

Differentiation of pupils in Swedish schools has become increasingly common. The Swedish School Inspectorate (Skolinspektionen, 2010, pp. 12-13) notes an increase in the creation of study-groups based on ability and warns that such methods can have a negative impact on motivation and limit pupils to their current level. The fear is that pupils will be locked in the groups in which they are initially placed, with little or no chance to move between groups. This negative effect relates to the pupils that are deemed to be less able, who are seen as being stigmatized when placed in special-needs classes. The Swedish National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2009, pp. 24-25) has determined that differentiation based on ability has to be temporary and continuously evaluated. The guidelines laid down by the authorities appear to be clear on recommending that schools in Sweden only rarely should use differentiating solutions in their daily work.

Despite this fact, a number of schools in Sweden are working extensively with ability grouping. According to the National Agency (Skolverket, 2010, pp. 33-34), English is, along with mathematics, rather commonly taught in this way and a large majority of both pupils and teachers that are involved in differentiated teaching consider it successful in meeting the needs of all pupils. The concerns that the authorities raise are thereby not shared by the people who are actually working with ability grouping. It seems that many teachers would respond to the criticism that they do not challenge the more able pupils by blaming the lack differentiation in the classes that they teach. Doing so would not only provide the necessary support to special-needs pupils, but also allow high ability pupils to be challenged on the level that they have the right to according to the curriculum.

2.1. Theoretical background

2.1.1. Ability grouping, streaming, tracking

Studies on ability grouping (also known as tracking and streaming) have been conducted for a long time. Slavin (1990, p. 471) states that ability grouping has remained one of the most controversial issues in education for 70 years. Some research focuses on a particular school subject while others are interested in the stages at which tracking is introduced. There are big differences between different countries when it comes to the extent of implementation of tracking. Van Elk, van deer Steeg and Webbink (2011, p. 1009) report that different forms of ability grouping are common in countries such as Hungary, Austria and Germany, while Norway, Sweden and Japan retain an almost exclusively comprehensive educational system up to the level of upper secondary school. The modes of tracking that are implemented are also different. The two main categories are between-class and within-class. According to Slavin (1988, p. 68), between-class plans put pupils in entirely different classes based on ability, while within-class refers to group arrangements made within heterogeneous classes in order to adapt instruction to the varying needs of pupils. Indeed, the beliefs in different modes of tracking seem to be mixed among different educational systems and researchers.

As was noted above, a popular belief among teachers and pupils seem to be that the effects of tracking are generally positive. Such has been the case for a long time. In 1964, Jackson (p. 122) reported that among 655 interviewed teachers, most believed that tracking was essential if any academic standard
was to be maintained. The United Kingdom was at the time involved in extensive ability grouping within its educational system, and did so with a firm support from school staff. In a more recent study in the United States, Glickman (1991, p. 5) noted that despite lots of research into the negative effects of streaming, schools kept on implementing it, mainly because they deemed it easier to manage the classrooms if pupils were grouped based on ability. Practical concerns are thereby allowed to overshadow the pedagogical reasoning. In Sweden, Olsson and Jonasson (2009, p. 24) indicated that teachers can save time in the planning of lessons if their classes are homogeneous. This might have contributed to the positive attitude toward ability grouping reported by the National Agency.

The main interest in studies of tracking is the overall academic achievement of the pupils taking part in it. There would be no way of motivating the choice of differentiating pupils if there were no positive effects on the learning outcome. In one of the most extensive studies on the topic, Slavin (1990) looked at the effects of tracking across the curriculum, incorporating numerous smaller inquiries to study the overarching effects of ability grouping. He states that the commonly believed advantage of such systems is that teachers can adapt their instruction to the disparate needs of a large student body, providing challenging tasks for the more able pupils and support to those who need it. Arguments against ability grouping are mainly centred on the damaging effects on low achievers, who are taught at a lower pace and quality by teachers who are less experienced. The results of Slavin’s study discredited any belief in increased academic performance, even in the more able pupils. Slavin (p. 494) concluded that different forms of ability grouping are equally ineffective for pupils of all abilities in all school subjects. There were no statistically meaningful effects of tracking on the performance of pupils on standardised test. The only area where a difference was discernible was in social sciences, where the effects were negative.

Pupils of different ability are affected in separate ways by tracking. As noted above, pupils of high ability are thought to have substantially greater chance of being challenged on their level if they are grouped together using between-class tracking. In Holland however, van Elk, van deer Steeg and Webbink (2011, p. 1020) found implications that the able pupils’ chance of completing higher education was not affected by early tracking, as opposed later tracking. When this implication is brought together with the fact that less able pupils were negatively affected by early tracking, van Elk, van deer Steeg and Webbink see no advantages with introducing early ability grouping. Their findings coincide with Slavin’s in the lack of effects on the able pupils. The main difference between the two is the effects on the less able pupils.

Some studies look specifically into ability grouping in the teaching of English as a second language. In Korea, Kim (2012, p. 307) found that between-class grouping had not had the expected positive effects, especially for the less able pupils. Kim also looked into the more practical issues and reported that teachers of English had access to little material that was adapted to different levels, putting pressure on them to create their own teaching material that corresponds to the different needs of different groups. It is thus clear that not all teachers have favourable opinions of ability grouping, with practical implementation being a key concern.

### 2.1.2. The able pupils and their needs

Many attempts have been made to define the more able pupils. When groups are assigned it is common to use performance on a diagnostic test as a determiner of current skill. However, ability is more than performance on tests. Wahlström (1995, pp. 24-39) lists several attempts which have been made to define what ability or giftedness is. All of them share the potential for high work-load, the
ability to see and work with context, ease of understanding abstract ideas and the ability to quickly learn new concepts and use them in new ways. But there are also areas where marked disagreements exist. The multiple intelligence model first introduced by Gardner recognizes that there are several disparate intelligences. Armstrong (2009) explains that Gardner’s model dictates that there are seven intelligences which all people possess. Individual differences stem from varying strength in the abilities, so that pupils that appear to be more able are fortunate to have strength in the intelligences that are promoted by the curriculum. Armstrong (2009, pp. 195-196) takes heed of the critique that the model artificially makes every pupil believe that he or she is smart by using their own intelligence while in fact accomplishing little through especially designed exercises. Advocates of this view fear that the multiple intelligence model mostly cater to the less able pupils by making them feel good about meaningless accomplishments in their specific intelligence. The point is that it is not uncontroversial to classify pupils as “able” or “gifted”, while attempts to view all pupils as able but in different ways are equally criticized.

Whatever stance is taken, most teachers would acknowledge that there are pupils in their classes who are more able than others. Wahlström (1995, p. 24) maintains that the majority of lesson time is spent on the less able pupils who are deemed to have special needs, when teachers should recognize that the more able pupils also have special needs. Children who effortlessly complete tasks ahead of time are being denied their individual needs if they are not allowed to proceed. The School Inspectorate’s critique appears to coincide with this. However, these special needs do not require differentiating solutions to be fulfilled. Wahlström (1995, p. 74) argues that the pace of instruction and task completion should not be the main concern. Instead, the possibility of progression within the topic, in order to get a deeper understanding, is the best answer to the requirements of the gifted pupils. This would allow pupils in mixed-ability groups to work on the same task if the teacher offers different levels of work and accepts varying outcomes. Such an approach would also allow the whole class to profit from the work of the gifted pupils, if they are given the chance to extensively interact with their peers and present their work.

Ability in second language acquisition can be classified according to a number of different criteria. It has been suggested that giftedness applies to all subjects, which becomes clear when it is measured using IQ-tests (Wahlström, 1995, pp. 25-26). However, this is becoming less common and ability is now seen as pluralistic, allowing individuals to be able in one area and less so in others. Attempts have also been made to classify a good language learner. Lightbown and Spada (2006, p. 55) exemplify that willingness to guess and make mistakes, eagerness to get the meaning across, above-average IQ, enjoyment of grammar exercises and good self-image and confidence have been said to be favourable qualities in people learning languages. Pupils who possess some or all of these qualities might be more successful in the English classroom.

Able pupils could have specific needs in the second and foreign language classroom. Jackson (1982, p. 331) suggests that such learners require discussion with intellectual peers, divergent and open-ended tasks and opportunities to assume different roles in group interaction. Design of tasks in mixed-ability groups should take heed of this while at the same time catering to the less able pupils. The difficulty of designing such tasks might be taxing on teachers and could be the reason why tracked groups are generally preferred, as noted above. On the other hand, discussion with intellectual peers and opportunities to assume different roles could be offered in tasks where pupils interact with each other. If it is assumed that ability in learning a second language is different from other subjects, it is not difficult to imagine pupils with varying ability interacting and discussing productively, since less able pupils can still be intellectual and provide a stimulating environment for their peers.
2.1.3. Interlanguage talk and negotiation for meaning

Contemporary approaches to the teaching of second and foreign languages emphasize the value of interaction, which can occur in formal or informal settings. Outside of the classroom, interaction with native speakers will benefit the second language learner. In the second and foreign language classroom however, interaction between the learners themselves occurs. Long and Porter (1985, p. 224) argue that interaction between language learners, which they call interlanguage talk, has been shown to impact development favourably and call for additional research on the topic. Thus, communication with other learners when completing tasks or discussing linguistic problems can be beneficial. Conversation and other interactive forms of communication become central to the learners in their language development. Additionally, Long and Porter (1985, pp. 208-212) maintain that group interaction provides practice opportunities, improves the quality of pupils’ speech, individualizes instruction, promotes a positive affective climate and motivates learners. Any work that is done in groups will complement teacher-centred teaching for these reasons. Swain and Lapkin (1998, p. 333) followed French immersion students as they interacted and concluded that their dialogue became a tool for both communication and learning. By using the target language, the students developed their speech while completing the tasks they were working on. The study thus implies that it is beneficial for second language learners to work in groups where the target language is used for communication.

When language learners engage in interaction, there is a chance that negotiation for meaning occurs. Specifically, when there is a breakdown in communication, learners need to work with the language in order to re-establish interaction. According to Pica (1996), participation in negotiation with expert speakers gives the novice learner the target language input they need to modify their interlanguage. This is thought to pose a rewarding learning sequence where focus on lexical items and structure can be made. In this first study, the focus was on negotiation for meaning between native and non-native speakers. In a different study, Pica et al. (1996, pp. 79-80) found that negotiation between learners also can stimulate development, albeit on a lower level. They maintain that interaction between learners and native speakers is the most rewarding interactive set-up. However, the finding that interaction between learners is also beneficial is of great value to classrooms where native speakers are not readily available. Pica et al. (1996, pp. 79-80) reassure teachers that asking their pupils to work on communicative tasks will assist target language learning and that it in no way will be harmful. Thus, interaction in the classroom of English as a second language should benefit the progression of all pupils.

The ability of the pupils becomes relevant when the teacher sets up groups for interaction. The fact that interlanguage talk can be beneficial does not mean that any group constellation will substantiate this. Yule and Macdonald (1990, p. 553) examined pair interaction between less and more able pupils and found that positive interaction can occur between them. Their study put pupils in dominant and passive roles and it was concluded that beneficial interlanguage talk occurred when the dominant role was assigned to the less able pupil. This meant that the more able pupil had to engage in negotiation for meaning in order for the communication not to come to a halt. Interactive skills can be practiced in groups that consist of mixed ability, which is beneficial to all pupils. In a different study, Storch (2002, pp. 147-148) concluded that pair work functions best in collaborative and expert/novice groups. She argues that co-construction of knowledge can occur when neither part of the pair is dominant or passive. In essence, this means that ability is not the deciding factor in the outcome of group work. Mixed-ability and tracked groups can both substantiate interlanguage talk and positive negotiation, as long as no part takes too much space or does not take part sufficiently in the interaction. However, it is not clear if this applies to groups as well as pairs.
2.2. Curriculum and syllabus

The curriculum of Swedish compulsory school dictates that all pupils have the right to develop according to their own needs. It is clear on the fact that:

Teaching should be adapted to each pupil’s circumstances and needs. It should promote the pupils’ further learning and acquisition of knowledge based on pupils’ backgrounds, earlier experience, language and knowledge. (Skolverket, 2011, p. 10)

This paragraph is relevant for all pupils, including the more able ones. Therefore, the more able pupils who might have surpassed their classmates still have the right to further learning and acquisition of knowledge. At no point should any pupil be held back and hindered from progression. This is a challenge for teachers of mixed-ability groups. According to the curriculum, they should “take into account each individual’s needs, circumstances, experiences and thinking” and “reinforce the pupils’ desire to learn as well as the pupil’s confidence in their own ability” (Skolverket, 2011, p. 16).

Responsibilities of the teachers are thus regulated by the curriculum as well. Decisions on between-class ability grouping are made by the management of the school but teachers still need to ensure that they cater to each individual in their classes, regardless of group constellations. The conditions for meeting this goal are different in each classroom, but the curriculum is clear on the responsibilities of teachers. The critique mentioned in the introduction of this study thus criticizes teachers for not fulfilling their professional responsibilities.

Interaction is an integral part of the syllabus for English in compulsory school. Thus, it appears that interlanguage talk and negotiation for meaning are acknowledged to be beneficial to the development of pupils’ skills in English. Central content includes, under production and interaction, “Language strategies to understand and be understood when language skills are lacking, such as reformulations, questions and explanations” (Skolverket, 2011, p. 35). This passage appears to directly state that negotiation for meaning should be part of the lessons that are taught. “Reformulations, questions and explanations” are all parts of negotiation and breakdown in communication occur when “language skills are lacking”. Further, central content includes:

Language strategies to contribute to and actively participate in conversations by taking the initiative in interaction, giving confirmation, putting followup questions, taking the initiative to raise new issues and also concluding conversations. (Skolverket, 2011, p. 35)

The exemplified strategies could be interpreted as such that can be practised in mixed-ability groups. Yule’s and Macdonald’s research mentioned above implied that able learners profit from interacting with other learners when it comes to acquiring such strategies. The outcome of the present study could show if this is actually what happens in such groups.
3. Method

This study employed discourse analysis through recordings made of group conversations. Discourse is in this text defined as interactive speech in context. Norrby (2004, p. 29) maintains that discourse analysis stems from the assumption that any utterance which is separated from its context is no longer part of the discourse. This means that the analysis of utterances or speech acts always has to take heed of what surrounds it and what function it fulfils within the dialogue. In order to answer the research questions it was decided that actual observations of pupil interaction were needed. According to Johansson and Svedner (2010, p. 41), observations are probably the method that yields the best information on the pupils’ behaviour in the classroom. Other methods that could have been used, such as interviews with pupils and teachers, would not have provided any direct information on the actual work that is carried out during lessons. For any comparative analysis to take place it was also necessary to put together both tracked and mixed-ability groups. Thus, the pupils were separated from their usual group arrangements when the study was carried out.

The study used a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods of discourse analysis, although mostly following the qualitative tradition. Lazaraton (2002, p. 33) presents the different qualities of discourse analysis in dichotomies which align under qualitative and quantitative methods. The present study was controlled, experimental, descriptive, process-oriented, valid and yielded rich data. The first two properties belong in the quantitative tradition while the last four are qualitative. The controlled and experimental properties arose from the need to contrast tracked and mixed-ability groups. Potential criticism of this will be discussed below. McKay (2006, p. 139) argues that discourse analysis can devote attention to patterns that arise from the data collected but that the findings are limited to the context in which they are situated. Therefore, any patterns that took form have limited potential to be generalized, as they are bound to their specific context.

3.1. Informants

The study was conducted at a large secondary school in a big city in Sweden. One class of 26 pupils in year eight participated, of whom all had Swedish as their first language. The conductor of the study was familiar with the pupils and thus knew their individual ability and grades prior to the data collection. Based on previous performance and discussion with the pupils’ English teacher, 12 of them were labelled as more able and 14 as less able. More able in this case meant that a C or higher had been scored on previous oral-interaction assessment tasks. Less able meant any grade below a C.

When the study was carried out, one of the able pupils and five of the less able either chose or could not participate due to absence. Thus, 20 pupils ultimately participated in the study. The relatively high frequency of able pupils shows that the class generally performs on a high level. This coincides with the findings of Skolverket (2004, p. 86), which indicated that pupils in Swedish schools are relatively skilled in English when compared to other European countries, on account of the language’s special status in Sweden.
3.2. Material

The material that was used to initiate the group interaction was taken from examples of national tests in year nine combined with preparatory tasks designed for the International English Language Testing System (Skolverket & Göteborgs universitet, 2012; University of Cambridge, 2009). Pupils were asked to agree or disagree with a statement, argue for their opinion and reach a conclusion in their respective groups (Appendix 1). The national tests for the subject of English include oral interaction, where pupils are asked to discuss different topics in groups. The oral interaction test is designed to give pupils a chance to display their narrative and descriptive skills in English along with their ability to adjust to the situation and maintain a conversation. As such, they are intended to test the pupils on what they should have been taught according to the syllabus, as indicated in the background section of this study. Similarly, part three of the International English Language Testing System involves oral interaction. However, this system was not designed for younger learners, meaning that only the conversation topics that were deemed to be accessible to the informants were used.

3.3. Procedure

The data collection took place during English lessons in which the groups left the classroom when their respective discussions were held. Pupils were arranged into five groups of four that were separated from the rest of the class. Norrby (2004, p. 225) indicates that the difficulty of transcription and analysis increases with number of participants in conversations. In order to cope with this, the conductor of the study was present during the conversation and took general notes that were used to ease the process of transcription. This could have affected the interaction of the pupils, although not in any major way. The pupils were used to interacting in groups while the teacher observed and since pupils were familiar with the conductor of the study it was decided that this would not have any marked effect. When the group discussions had been recorded they were transcribed using relevant principles for transcription presented by Norrby (2004, pp. 98-99).

What could have affected the pupils was the fact that their conversations were recorded, making the situation specific and unusual. According to Norrby (2004, p. 228), the procedure of recording often influences the informants, although this can be countered by allowing the informants to warm up. When the recording has gone on for a while the awareness of the recording device decreases and attention shifts to the actual conversation. Therefore, the first few minutes of the discussions were approached cautiously, as the validity of the start of the recording could be lower than other parts.

3.4. Validity and reliability

The validity of this study was carefully considered in the choice of method. Johansson and Svedner (2010, p. 83) indicate that the validity of a report is its relation to the actual reality of what it reports on. First of all it should be noted that the able pupils who were arranged into tracked groups were not used to being so. Their English lessons were outside of the study exclusively taught in mixed-ability classes and no within-class ability grouping was practised. As such, the study becomes slightly controlled and experimental. However, these pupils were not told that they were being placed into tracked groups, which should negate most effects of this. Also, the focus of the study was not the attitude of able pupils, but rather their performance. Whether the able pupils were used to interacting with each other should not impact their performance markedly. Pupils are also accustomed to the school context, where groups are often assigned beyond their control, thus making the study less
experimental. Finally, the amount of data collected was limited, which could hinder the making of any valid generalizations. However, this is a qualitative discourse analysis with traits of a case study, which has other principles of validity. Yin (2003) maintains, as referenced by McKay (2006, p. 139), that case studies derive their validity from analysis of small amounts of data which can be added to a broader theory. This study only intended to make a small contribution to the field of ability grouping in second language classrooms. Therefore, its internal validity depends on the strength of the analysis. According to McKay (2006, p. 13), internal validity reflects how credible the findings are, while external validity refers to transferability.

Whether the same results would be found if the study was replicated depend on its transferability, which is connected to the reliability of the study. Transferability is achieved through intricate description of the context of the research. Reliability in qualitative research is described by McKay (2006, p. 14) as how trustworthy the results are. In the present study, this is achieved by explanation of all the steps made in carrying out the data collection and the subsequent analysis.

### 3.5. Ethical considerations

This study takes Vetenskapsrådet’s ethical principles into consideration. Their codex for research includes four main principles. First is the information requirement, which directs researchers to inform participants prior to the study (Vetenskapsrådet, 1990, p. 7). The requirement was met, although the pupils and parents were told that the focus of the study was simply oral interaction between pupils. It was decided that informing the pupils that their different levels of ability were taken into account could raise an affective block which would stand in the way of research. Second, researchers need to ask for permission in advance (Vetenskapsrådet, 1990, p. 9). Both the pupils and their parents were thus asked for permission prior to the study, since the informants were below the age of 15. This was done orally with the pupils and a consent-form was sent to the parents by email (Appendix 7). Third is the confidentiality requirement, which directs researchers to make informants impossible to identify (Vetenskapsrådet, 1990, p. 12). Neither the school, the class nor the pupils were disclosed in this study. Fourth and final is the requirement that the use of the data is limited to research (Vetenskapsrådet, 1990, p. 14). The recordings that were made in this study were deleted after transcription and publication had been made. The transcriptions were left intact and are free to use for further research.

### 3.6. Methods of analysis

Since this is a qualitative discourse analysis, patterns were allowed to emerge in place of having cemented, pre-set categories. The group conversations were transcribed and divided into utterances made by the individual participants. In the process of transcription it was decided that words would be the main unit of analysis. A word was defined as the smallest independent unit in text surrounded by spaces (Språkrådet & Kungliga tekniska högskolan, 2012). This included utterances such as “hmm”, “eh” and others, which are relevant to discourse analysis. When all of the groups’ discussions had been transcribed, attention was paid to any reoccurring themes in the tracked and mixed-ability groups respectively. The transcripts were then contrasted in search of any common occurrences. According to Norrby (2004, p. 232), a functional analysis of a conversation can shed light on strategies used to reach communicative goals and whether cooperation or competition dominates the interaction. These were areas of interest that were pre-defined in the study.
4. Results

4.1. Description of data

The aim of this study was to examine how varying conditions affect the more able pupils when they work in groups. Spoken group interaction was observed, recorded and transcribed. The group discussions were between twelve and a half and sixteen and a half minutes long, meaning that the transcriptions are much too long to be displayed in this section. The main presentation of the results will be the statistics of each groups’ interaction, shown in different tables. These results will be analysed according to the reoccurring patterns that emerged from contrasting the five different transcriptions. Groups 1 and 2 were tracked groups (T), consisting of only more able pupils. Groups 3, 4 and 5 were mixed ability groups (MA), consisting of one able pupil and three less so. The task, consisting of the six statements to which the pupils agree or disagree (Appendix 1), was explained prior to the start of the recordings. The groups were also told that they had around fifteen minutes to complete the discussion and that the recording would be stopped if they went on any longer. However, it was indicated to the pupils that it did not matter if all statements were dealt with, as their actual discussion was the object of interest. Finally, the pupils were told that their performance would be reported to their teacher, after which the groups were left alone.

Five patterns emerged when the groups’ discussions had been transcribed and compared. First, the number of words spoken per minute was fairly equal in all but one of the groups, which called for closer inspection. Second, the turn length was shorter in the tracked groups. Third, the space that the able pupils took varied significantly between the groups. The forth indicative pattern was found in the support cues, which were delivered by the able pupils to a large extent in all groups. The final theme was the extent of simultaneous speech, which was markedly higher in the tracked groups.

4.2. Results and data analysis

The first research question of this study was whether the level of performance of the more able pupils is impacted by the ability of their peers. In order for any linguistic performance to take place, the conversations that represent the learning environment first need to be established and go on for some

Table 1. Group discussion length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group discussion length</th>
<th>Total words spoken in all turns*</th>
<th>Words spoken per minute</th>
<th>Amount of code-switching (words)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 (T)</td>
<td>15:35 min</td>
<td>2337</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (T)</td>
<td>16:22 min</td>
<td>2794</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 (MA)</td>
<td>13:26 min</td>
<td>2405</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 (MA)</td>
<td>14:55 min</td>
<td>2217</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5 (MA)</td>
<td>12:30 min</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Including code switching and hesitations such as hm, ehm etc., not counting support cues and unsuccessful interruptions (see below).

**Whenever a word that is not in English is used to communicate.
time. The pupils were allowed to control the length of their discussions, meaning that the time they used is indicative of how long they were able to keep their conversations going. All groups managed to conduct a conversation where meaningful interaction in the target language took place, which the relative lack of code switching indicates. Groups 3 and 5, which were both mixed-ability groups, chose to finish early. The tracked groups with only more able pupils kept the conversation going past 15 minutes and their recordings were stopped before they were done. This indicates that able pupils might have a greater chance to engage in rewarding interlanguage talk and positive negotiation when interacting with other able pupils. However, Group 4 discussed for 14 minutes and 55 seconds, which discredits this assumption. What is clear from Table 1 is that Group 5’s interaction was considerably shorter and contained fewer words. For whatever reason, the able pupil in this group appears to have had a less rewarding learning environment compared to the able pupils in the other groups. Groups 1 and 4 spoke roughly the same number of words per minute, as did Groups 2 and 3. Group 5 spoke significantly fewer words per minute collectively, presumably because they spoke slower and had more pauses in the interaction than the other groups. According to Norrby (2004, p. 116), an abnormal number or length of pauses can disrupt the conversation. Tolerance of pauses varies between cultures, but since all of the informants were Swedish natives it can be assumed that they share the same tolerance. Therefore, it can be argued that Group 5’s interaction was more awkward and less naturalistic, since it deviates significantly from the other groups. Norrby (2004, pp. 101-102) references an exhaustive study on informal group conversations between friends that found that the average word count per minute was 220 and that adolescents generally speak even faster. The study was made on first language interaction in Swedish, so it is to be expected that second language interaction has a lower word count per minute. However, it can be said that a higher frequency of words is more reminiscent of an authentic, informal conversation. If this is accepted, Group 3 was most authentic, followed by Group 2. Group 1 and 4 were equally authentic and Group 5 was least authentic. Based on the data in Table 1, it appears that two of the mixed-ability groups created a learning environment that was as authentic and informal as the tracked groups, while one of the mixed-ability groups failed to do so.

Another way to measure the level of authenticity in the conversations is to look at conversational turns. Norrby (2004, pp. 109-110) defines the turn as the varying time between when a speaker starts and finishes an utterance, if it is accepted by the conversational partner(s). A turn can vary in length between a single word and much longer statements, but all turns contain indications of where they end, which skilled speakers recognize. Norrby (2004, p. 104) states that turns generally increase in length according to formality. Therefore, the pupils’ discussions were less formal if their turns were shorter. Based on the study mentioned above, Norrby (2004, p. 104) argues that the average turn length in informal group conversations is ten words. Table 2 shows that Group 1 had the shortest turn length, followed closely by Groups 2 and 3. Notably, the turns in Group 3 were the fastest and their

Table 2. Turns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of turns (total)</th>
<th>Average number of turns per minute</th>
<th>Average turn length (words)</th>
<th>Average turn length (time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 (T)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.2 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (T)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.3 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 (MA)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.9 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 (MA)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.9 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5 (MA)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.6 sec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interaction had the highest conversational pace. Groups 4 and 5 had the longest turns, both in number of words and length of the turns. The pattern that emerges here is that able pupils in tracked groups appear to make their discussions less formal. This also occurred in one of the mixed-ability groups, but not in the other two. Less formal does not necessarily equal better, as the school setting is formal by definition. The pupils were told that they were going to be assessed, which plays into this as well. However, more informal interaction indicates that meaningful communication, where the pupils had genuine communicative intent, occurred. The interactive and linguistic skills of the able pupils presumably allowed for less formal conversations when they interacted with each other. The difference between Groups 4 and 5 and the three others is significant, but the results of Group 3’s discussion stand in the way of determining that exclusively tracked groups established meaningful interaction. The data is indicative of a better learning environment in the tracked groups if informal conversation is sought. This can occur in mixed-ability groups as well, although it is less likely.

Table 3. Words spoken by able pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total number of words spoken*</th>
<th>Words spoken by able pupils</th>
<th>Percentage of the words spoken by able pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 (T)</td>
<td>2337</td>
<td>584**</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (T)</td>
<td>2794</td>
<td>699**</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 (MA)</td>
<td>2405</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 (MA)</td>
<td>2217</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5 (MA)</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Including code switching and hesitations such as hm, ehm etc., not counting support cues and unsuccessful interruptions (see below). **Averaged, not counted for each pupil in the tracked group.

Since the able pupils were the focus of this study, it is relevant to examine the roles that they assume in the different groups. Among the notable points that emerge from the data in Table 3 is the fact that the able pupil in Group 3 spoke 21.8% of the words in the group. It is stated above that Group 3 discredits some possible generalizations based on the average turn length and duration. It appears that this was not caused by the able pupil’s performance. One or more of the pupils that were deemed to be less able have produced a lot of words, which carried the group to authenticity in the analysis based on Table 1. Closer inspection of the transcription of the discussion reveals that Pupil 1 dominated the group and was the cause of this (Appendix 4). Therefore, the data on Group 3 displayed in Tables 1 and 2 should be approached cautiously, since the able pupil does not appear to have been the deciding factor in the results. However, this is a finding in itself, which should not be forgotten. Another notable point is that the able pupil in Group 5 spoke the most words of all able pupils in all groups, uttering 938 words, 64.6% of the words spoken in the group. This able pupil dramatically dominated Group 5, which indicates two things. The able pupil got to speak English extensively, which is positive. On the other hand, the conversation was less interactive, resulting in a learning situation where the able pupil had fewer opportunities for negotiation and practise of the skills indicated by the syllabus. The pupil might have tried to establish a meaningful discussion but did not succeed in doing so. It appears that the mixed-ability groups constituted varying situations for the able pupils, ranging from less space to speak in Group 3, slightly more opportunities to speak in Group 4 and markedly more space to speak in Group 5.

Table 4 yields more consistent results when isolated from the other data. It shows that able pupils in mixed-ability groups of four pupils take more than a fourth of the turns. This indicates a pattern where able pupils have a larger chance to speak English in mixed-ability groups, as the space offered or taken
by them is greater than in the tracked groups. However, a combination of Tables 3 and 4 provides disparate results. The able pupil in Group 3 took many but shorter turns, the able pupil in Group 4 took slightly more turns than other pupils and spoke slightly more words and the able pupil in Group 5 took about half of the turns in the group but spoke about two thirds of the words uttered. Therefore, no distinct patterns emerge from the combination of the data in the two tables.

Table 4. Turns taken by able pupils in MA groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of turns (total)</th>
<th>Turns taken by able pupils</th>
<th>Percentage of the turns taken by able pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 (MA)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 (MA)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5 (MA)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Turns taken by able pupils in T groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of turns (total)</th>
<th>Able pupil 1</th>
<th>Able pupil 2</th>
<th>Able pupil 3</th>
<th>Able pupil 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 (T)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (T)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that the turns were not evenly distributed between the able pupils in the tracked groups. Both groups were dominated by one pupil and both groups contained one pupil that took significantly fewer turns than the others. The latter should not be seen as passive however, as they still took a fair number of turns in both cases. The fact that the tracked groups were similar in this regard can mean that some able pupils might get to speak more in mixed-ability groups. However, the number of turns will presumably never be completely equally distributed, as personality factors can come into play. Such factors exist in both mixed-ability and tracked groups but lie outside of the scope of this study.

Whether able pupils support and lift the interaction in mixed-ability groups can be examined by looking at support cues. Additionally, this will show to what degree the able pupils support each other in the tracked groups. Norrbj (2004, p. 147) defines the support cue as a signal that aids the current speaker by telling him or her to proceed with the turn. Such cues are not counted as turns, but function as a way to indicate to the current holder of the turn to continue and are signs of active listening in interaction. In this study, vocabulary support cues have been grouped together with general minimal responses (such as yes, indeed and others) because they fill the same purpose in interlanguage talk. Table 6 shows the number of support cues in the five different groups and Table 7 the number of cues used by the able pupils in mixed ability groups.

Table 6. Support cues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of support cues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 (T)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (T)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 (MA)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 (MA)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5 (MA)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Support cues by pupil in MA groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Able pupil</th>
<th>Pupil 1</th>
<th>Pupil 2</th>
<th>Pupil 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 (MA)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 (MA)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5 (MA)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two notable patterns emerge. First, the able pupils were active listeners to each other in the tracked groups. Since they supported each other to a large extent, their conversations can be assumed to have been interactive. This was especially the case in Group 1. This indicates that able pupils have a greater chance to develop their English when grouped with other able pupils. Second, the able pupils support the less able pupils in the mixed-ability groups. They lead the number of cues given in all three groups. Group 3 deviates from this slightly, which might be the result of the domination of one of the less able pupils, as noted earlier. However, it can be said with some certainty that the able pupils do support and lift the interaction to higher levels in the mixed-ability groups of this study.

Finally, the number of times the pupils spoke simultaneously will indicate answers to the three research questions. According to Norrby (2004, pp. 105-106), a very large number of turns overlap each other, especially if the conversation is informal and if it has more than two participants. A conversion can be seen as lively and interactive if it contains a large number of overlapping or simultaneous speech. As is shown in Table 8, this was the case to a significant extent in the tracked groups. Group 3 closely followed the tracked groups, while this occurred notably fewer times in Groups 4 and 5. Pupils in Groups 1, 2 and 3 appear to be more eager to take the turn and speak. This agrees with patterns that emerged from the number of turns taken, which was that interaction between able pupils is less formal and possibly contain more meaningful interaction. This was also the case in one of the mixed-ability groups, again limiting the possibility of generalizations. The same pattern occurred in the counting of latching responses.

A possible negative outcome of grouping able pupils with each other stems from the occurrence that they fight to take the turn from each other, disrupting the interlanguage talk. This happened to a significant extent in Group 1, as shown in Table 8. Unsuccessful interruptions fill no communicative purpose and are only harmful. Some of the overlapping speech represent successful interruptions. This can be potentially disruptive, but is also a natural part of informal conversation. There was almost no fighting over the turns in Group 5, which indicates a weak interest in meaningful communication in

Table 8. Simultaneous speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of times simultaneous speech*</th>
<th>Number of times overlapping speech**</th>
<th>Number of unsuccessful interruptions***</th>
<th>Number of latching responses****</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 (T)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (T)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 (MA)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 (MA)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5 (MA)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*When two or more pupils initiated a turn simultaneously.  
**When the next turn started before the previous turn had finished.  
***Unsuccessful attempt made to take the turn for any reason.  
****When the utterance was made immediately after the last utterance of the previous turn, without pause.
the less able pupils, since the group was dominated by the able pupil, as noted above. Able pupils in mixed-ability groups speak more and are less likely to be interrupted. While it could be said that this benefits the able pupil, the lack of interaction is unfortunate.

4.3. Summary of analysis

The analysis provides answers to the three research questions based on the patterns that were observed in the data. Many of these patterns depend on the assumption that less formal interaction constitutes a more favourable learning situation. It is argued that informal interaction indicates meaningful communication. If this is accepted, the frequency of words spoken, turn length and overlapping speech indicate that able pupils are given a greater chance to develop their oral interaction skills in tracked groups. This answers the third research question; whether able pupils are given a greater chance of developing their English when working with other able pupils. The second research question was if able pupils support and lift the interaction to higher levels in mixed-ability groups. The number of support cues clearly indicates that this indeed occurs. In answer to the first research question, whether the able pupils’ performance is affected by the level of their classmates when they work in groups, it can definitely be said that other group members are relevant to the conditions for the able pupils. However, there are no indications that the able pupils’ performance is affected by group constellations, since none of the patterns found in the data suggest that the able pupils do not perform according to their pre-assumed level. This study finds no evidence that the performance of able pupils is negatively impacted by less able peers.
5. Discussion

The present study was motivated by the School Inspectorate’s critique that the more able pupils were not challenged sufficiently in the teaching of English in Swedish secondary schools. This led to the posing of research questions that would determine if ability grouping, which is becoming increasingly common, had any effects on the able pupils and what the potential implementation of such a program would mean. By observing the able pupils, it would also be possible decide how their performance impacts on other pupils. The analysis led to the conclusions that able pupils’ performance is not affected by the ability of their peers, that they support and lift the interaction in mixed-ability groups and that tracked groups might be a better learning environment for able pupils. This has diverse implications for the usage of ability grouping in second language classrooms.

The finding that the performance of able pupils is not impacted by the ability of their peers coincides with previous research. Scholars argue that ability grouping has little or no effect on the achievement of able pupils (Slavin, 1990; van Elk & van der Steeg & Webbink, 2011). It appears that pupils who are skilled speakers of English manage to maintain their level of performance regardless of what pupils they interact with. The interactive skills that the syllabus of English in Swedish compulsory school (Skolverket, 2011) emphasize were used by the able pupils in all of the groups of this study.

The conclusion that able pupils support and lift the interaction in mixed-ability groups has implications for the less able pupils, who would potentially suffer if this support was not available to them. The School Inspectorate’s fears that ability grouping can have negative effects on less able pupils is thus substantiated (Skolinspektionen, 2010). The more able pupils appear to play a key role in the establishment of interlanguage talk and negotiation for meaning, which have been found to be rewarding in second language classrooms (Long & Porter, 1985; Pica & Lincoln-Porter & Paninos & Linnel, 1996; Storch, 2002; Swain & Lapkin, 1998; Yule & Macdonald, 1990). There are thus clear implications that less able pupils would suffer in the implementation of large-scale tracking.

This study contests the position that able pupils have equal potential to learn in mixed-ability and tracked groups. The analysis led to an affirmative answer to the third research question; whether able pupils have a greater chance to develop their English when working with other able pupils. The stance that many teachers have been shown to take is thereby given some credit (Glickman, 1991; Jackson, 1964; Olsson & Jonasson, 2009; Skolverket, 2010). The needs of the able pupils reported by Wahlström (1995) and Jackson (1982) appear to be more easily met in tracked groups. Oral interaction is a singular but important part of the syllabus, as Swedish learners of English presumably do not have many opportunities to use the language outside of school. This finding clearly goes against the meta-analysis of Slavin (1990), which combined studies on different school subjects. It is possible that a study centred on tracking in the teaching of second and foreign languages would turn out positive results, but the small scope of the present study makes it an insufficient base of such conclusions.

Some factors that are potentially relevant to group interaction are not examined in the analysis. For instance, the personality, motivation and anxiety of the pupils can impact their performance, meaning that ability is not the only determinant of the outcome of the recorded discussions. The turns were far from evenly distributed in the tracked groups and the leadership role in the mixed-ability groups was not always taken by the able pupil, indicating that other areas than ability could be analysed. This
means that the analysis of the transcripts could be taken further. However, the present study has insufficient space to facilitate this. A combination of ability and other factors presents an interesting topic for further discourse analyses of second language interaction.

Significant parts of this study deal with research areas which are relatively unexplored. Interlanguage talk and negotiation for meaning are important areas of interest in the field of second language acquisition but remain contested, especially when it comes to interaction between learners. More studies are needed to ascertain that these play key roles in the acquisition of second and foreign languages. Meaningful interaction which involves these two concepts is in the analysis assumed to have greater chance of occurring in informal conversation, which has also not been confirmed. Finally, some would argue against the classification of pupils as more or less able (Armstrong, 2009). The present study used grades and previous performance as a determiner of ability, which might have meant that some pupils with untapped potential were ignored.

The discourse analysis performed in this study provided answers to the research questions. The mix of quantitative and qualitative traditions allowed for a data collection that provided rich information on the examined learning situation. It should be noted that the study was conducted on 20 secondary-school pupils on a singular occasion and as such it cannot be viewed as having broad implications for the teaching of second languages. Discourse analysis is by definition a mode of research that provides a wealth of data on the interaction of the studied informants, but it is unfit to be performed on a large scale on account of its time-consuming procedure of data collection. Therefore, it is not suited to satisfactory reveal whether ability grouping should be implemented in second language classrooms. There is however some potential for this study to be used in combination with quantitative research with statistical validity to show what happens when groups are put together based on the ability of pupils.

Despite the suggested limitations of this study, the outcome is interesting in the light of the Swedish School Inspectorate’s critique of the teaching of English. The curriculum clearly states that all pupils have the right to further learning, regardless of their current level. Able pupils consistently perform according to their pre-assumed level and support other pupils, but might have an increased chance of developing their oral interaction skills when grouped with other able pupils. Many schools already implement ability grouping in the teaching of English (Skolverket, 2010), but there is a definite need for further research on the effects of this, both in the Swedish context and in the subject of English as a second language. Differentiated teaching is a controversial issue where ideology plays a major part. This study has made a small contribution to a field that calls for more attention.
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Appendix 1

Agree / Disagree?

Discuss the following opinions. Do you agree or disagree with them? Explain your own opinion so that your classmates understand. Try to decide in your group if you agree or disagree with the statements. You have 15 minutes to discuss but it does not matter if you don't have time to decide on all of the statements.

1. Having a cat or a dog should be forbidden if you live in a city.

2. Everybody should be a vegetarian.

3. Buying expensive clothes is a waste of money.

4. Money makes people happy.

5. Living without a car is much better for everyone.

6. Having your own room at home is not necessary
Appendix 2

Group 1 – Transcription
Tracked group, more able pupils only.

[ - Overlapping speech
[] - Simultaneous speech
= - Latching response
OMITTED - Omitted to protect the identity of the informants
INAUDIBLE - Inaudible utterance
(.) - Micro pause, less than 0.5 seconds
(0.5) - Pause, in seconds
LAUGH - Everybody laughs
LAUGHING - The speaker laughs
NOISE - Unrelated noise
? - Rising tone

Red - Support cues and minimal responses, not counted as turns.
Green - Interruption, unsuccessful attempt to take the turn.
Blue - Code switching.

Participants: AP1, AP2, AP3, AP4

Recording length: 15 minutes, 35 seconds

1. AP2: ok[ay
2. AP3: [okay
3. AP2: first question.
4. AP4: having a pet ah a dog or a cat in the city (0.5)
5. AP1: should be forbidden if you live in a city
6. AP3: hm
7. AP2: I don’t think so it depends on how you treat it hm
8. AP3: yea
9. AP2: if you have a dog in a city you need to go out with it just like you do in (.)) the country
10. AP3: INAUDIBLE
11. AP4: you [can
12. AP1: [I think there’s no problem with a dog because a dog (.)
13. AP4: what’s wrong with c[ats?
14. AP1: [you can let a dog walk by itself
15. AP4: so can a [cat
16. AP1: [everywhere but a cat I have three cats and I think they would be very
17. AP2: do [you
18. AP1: [depressed if they would just be in my house
19. AP2: they need more freedom
20. AP3: yea you need you can’t really let them out because they they can (.)) get run down by a car or something so [you can’t really let them out
AP1: [yea maybe if it’s a crowded city or [something
AP2: [but cats don’t feel good if you have a
leash on them
23. AP1: no
24. AP3: mm
25. AP1: they really need their own freedom (.) they’re like [very
independent
26. AP2: [independent
27. AP1: independent persons because they are like [persons
28. AP2: [like dogs INAUDIBLE dogs are really independent
29. AP3: mm
30. AP1: dogs [are like
31. AP2: just as much (1) they need [there owner to go out
32. AP1: [they need their like leader or (.) they need someone to
33. AP2: yea
34. AP1: cats are more
35. AP4: but also depends on h’many you have
36. AP2: yea
37. AP3: yea so we don’t agree that in a city you shouldn’t be having a (.) a cat really
38. AP1: you can have a cat
39. AP4: [i it wouldn’t fit that good
40. AP1: [there are like [inside cats
41. AP3: [no.
42. AP2: [they need to but if you have a cat in the city then you need to hm
43. AP1: satisfy the cat with [something
44. AP2: [you need to fix things so the cat can live there like hm if you live in in
an apartment (.) if you live on (.) on the first floor and your balcony is like eh really close to the
ground then you can have a little
45. AP1: =stair [like
46. AP2: [ladder (.) yea so the cat can walk down (.) then you can have a cat in the city
47. AP3: no but the problem is you [can’t
48. AP1: [I think
49. AP3: really let let it out because it (.) it’s a lot of cars [INAUDIBLE
50. AP1: [I think so too
51. AP3: so you cant really
52. AP4: I think a cat can be a little smaller than that
53. AP1: cats are really really small (.) but [hm cars are really really fast
54. AP3: [yes but I still give it
55. AP2: they really are [but like here here
56. AP4: [yea but if they see a bus and they’re running around why would they go
there.
57. AP1: like here in OMITTED there’s absolutely no problem because this isn’t like a big city
(.) it’s just [has cars but it’s not like hm
58. AP3: [yea
59. AP2: if you have an apartment like in OMITTED and you live on the first floor then I
think you can have a cat but definitely not in like the middle of New York or
something
60. AP1: =no I think that’s a bit hard
61. AP3: yea but I don’t I wouldn’t count OMITTED as a (.) big city so
62. LAUGH
63. AP4: but it
64. AP3: I guess
65. AP2: cats not in the city and dogs you can have
66. AP3: yea you can have [that
67. AP4: [you can have a cat but not recommended
it also depends on who you are and who your cats are (.) if your cat (.) is like satisfied in with (.) just being at home and (.) things like yea

this is good enough for me

yea then [is]

I think it’s okay I know I know some people that have cats just inside and they can’t go out but I think that’s a bit mean (.) because cats really want to go out if they can’t they just like sitting in the window watching (0.6) yea

this is good enough for me

yea then

I think it's okay I know I know some people that have cats just inside and they can’t go out but I think that’s a bit mean (.) because cats really want to go out if they can’t they just like sitting in the window watching (0.6) yea

yea then

okay should we see the next question?

everybody should be a vegetarian vegetarian (2)

and

no

I think when you grow up everyone can be but when you’re growing when you are a child you need to eat meat to get protein and grow

yea but eh you need everyone needs something to (.) to exchange the meat’s protein and a INAUDIBLE fat you get from the meat and why not anybody think besides think how expensive vegetables would be

well perhaps people who raises animals for (.) killing just so you can get meat what happen to them

[and

meat meat production yea (.) you should you really should

[and

[meat

[try to

[cut it down a bit (.) but I don’t think it’s like

don’t stop it

[no cause [it

you need to cut it down a bit but ye[ah

[not it all

not all of it

I don’t think you should stop (.) all the

meat

cut it down a bit(.) but I don’t think it’s like

don’t stop it

[no cause [it

you need to cut it down a bit but ye[ah

[not it all

not all of it

I think you should be able to choose if you if you don’t like [bits INAUDIBLE

I think I think everyone should give it a chance like one or two times a week you can eat eh (.) vegetarian food [and the rest of the days you can

[mm

I think so too (.) we should like

but eh what kind of vegetarian did it say?

[vege

[just vegetarian

then you can be [a

[so only

=vegan I [think

[not a ve[gan

[vegans are so (1)

that’s just

=that’s just too much

its a little bit too [much

[you know cows

[mm

when they have like (.) milk in their (.) LAUGHING in their
AP4: =we get it
AP3: yea
AP1: eh if if if they don’t get
AP4: milked
AP1: milked LAUGHING they get like (0.6) they have really
AP2: INAUDIBLE
AP1: =no they have a big big they get like they eh [it’s just
AP4: their belly expands
AP1: they they hurt them very much they need to get milked and like (3)
AP2: INAUDIBLE
AP1: =no they have a big big they get like they eh [it’s just
AP4: their belly expands
AP1: they they hurt them very much they need to get milked and like (3)
NOISE
AP2: okay hm (2) but I love meat but I I think that I shouldn’t think of eating more
vegetarian food (. ) we all should like one or two time a week it would really help the
environment too
AP3: =yea
AP2: okay should we move on?
AP3: yea (. ) okay buying expensive clothes is a waste of money
AP4: =yes
AP2: if they’re too expensive but then what
AP4: that depends on how mu how much how much INAUDIBLE
AP2: I think it’s totally a waste of money to buy a pearls for eh five thou five thousand
dollars but if you buy a expensive shirt because it will it wont take
AP1: =if you are going to use it [a lot
AP2: [use it a lot and [it’s
AP1: [special and it’s
AP2: has a good material so it doesn’t
AP1: good quality or something
AP2: =yes but then I think you can (. ) pay [a little bit extra
AP3: [yea
AP1: [and sometimes like need to give me yourself something
AP2: you you need to (. ) give me
AP1: maybe you should maybe you should think of (2)
AP4: but [why
AP1: that they they maybe are cheaper
AP2: options
AP1: op[tions
AP4: [but just as good
AP1: yea alternatives but sometimes (. ) you have to buy yourself something
AP2: yes
AP4: I do I give myself pleasure of not buying things
AP2: why do you have to save the money?
AP4: =yes
AP1: what are you saving for then?
AP4: I have no idea
AP2: meh LAUGHING
AP4: OMITTED is a perfect example
AP1: what (. ) what’s he saving for?
AP4: =he has nothing to save [for
AP2: [he always saves for something (. ) now he has nothing but eh every
time he saves his money he he always has a game he wants to buy or
AP4: =yea that’s the same thing [I just save up cause know later always comes something
expensive I want
AP1: [I (. ) I save money the whole year I save money the whole year
to like
AP3: [[wait
AP2: [[buy my
AP1: [buy my family Christmas presents and then I don’t have any money anymore]

AP1: [and every year I think like (.) this year I will eh I will buy (.) cheaper stuff]

AP2: [doesn’t work out]

AP1: It doesn’t work out really

AP3: [[mm]

AP4: [[how? it’s crazy

AP1: but I

AP4: [[I will spend any money

AP2: [[no you start by making home-made soap

AP4: [so]ap?

AP3: [what?]

AP2: =soap

AP4: you make you make home made

AP1: you know soap?

AP3: [[yea we know soap

AP4: [[yea we know soap

AP1: ye

AP2: for my aunt (.) she will love [INAUDIBLE]

AP1: [it’s really funny to make haven’t you done that?]

AP3: [[noo]

AP4: [[noo I make sweets

AP1: what kind of sweets?

AP2: =I will bake [chocolate chocolates

AP4: [ehm (.) pretty much anything chocolates

AP3: wait how do you make soap I never done it before

AP2: ehm you buy it at like (.) eh Panduro and then you

AP3: =Panduro [LAUGHING

AP2: [for example for example Panduro there you can buy a lot of ehm stuffs

then you can make your own things and then you have this (.) eh soap

AP1: it’s like a box with everything in it

AP3: [[yea okay

AP2: [[with the soap it’s like a (1) you know when you bake a cake you get

AP4: yea?

AP2: what’s the word for that

AP1: =eh (.) you mean like

AP3: the word for what

AP2: yes ehm

AP3: what (.) the word for what?

AP4: this has nothing to do with soap but (.) we haven’t we we got far off topic

AP2: ehm yea

AP4: occasion

AP2: special [occasion

AP1: [special

AP4: a wedding

AP1: special events or something if you getting married

AP4: then you seriously [need to spend some money

AP1: [of course but of course your dress won’t be like (.)

AP2: and you can buy (.) you can put a little extra money in clothes if you’re going to use

them but you don’t [need to waste all of you

AP1: [I think I also think if if it’s like for special

AP4: occasion

AP2: special [occasion

AP1: [special

AP4: a wedding

AP1: special events or something if you getting married

AP4: then you seriously [need to spend some money
215. AP2: three dollars
216. AP1: no
217. AP4: but anyone would buy [some expensive then
218. AP3: [but normally I I wouldn’t (.) [really spend much of my money
219. AP4: [but normally no but also depends how much
you buy (4)
220. AP2: but okay (.) should we move on?
221. AP1: [[okay
222. AP3: [[sure
223. AP2: money makes people happy
224. AP1: I think money makes people happy for a while
225. AP2: yes
226. AP3: while?
227. AP1: for a while like
228. AP2: for the moment
229. AP1: =yea for the moment they know that they have money they can buy stuff but I don’t
think (.) I don’t think money will keep them happy for life
230. AP2: I think that if you’re like a football player who has tons of tons of money and then
you get (.) more money I don’t think that makes any ch change but if you like living
in a country where where you barely can drink and eat and if you would get lot of
money then I think it would make you happy because it would save your life (.). [not
because you would be able to buy a TV or something
231. AP4: [but money would money is I
think money doesn’t exactly make up I think it’s a cause of
money gives you the opportunity to get to buy your friends eh things (.). do all the fun
things with your family or so your friends
232. AP2: that’s what makes you happy [not the money itself
233. AP1: [that’s good no [yea
234. AP4: [the money is the cause of (.). it will make you the it
gives you opportunity to do something fun ehm it it gives you happiness
235. AP2: [[INAUDIBLE
236. AP1: [[and its like if we turn to the last question was like buying expensive clothes I don’t
think (.) that can also make you happy for a moment
237. AP3: =yea that will make you [happy
238. AP1: [but I (.) using money for a (1.5) trip with your family to some
239. AP4: =that will last [a lot longer
240. AP1: [that that will be like a memory for life [and then
241. AP4: [not a memory for life I don’t think a memory for
life it depends what happens
242. AP2: [[if you’re just swimming
243. AP1: [[yea but if you’re having a good time with your family even if you don’t think about
it every day when you’re like (.). sad you can go (.). back to it and think of [of all
244. AP2: [yea when you where at the beach and
you we’re laughing
245. AP1: it’s like it’s like now its like now I think of like the summer vacation when I (.). was
with my friends and like ehm
246. AP2: LAUGHING then it makes you happy the memories too
247. AP1: yea
248. AP2: so then you can all (.) if you’re (.). [depends on
249. AP1: [but I don’t I also think like OMITTED said like if you
have too much money then you can get kind of sick of the money
250. AP3: [[yea
251. AP2: [[it feels like you have to do something with it just [because you have
252. AP3: [like the more money you have the less happy
you get (.). you get after getting more money
253. AP1: [[yea
254. AP2: [[yea
255. AP3: if you have if you are really poor then of course you get very happy (.) with eh because money means like food or [education
256. AP2: [If you don’t have any money and you get money (.) then you can get happy for the moment if there’s something you have saved for (.) cause if you have nothing that you buy and just get more and more then I think it just (2) it’s must be (.) irritating
257. NOISE
258. AP1: I think like big football stars should (. ) give more money to like to to ehm [charity or
259. AP2: [organizations
260. AP4: Greenpeace and stuff
261. AP1: or UNICEF
262. AP2: yea
263. AP1: that would make them happy I think that that would satisfy them
264. AP4: but I don’t think with most of them I think they just want a good reputation
265. AP2: yea some of them
266. AP4: I think that most of them
267. AP3: [[yea but INAUDIBLE
268. AP1: [[if if they are really good people I think that that would make them more happy than just having money in their pocket.
269. NOISE
270. AP3: giving money to charity or something it makes you more happy (.) when you know you’re about to
271. AP4: make up INAUDIBLE
272. AP3: die or something or something if you then you can feel like your life was (.) meaningful for other people so (.) that can also
273. AP2: ehm should we (. ) living without a car is much better for everyone
274. AP4: no
275. AP1: I must say I think so
276. AP4: no
277. AP3: yes
278. AP4: no
279. AP2: I don’t get of course the environment will be better and you’ll get more (2) you get to move more by yourself
280. AP1: would you get [like help?
281. AP3: [why don’t you think that if you if you just made a city without roads and you only build like subways (1.5) [and housing it would be so much better for everyone
282. AP2: Aha something
283. AP1: [I think I think you should use the subways more more
284. AP3: [[but
285. AP2: [[yea
286. AP1: [[but they are like so good (. )and we we’re not using them when we like (.) when (. ) we’re going to go to some place then just (.) is like ten minutes away (.) sometimes we take the car and (.) that’s [really
287. AP2: [that’s not
288. AP4: [that’s the short range distances what about long range
289. AP2: [distances
290. AP1: [but my dad in his work he needs a car or he can’t keep his work so then (. ) he really needs it
291. AP2: =yea yea if your travelling from Sweden to Italy for (. ) summer vacation then maybe you need a car instead of the subway
292. AP1: and maybe if your like in a (.) what do you you call it a
293. AP2: road trip?
294. AP1: road like a rolling chair
295. AP3: I think I we understand what you mean
296. AP1: like I don’t know what you call it (. ) a rolling chair
297. AP4: no I don’t [know
298. AP3: [wheelchair
299. AP2: wheelchair
300. AP1: wheelchair oh (. ) sorry (. ) and then (. ) I think you can use
301. INAUDIBLE
Appendix 3

Group 2 – Transcription
Tracked group, more able pupils only.

AP - Able Pupil (with a C or higher)
P - Pupil

[ - Overlapping speech
[[ - Simultaneous speech
= - Latching response
OMITTED - Omitted to protect the identity of the informants
INAUDIBLE - Inaudible utterance
(,) - Micro pause, less than 0.5 seconds
(0.5) - Pause, in seconds
LAUGH - Everybody laughs
LAUGHING - The speaker laughs
NOISE - Unrelated noise
? - Rising tone

Red - Support cues and minimal responses, not counted as turns.
Green - Interruption, unsuccessful attempt to take the turn.
Blue - Code switching.

Participants: AP1, AP2, AP3, AP4

Recording length: 16 minutes, 22 seconds

1. AP3: oh okay first question (.) ehm I kinda both agree and disagree
2. AP1: I think (.) ehm you go first
3. AP3: LAUGHING because (.) it would be (.) okay to have a dog or a cat in the city if you
   (.) and this is not a city this is this is a sub
4. AP1: =suburb
5. AP3: suburb to a city but ehm (.) in the city yea sure it’s a lot of cars and people and stuff
   and people can be allergic to to them such but I think (.) you you can have a cat in the city
   cause they’ll just stay inside all the time (.) but a dog ehm [I don’t really know
6. AP1: [but I think ehm I think I disagree I think you
   should have a cat (.) I I think you should be able to have a cat or a dog in a city or a
   suburb or anywhere you live an (.) ehm but I think the most common thing that people are
   (.) disturbed by is like when you don’t pick up after them
7. AP3: =yea [the
8. AP1: [when like when there when there in the way or like (.) yea ehm you should show
   respect to people who have allergies but (.) I think it’s up to them to like [look after
   them
9. AP3: [yea take their medicines and such
10. AP2: [but it’s outside (.) yea cause I think you don’t like (.) let other people in in your house it’s eh or
    apartment it’s your and then
you go out for a walk [it’s not like

12. AP3: yea yea [sure
13. AP4: [so I don’t think they would go and bah hi doggy how are you doing and [stuff] like that
14. AP3: [I do that all the time but [I don’t LAUGHING
15. AP4: [but you’re not allergic
16. AP1: okay ehm so we all disagree
17. AP4: yea (.) I disagree with that
18. AP3: [yea me to
19. AP1: [I think (.) yea great (.) ehm question number two (.) everybody should be vegetarians
20. AP3: [no I disagree
21. AP4: [no (.) I disagree LAUGHING so much
22. AP1: I I would myself been a vegetarian and I don’t think (.) it’s a lifestyle for (.) anyone like I didn’t fit me (.) so I got back to meat eating meat and (.) I don’t I think you (.) I think you like feel better and I (.) the brain needs like proteins and stuff to work ehm and it’s really hard to get those things you need from meat not eating it
23. AP4: =yea then it’s just fake products
24. AP3: [yea yea
25. AP2: [but I think that everyone has a choice (.) and or like to opportunities I can be an vegetarian
26. AP1: mm vegetarian
27. AP2: and I I can choose not to be
28. AP3: yea everybody
29. AP1: [yea it’s the individual
30. AP2: [and that’s you choice and but I still I don’t think like (.) five year olds should be (.) like vege vegetarisan
31. AP1: [vegetarian
32. AP4: not cause they are [like growing
33. AP2: [because like (.) I think like (.) atleast (1)
34. AP1: [ah eh an age
35. AP2: [fifteen because so that you don’t [effects
36. AP3: [yea don’t get affected so much cause for example my ehm (.) godmother
37. AP1: godmother [yea LAUGHING
38. AP3: [yea ehm she (.) has two kids and they’ve been vege vegetarian since they were like one year old so
39. AP1: yea that is [I think that but
40. AP2: [is she a vegetarian?
41. AP1: yea eh is she a vegetarian as well
42. AP3: yea
43. AP1: yea cause I know that ehm (.) if you if those kids then decide to (.) like by their own choice to go back to eat meat (.) I know that they have very hard time like (.) melting the food and [processing the proteins
44. AP3: [yea I know
45. AP2: but I don’t think like (1) I don’t think it’s right (. the right thing to do [to make like to make like
46. AP1: [because they didn’t have a choice to just have to eat like vegetarian food
47. AP2: but I still think that they they like can (.) say no I don’t like this I don’t wanna eat this I wanna eat (.) a hotdog
48. LAUGH
49. AP4: or [bacon
50. AP2: [yea yea and [then
51. AP1: [bacon is actually the think I miss the most about being a vegetarians
52. LAUGH
53. AP2: then you should be able to have a hot dog or bacon or whatever it is not like oh my
mom is a vegetarian so I have to be
54. AP1: =yea cause they didn’t have a choice
55. AP2: I don’t but I can understand that(.) she like
56. AP3: every one should choose their own
57. AP4: [[yea
58. AP1: [[yea I think yea conclusion really I think it’s(.) we think it’s up to the individual itself
59. AP3: [[yea
60. AP4: [[yea [exactly
61. AP1: [and eh yea
62. AP3: isn’t necessary
63. AP1: no yea not not [like
64. AP3: [maybe if you don’t like to kill an kill animals
65. AP1: yea then it’s great but you really should it’s individual choice
66. AP2: but it’s still good if some people are
67. AP1: okay read question [number three
68. AP3: [okay so we disagree we disagree on that too
69. AP1: ehm yea ehm can you read question number three
70. AP2: buying expensive clothes is a waste of money(.) yes
71. AP4: ehm(.) I both disagree and agree with that because eh some expensive clothes are just
eh
72. AP1: =as good as [the
73. AP4: [yea eh exact and some are better they are like super stuff and they are
[like are
74. AP1: yea everything if they breath and they are softshell and they(.) [water rejective and everything
75. AP4: [yea so I think it can be on both sides in that case so
76. AP1: yea so like(.) buying expensive clothes is okay of they like(.) worth it
77. AP3: yes
78. AP4: yes [like if they are very soft or something
79. AP2: I think that they I I still think like again that you have a choice of your own(.)
you can choose to buy this jacket h and m(.) or you can choose to buy the jacket from(.)
80. AP1: Peak Performance or [Hollister
81. AP2: [for example Hollisters and they look the same you have a
choice I buy this one [or I buy this one
82. AP3: [yea cause I never
83. AP1: [it’s very it’s very mainstream as a like(.) you don’t like today most
people people(.) a lot a lot of teenagers have Ugs or Hunters or
84. AP3: yea
85. AP1: clothes from Hollister and everything like that cause so it’s very mainstream but I
agree as well(.) I don’t think it’s a waste of money(.) [like not if you really want it
86. AP3: [no me neither but(.) but I never buy expensive
clothes the like the most expensive of everyone was a t shirt that cost me like three hundred
and fifty crowns or something
87. AP1: =yea but that’s that’s expensive
88. AP2: but but I think like ehm for me(.) my opinion is that I don’t care if a buy a(.) shirt
from H and M or Hollister and they look the same besides that Hollister
89. AP3: =has a little [bird on it
90. AP2: [bird on it and(.) h and m doesn’t I don’t care if the H and M is more
comfortable (. ) then I buy it

91. AP1: yea
92. AP2: and if the Hollister is more is more comfortable [then I buy that one
93. AP4: [it's like when you buy ehm fake stuff they look the same and feel the same but they're fake
94. AP3: do they really feel the same?
95. AP4: =no but (.) almost
96. AP1: =it's it's very close
97. AP3: yea
98. AP2: but I think also no
99. LAUGH
100. AP1: yea so we (. ) we think it's both but mostly not if you like want
101. AP4: []yea
102. AP3: [yea both [disagree and agree
103. AP1: [so we disagree slash agree
104. AP4: [yea
105. AP3: [yea so it's both
106. AP1: [ehm question number four
107. AP3: money makes people happy (.) [for some people maybe
108. AP4: [yea not (. ) in every case [cause
109. AP1: [like if you only had money and nothing else that would make you happy
110. AP3: no
111. AP1: money I think people (. ) I think it's a great you can buy stuff that makes you happy I can buy a blouse if that makes me happy
112. AP3: =yea I know but ehm money can buy anything so
113. AP4: =ch no not anything but
114. AP1: money can't buy love (.) from a
115. AP4: exactly but ehm can do a lot of things it can makes make you happy or it can make unhappy when you are trying to keep the money
116. AP1: =yea I think we so we live in a world (. ) it's everything is quite material like we spoke about the clothes
117. AP3: yea
118. AP1: ehm so (. ) but and we ehm so dependant on like numbers and (. ) where we are in our bank accounts [and stuff like that
119. AP3: [yea we are really obsessed with money so
120. LAUGH
121. AP1: yea yea but it's true we it's a big part of our lives and (. ) so I yea I think (. ) I think it it is a it is a it really means a lot to us in both bad and good ways
122. AP3: I guess in our age we really don't care about money that much
123. AP1: =no I think we started to care more than [we do when we're kids
124. AP3: [yea yea yea when you grow older (. ) you start to care more and more and more
125. AP1: yea and [you have to get
126. AP3: [and finally you have to have you have to have money
127. AP1: yea
128. AP2: I think that it's bad that money is like this big status like
129. AP1: and I [think it's true so
130. AP2: [I I think I think that it has
131. AP1: it's alone on this huge pedestal [and it doesn't really means
132. AP2: [yea and it has grown to a lot bigger thing than it is and I mean you need money you need some kind of (. ) structure
133. AP1: structure
134. AP2: yea like yea cause you can't have everything for free because it would crash
135. AP4: no no no you must have [money so you can live
136. AP2: [yea you have or not money or you can buy like (1) trees or like something to pay with because
137. AP3: [wouldn’t it be better if yea wouldn’t it be better if everything was being (.) traded in stead of
138. AP1: =yea I think so to that would be like you did in the old times in Egypt and stuff like that
139. AP3: =yea I know it may get a little chaotic but it’s
140. AP1: but I can like I’ma trade you this phone for (.) ehm half of the money buy (.) a new phone and something like that
141. AP4: it would be very hard when you (.) are you going to Elgiganten and you’re going to buy a new TV and you give them like a pig but ehm I give you this pig for the TV
142. AP1: yea cause I know but so in some way it like becomes money instead cause then you have to grade everything like how much is this one worth [and something like that
143. AP3: [yea yea but if you trade everything you everyone can buy anything really
144. AP1: =yea [actually but then you like
145. AP3: [if you like but if then you get you own things to give people LAUGHING
146. AP1: then you’d like be like be like ehm like oh I trade you (.) I’m trading myself a Ferrari for my house (.) well sucks for you but LAUGHING I don’t know it’s yea you should be able to trade anything without any [financial consequences
147. AP3: [yea but maybe maybe you can have money and it and it would be legal to trade things with people
148. AP1: yea I think it’s a great idea I think
149. AP4: =yea I think you could trade in like food and stuff
150. AP3: ehm food [food for food
151. AP4: [but not (.) a television against a pig cause [then just doesn’t work
152. AP3: [yea before it was before it was like the prey for ehm I don’t know (.) hardware
153. AP4: yea
154. AP1: yea and so we think [if it
155. AP2: [but before it was much easier because they didn’t have a TV
156. AP1: [[they didn’t care as much
157. AP4: [[but everything handled about money
158. AP2: yea but I [but I
159. AP1: [they didn’t care [was just like it was just like
160. AP4: [nej money what I don’t think I mean food
161. LAUGH
162. AP3: INAUDIBLE needed
163. AP1: it wasn’t needed no it wasn’t necessary to have the biggest car or the biggest it was just
164. AP4: it was the biggest pig
165. AP1: so on this one we think money can make people happy but we could be better without
166. AP3: yea yea so [is both yea
167. AP1: [as well it’s both that that as well ehm question number (.) [five
168. AP4: [five (1) living without a car is much better for everyone no LAUGHING
169. AP3: no no no no
170. AP1: imagine the subways (1) [yea buses and
171. AP3: [oh shit it’s like Japan where they push
172. AP4: [you need to you need to have a car if you’re going to like Umeå (.) then you can’t
173. AP3: you can fly [there but it’s more
174. AP4: [yea but if everyone is going to fly there are there will be a lot of people [there I hate people
175. AP3: [yea but like INAUDIBLE the ehm subways (.) and in Japan and China ehm [in some
points

176. AP4: [no no no but in great scale like hundred people are going on the same plane as me and [I’m not like sick of them

177. AP1: [ehm so ehm yea I I guess it could be better for the environment but no it can’t cause (.) if we like stop using all the cars we’d (.) replace them with like more air planes more buses more subways and that wouldn’t that wouldn’t

178. AP3: =they wouldn’t be better

179. AP1: [it would be like the same thing no exactly

180. AP4: subways (.) doesn’t [do the same as cars

181. AP3: [yea but bus (.) you go by bus

182. AP1: [no but you can think like oh buses it will be like buses everywhere and (.) air planes you’d see [them more often

183. AP3: [yea it can’t be train tracks everywhere either so

184. LAUGH

185. AP3: like on highways (.) it wouldn’t work

186. AP4: LAUGHING no (.) that’s right

187. AP1: [so I don’t think it’s and I think it’s great relief to have like a car where you can just listen to music (.) when you drive by yourself (.) I cant wait to get my license

188. AP3: [yea maybe (.) like electric cars (.) if electric cars (.) [take over yea

189. AP1: [yea

190. AP4: [yea in cars eh no in cities they would have they should have electric cars cause they just drive like ten miles [or something

191. AP3: [or like magnetic (.) if they put like some kind of metal underneath [the (.) road

192. AP4: [then it’s like a train

193. LAUGH

194. AP3: yea maybe but it’s more like a car

195. AP1: yea but I think cars cars are better INAUDIBLE they’re like good to have

196. AP4: =yea

197. AP1: and just like (.) drive

198. AP3: yea [maybe more environmental (.) friendly but

199. AP1: [I really really I really really really I can’t wait to have my driver’s license

200. AP3: =yea [me neither

201. AP1: [it’s gonna be such a relief to drive myself anywhere I wanted to (.) so ehm we think it wouldn’t be better for anyone

202. AP4: [[no

203. AP3: [[no no it wouldn’t

204. AP2: but it would be better if like we had like (.) INAUDIBLE cars

205. AP3: electric [cars

206. AP2: [electric cars that would be better but I think like if a car has be become such a big part of our lives (.) and then if we took away the cars everything was was just it’s just gonna

207. AP1: =yea it would be hard to replace

208. AP4: yea [we can’t take back all the horses

209. AP3: [yea but what what we what we would do with the roads and such if we [take away all the cars

210. AP1: [yea eh we can use the horses (.) no

211. AP3: no no no

212. LAUGH

213. AP3: I don’t think so

214. AP1: if we take about (.) take away the cars will we then (.) does that include the buses?

215. AP4: I guess so
216. AP2: [[it does
217. AP3: [[yea yea everything that spit out ehm koldioxid
218. AP4: koldioxid
219. LAUGH
220. AP2: [[next question
221. AP1: [[okay we we we dis we disagree on number five
222. AP3: [carbon dioxide (1) yea we do okay
223. AP2: having your own room at home is not necessary
224. AP1: =yes it is
225. AP4: [[it’s necessary
226. AP3: [[it’s nece it’s necessary [it’s necessary (. ) my brother is a pain in the ass (. ) all the time
227. AP1: [it’s very necessary
228. AP2: [you need somewhere
229. AP4: =to be alone
230. AP1: yea like and like to be like (. ) have a private life and just (. ) chillax
231. AP3: if you can afford it [but but
232. AP2: [even if it’s just like (. ) a little home [with a bed
233. AP1: [it’s so much better
234. AP2: but that is like (. ) inside these walls (. ) it’s mine and I can decide what’s in here like have [somewhere
235. AP1: [what’s happening in here [and what who people get
236. AP3: [yea
237. AP2: [yeah and like the and you can like have control or like something to (. ) to know that it’s mine (. ) it’s mine and I decide
238. AP4: I think so (. ) [that very important
239. AP1: [I think yea [that was good that was good eh (. ) good spooked
240. AP3: [cause I live with (. ) I lived in the same room as my brother (. ) until I was like like (. ) one and a half years ago cause we couldn’t afford any [bigger appartment
241. AP1: [yea but that’s a bit that’s a big problem as well cause I know people (. ) and sharing it with your sibling can’t be (. ) it’s it’s hard eh I never done it myself but (. ) I started sleeping in own room like (. ) when I (. ) could like when I was a I from the beginning
242. AP4: =yea me too
243. AP1: yea so I don’t have any like like shared rooms like that but
244. AP2: but I think that if you are small (. ) small kid
245. AP4: small
246. LAUGH
247. AP2: then like it doesn’t matter (. ) because then you like [your own sister and brother
248. AP1: [you don’t even care yea
249. AP3: [[yeah yeah
250. AP4: [[then you like them LAUGHING
251. AP1: those times are over
252. LAUGH
253. AP2: but then when you when you grow when you grow up then (. ) you need somewhere to
254. AP3: yea
255. AP2: like I said as I this is my place [my place
256. AP1: [like especially in our age (. ) as well
257. AP4: [[yee
258. AP3: [[yee
259. AP2: [[somewhere to go and be alone (. ) and just listen to music or [doing homework (. ) it’s like
260. AP4: [it would be very awkward if you had girlfriend or [boyfriend and then your brother yea and your brother comes in bah
261. AP3: [and in the same room LAUGHING as your brother
262. AP1: so just think now and you like going to do something and no
263. LAUGH
264. AP4: exactly
265. AP1: yea but I think yea it’s always INAUDIBLE fifteen
266. NOISE
267. AP3: oh six fifty nine
268. AP2: [[we’re awesome
269. AP4: [[well (.) so eh I think it’s necessary but (.) yea
Appendix 4

Group 3 – Transcription
Mixed-ability group.

AP - Able Pupil (with a C or higher)
P - Pupil

[ - Overlapping speech
[[ - Simultaneous speech
= - Latching response
OMITTED - Omitted to protect the identity of the informants
INAUDIBLE - Inaudible utterance
(.) - Micro pause, less than 0.5 seconds
(0.5) - Pause, in seconds
LAUGH - Everybody laughs
LAUGHING - The speaker laughs
NOISE - Unrelated noise
? - Rising tone

Red - Support cues and minimal responses, not counted as turns.
Green - Interruption, unsuccessful attempt to take the turn.
Blue - Code switching.

Participants: AP, P1, P2, P3

Recording length: 13 minutes, 26 seconds

1. P1: okay lets start
2. NOISE
3. P1: eh okay (.) like say the first question (.) having a cat or a dog should be forbidden (.) if you live in a city
4. P2: I actually disagree with that one because if you have a cat or a dig they can be like inside dogs and inside cats and they don’t have to go out if that’s the problem
5. AP: yea like I think (.) it kind of depends on (.) [where
6. P1: [what dog?
7. AP: =no what yea kinda of but also (.) like how big your house is and (.) if the cat can jump out a window and go outside
8. P1: amen like alltsâ some cats they just like (.) like ehm where I live ehm is like eh a woman on the first floor (.) she has two cats so they just like she just
9. AP: =and that’s okay but [if (.) they are on like the first floor
10. P1: [yea you can just let them like go on and then they jump up again so
11. AP: but the highest floor doesn’t really work that way
12. P1: =yea I know
13. AP: like cat’s cant
14. NOISE
15. P1: OMITTED what do you think?
P3: eh I think that’s I don’t really know because I live in a house with my dad and we have dogs because eller we have one dog and I think that it’s like if it if it’s a small dog or a big dog they alltså

P1: yea alltså the you mean the

AP: like if it’s big you can’t have it in a small appartment

P1: [exact alltså you mean like you mean it’s like it’s a like a Pitbull or a Chiwawa like [alltså is a big difference

P3: [yea if you have a Chiwawa it can be

AP: you can have it in you hand\[bag

P3: then it’s easier to have in an apartment

AP: [yea

P1: but if you just like walk around in the USA then I don’t know

AP: but in some houses you aren’t allowed to have pets

P1: =no [but so

AP: [and that’s good cause some people might be allergic

P1: so we like disagree on this question

AP: we kinda agree and disagree it depends

P1: [yeah (1) yea

P2: okay

P1: eh eh okay should we got to the ne next question?

AP: yea

P1: everybody should be a vegetarian

P2: eh (.) eh can you read the question again?

P1: everybody should be a vegetarian I disagree [with that one

P2: P1: [yea I disagree with that one too

AP: I mean it’s really good to be a vegetarian [cause

P1: [I don’t know but still has the need

AP: =yea but I know meat’s really good and it’s

P1: cause if you don’t alltså you need you need meat to like

AP: =but you can have like substitute food or something ehm but

P2: but some people likes meat and they don’t want to be vegetarian so they shouldn’t be like forced to be vegetarians

P1: [I mean like the I mean like the maybe would be good for the animals but like

AP: =and it’s very good for the environment too

P1: yea (.) but I mean like I don’t think you could you like example you can force people to be a vegetarian like Omitted what do you think?

P2: P3: ehm (.) I think that people should decide for they own if they want to be a vegetarian or not because I like meat and

AP: a lot of people

P3: =a lot of people does do elle[like

P1: [do

P3: do like eh do and ehm many people doesn’t like it so (1) I don’t know

AP: but you should try to eat as

P1: alltså like [you should like eat (.) that (.) yea not like

AP: [as much (.) vegetarian as you can (.) cause it’s really good for the environment

P1: yea (.) but do you agree with that or do you disagree
61. AP: both LAUGHING
62. P1: is it like both on every question
63. LAUGH
64. P2: [[okay eh next
65. P1: [[I don’t know eh but okay you can read the next one also really INAUDIBLE third one
66. P3: buying expensive clothes eh clothes is a a waste of money
67. P1: eh () it depends () if you buy like expensive clothes
68. NOISE
69. P1: if if eh if you if you () buy like expensive clothes like all the time that’s very like ()
[=waste of money but maybe you can be rich so
70. AP: [yea but I think you can be () yea but you buy () expensive clothes because you like them
71. P1: because you’re rich
72. AP: [[no but like
73. P2: [[because you think they’re cool because they are like [oh they are like
74. P1: [I I don’t think if you
75. AP: [yea but () usually expensive clothes () are very nice
76. P1: =yea I know () but I don’t think like alltså like if you if your poor () then I don’t think you can like go out and buy stuff just to be cool I think () if you’re poor you like think about the food instead clothes and stuff so
77. AP: yea but () most people aren’t that poor
78. P2: [but you don’t you don’t
79. P1: [most people yea I know I know most people just buy to like (1) [be cool ().
80. yea
81. AP: [be popular
82. P2: most people doesn’t buy () clothes that is expensive when they when they are poor (1)
[cause then you can’t afford it
83. P1: [you are INAUDIBLE yea I know I know
84. AP: but you can buy something nice like () candy
85. LAUGH
86. P2: yea so I disagree with that one I think () because expensive clothes is like
87. AP: you [choose to
88. P1: [cause like alltså maybe we all too if you like if you buy something () and your like oh you have a new like that and also like yea yea () ehm I bought them like () yesterday then you and most people ask like how much did it cost () so if you say like () it cost fifty crowns it would be like eh [awkward
89. AP: [that’s nothing LAUGHING
90. P1: like I bought mine for like nine hundred () so that’s nothing to INAUDIBLE so yea
91. P2: next question or what?
92. P1: eh okay so
93. AP: money makes people happy
94. P2: it makes [some people happy
95. P3: [yes
96. P1: [yes
97. AP: I think yea it must people happy but () maybe like the really rich people because they don’t actually need all that money
98. P1: yes they do
99. AP: no they don’t [just
100. P1: [alltså like eh maybe not that much but I mean like it’s good cause you
101. AP: =I know but () the [if they have like a lot of money left
102. P1: you have lot of you have like hallå () the other one
103. AP: I know LAUGHING
104. P1: okay ehm okay that’s fine okay but I eh (2) yea I think I agree with that other one
yea but I mean (.) poor people really

AP:  

money or like rich people wouldn’t think that

P2:  

I would I would be rich rather than poor as well

P1:  

but it’s like

P2:  

but would you be happy or rich?

P1:  

[yea I think everybody would think that

P3:  

but people make not so much money they maybe slösa bort dom LAUGHING [they

P1:  

[but do they like I don’t think cause if

P3:  

your rich if your like rich (.) then ehm (.) alltså ehm I don’t think you like get like (.) we

P1:  

let’s say you get one million if you get one million (.) then you can’t call that person rich

AP:  

[INAUDIBLE

P1:  

[well it’s [INAUDIBLE

P1:  

[he doesn’t I mean if you just get one million

P2:  

then you don’t get anymore (.) you understand ehm the worst people they

P1:  

usually get like money like all the time (.) like soccer players or singers (.) like that then

P3:  

you get they don’t just get this money [then

AP:  

[yeah Zlatan

P1:  

=yea so (.) I don’t think they can waste their money cause they can they just get more

P2:  

money so (.) is like

P1:  

okay eh [five eh

P2:  

[but example how did we agree or disagree with that

P1:  

[ehm both

P2:  

[I agree [because

P1:  

alltså we’re like [as in both on every question

P2:  

we (.) we’re not disagreeing

P1:  

rich rich people (.) is happy when they have a lot of money

AP:  

and so is (.) poor people

P3:  

but maybe they get fat LAUGHING

P2:  

=yea no but no but that’s usually eh the poor people who get fat cause they don’t have

P1:  

the money to buy [healthy food

P2:  

but like Tom Cruise the movie guy

P1:  

nej eller it it depends

AP:  

no usually that’s the case [they gotta go cause they

P2:  

[I mean if they are really poor alltså in Africa they they they

P3:  

=yea of course but if you’re like

AP:  

oh like normal (.) [normal poor

P2:  

[but it it

AP:  

LAUGHING well you can’t really (.) explain but if you go to McDonald’s (.) every
day and don’t have enough money (.) to buy healthier food

P1:  

but I think it’s

P2:  

but some some rich people stay in shape (.) [most of them because they’re not like

P1:  

trea cause they like the the best soccer players basketball players they’re [rich but don’t get fat cause

P3:  

they are rich they need to stay in shape

P2:  

[that’s [because they

AP:  

[they have to stay in shape

P2:  

[yea yea

P3:  

[yea that’s their job

NOISE

P2:  

but maybe after [they

P1:  

did you know a did you know a guy eh that I soccer players they they
bought a soccer player (.) then they say they give him a diet cause they thought he was too fat

AP:  

she or he?

P1:  

[he he
Okay but we agree on that one.

Well it is better you can (...) it is better

Okay okay next question (...) living without a car is much better for everyone [ehm ehm no]

[It's better I] [I think]

Wait if nobody has a car

=yea if nobody had a car it would be so much better

Or it would be (...) more exercising

[But that you can you can travel with train you can travel with airplane you can still like travel with those things]

=yea but car is still good

[No but like the carbon dioxide we're letting out [and the air it's not good for anyone it's like global warming and]

=yea if nobody had a car it would be so much better

[But that you can you can travel with train you can travel with airplane you can still like travel with those things]

=yea but car is still good

[No but like the carbon dioxide we’re letting out [and the air it’s not good for anyone it’s like global warming and]

=yea but car is still good

[No but like the carbon dioxide we’re letting out [and the air it’s not good for anyone it’s like global warming and]

[Exactly]

=yea yea I didn’t even thought about that I thought about nice cars like Ferrari and Lamorghini so

[If I] as me I live very far away from with my mom (...) eh and it takes maybe one hour (...) eh with a car

But that's why you have the metro and ehm

=yea but then I thi I think it will take [more time if you were in the metro cause]

=yea but (...) you are killing earth so either you get

But I say eh more people die (...) wait how how eh does more people die with in car accidents or with train accidents

=car [accidents]

=car yea

=car yea car ja det mäste va det it have to be

[So it’s really better with cars but]

=[okay so we like (...)] disagreed ehm [agree]

=we agree yea

Okay

And OMITTED disagree

ehm yea

=you're kind of in the middle

=okay but like now we’re just now we’re not thinking about OMITTED we’re thinking about everyone

=yea okay having your own room at home is not necessary

=disagree

LAUGH

Of course [I need my own room]

I know how it is to share a room I still share a room so I disagree cause I want my own room now (1) first I shared with my sister (.) and now I share with my mom och det är that’s not good alltså

LAUGHING [ehm]

=yea you can imagine that

I think if [you don’t if it’s not your]

INAUDIBLE det är inte bra alls

det är inte bra alls

Men om (...) if you (...) okay [ehm]

I mean if it’s not your own room then (1) you can’t have it’s not private and you can’t

I know [alltså]

=you need [privacy you need to be like on your own]

=if you if my mom sleep there I can’t even change my cloth in the morning alltså (...) if she doesn’t if if she doesn’t have work (...) like today (...) I have to go somewhere else to change (...) some alltså (...) sometime I have to change in the living
room asså de e så trä that’s like good but (.) that doesn’t happen that much but

189. P2: but I actually disagree with that one cause you need your own room and you need your own privacy to do like homework like

190. P1: [yea yea(.) especially when your this old(.) maybe when your young like(.) until your like maybe I don’t know(.) when you when you like(.) three four years old then doesn’t matter cause then you can you can share a room with your sister or brother that doesn’t care cause she’s small but now when your fourteen alltså(.) it’s not the same thing

191. P3: but if you share a room(.) alone så här delar

192. P1: [yea yea(.) especially when your this old(.) maybe when your young like(.) until your like maybe I don’t know(.) when you when you like(.) three four years old then doesn’t matter cause then you can you can share a room with your sister or brother that doesn’t care cause she’s small but now when your fourteen alltså(.) it’s not the same thing

193. P3: [with your mom and(.) your fourteen and maybe you have to(.) be with your boyfriend or girlfriend

194. P2: awkward

195. P3: LAUGHING should they sleep in the same room with your mom mom to

196. P1: =no but I mean like I ehm if then I would just say like eh(.) sleep in the living room or something cause I wouldn’t I wanna let her(.) I wa wanna let her then I would just say I would just say no I’m not sleeping with my mom I just have two beds(.) I still have to beds ehm

197. P3: I’m in that situation eh I at my ehm eller with my dad I have my own room and with my mom I(.) have to(.) share a room with her(.) so it’s ehm I(.) choose to have a own room

198. P2: you would prefer an own room

199. P3: yes

200. P2: =okay so we disagree with that one

201. P1: ehm yea

202. P2: OMITTED?

203. AP: ehm(.) yea I think you should have the right to privacy

204. P1: yea eh like ehm

205. NOISE

206. P2: we’re we’re we’re done so

207. P1: [[no

208. AP: [[anyone who want’s to add [anything

209. P1: [wait lets just go through the question like one(.) would you we

210. P2: just say just say agree or disagree on this one

211. P1: wait dog(.) we say we disagreeing

212. P2: =we disagree on that one

213. AP: [no we [said

214. P1: [but I mean alltså I think you should be allowed to have a dog in the city

215. P2: yes so [that disagree

216. AP: [yes but it’s(.) in some places but some places it’s impossible to have a dog

217. P1: [but if you have like a 1(.) then you keep it in the(.) house

218. P2: [but if it is possible you should LAUGHING but if it is possible it should not be forbidden(.) to have a(.) [does that INAUDIBLE

219. P1: [but the question

220. AP: [but if the owner is allergic or something

221. P2: =the owner doesn’t buy a dog if he’s allergic

222. P1: then he doesn’t buy a dog if his allergic

223. AP: =no I mean I mean if the owner of the house and your renting the house is [allergic or the apartment

224. P1: [but the owner stay in the house

225. AP: yea but a lot of places where [you(.) rent where you(.) not allowed to have animals
226. P1: [like I rent rent we rent my lägen (.) we we have a building like the building and we rent it alltså (.) eh but the owner (.) he I don’t think he sleeps in that house

227. AP: =yea he doesn’t have to like (.) I mean he maybe doesn’t like (.) animals in his

228. P1: yea ehm

229. NOISE
Appendix 5

Group 4 – Transcription
Mixed-ability group.

AP - Able Pupil (with a C or higher)
P - Pupil

[ - Overlapping speech
[[ - Simultaneous speech
= - Latching response
OMITTED - Omitted to protect the identity of the informants
INAUDIBLE - Inaudible utterance
(.) - Micro pause, less than 0.5 seconds
(0.5) - Pause, in seconds
LAUGH - Everybody laughs
LAUGHING - The speaker laughs
NOISE - Unrelated noise
? - Rising tone

Red - Support cues and minimal responses, not counted as turns.
Green - Interruption, unsuccessful attempt to take the turn.
Blue - Code switching.

Participants: AP, P1, P2, P3

Recording length: 14 minutes, 55 seconds

1. NOISE
2. P1: I really disagree that because it’s people in the eh city who does have children who (.) maybe feel alone and want someone somebody to (1) be happy with or [something
3. AP: [to have company
4. P1: =yea have company when they got home from school maybe (1) and ehm it should not be forbidden just because you live in the city
5. P3: yea maybe you should not like let it out on the street but eh I definitely think you can have a (.) innekatt (1) inside cat
6. AP: yea but I think that it depends (,) which city it would like in china (,) it’s forbidden there to (,) have a dog of a that’s the height is over some eh (,) special
7. P1: yea
8. AP: but I think (,) it’s a alltså it’s about (,) how many people there are if there’s room for (,) like an animal (,) like a [dog
9. P1: [but you you can feel like OMITTED said (,) you can have you can have it inside you don’t have to put it outside if if if it (,)
10. P3: [[but if you
11. P1: [[maybe if you buy two cats they can have company with with each other until you got at home
12. P3: =yea and (,) you can like have a a ehm a collar (,) LAUGHING to the cat and and go
out but if ehm if you live eh (.) more on the country you can have it outside also

13. AP: =yea but I think that everybody should (1) be able to have (.) a cat or a dog
14. P1: [[yes
15. P3: [[yea I don’t think I like (3) shouldn’t be a law that you [don’t get to have it
16. P1: ]just because you live in the city
17. P2: yes everybody should be able to have a cat if they want to (.) or a dog
18. P1: so I disagree with that question
19. P3: [[yea
20. AP: [[[I think we all disagree
21. P2: yea
22. P1: ehm number two (.) ehm everybody should be a vege ve vegetarian
23. AP: I I disagree with [that
24. P2: [me too
25. P1: I disagree with a that because animals eat animals (.) why shouldn’t we eat animals then because they they kill each other anyway to eat each other (.) it’s the same with us
26. P3: [[ehm
27. AP: [[yea but I think that (2) ehm we should (.) not eat as much meat as we do (.) but I don’t think that everybody has to (.) become a vegetarian to fix the problem I don’t know everybody can eat meat I don’t think [that
28. P3: [yes but we should I don’t think we should eat eh like ehm a lot of eh pig and stuff because that’s not even healthy (.) but like ehm we need protein and then we can eat like kossor
29. AP: LAUGHING cows
30. P3: cows
31. AP: yea [but
32. P1: [but If you don’t
33. P3: [but like you can definitely cut down on the meat
34. AP: yea but I don’t think that everybody should be (.) INAUDIBLE totally vegetarian only [vegetables
35. P1: [we should eat (1) ehm eh a smaller
36. AP: =amount [amount of meat
37. P1: [yea of meat maybe but not (1) stop eating it
38. P3: men eh
39. AP: we are created to eat meat
40. P2: yeah [INAUDIBLE
41. P1: [what what what if lions didn’t eat meat any more (.) should they go and eat eh grass or (3)
42. AP: no
43. P1: so we all [agree there to
44. P3: [its like
45. AP: what did you have to [say
46. P2: [in one way ehm humans are also animals in one way we are just the smartest ones so like (1)
47. AP: yea
48. P2: we also need meat we all have all eaters
49. AP: we need meat for our brains so that we get smart smarter
50. P3: no that’s fish
51. AP: oh
52. P2: LAUGHING (2)
53. P1: next question
54. P2: buying expensive clothes is a waste of money
55. P3: kind of (.) but like you [decide
56. P1: [it is but you don’t think of it because
57. AP: it’s like quality or quantity or what it’s but
P1: if it is a shirt (.) ah a blank shirt with a eh blue colour (.) eh it maybe cost hundred crowns but if you got if you buy a shirt with eh a mark on it it can eh cost eh five hundred but just because of the mark it’s the same shirt but it but it’s the mark you changing it

AP: =it’s a famous brand

P1: yeah and you want and you want the for for the five hundred so it is a waste of money of you think like that because (.) eh a shirt with a mark is eh very expensive eh

AP: yea but I I don’t think that it’s always a waste of money like (.) like winter (.) jackets

P1: yea because [like

AP: [they are really like big and warm (.) they are expensive because they (.)

P3: [yea but then yes but then eh it’s like every eh little eh (.) vad ska jag säga eh alla (. it was suppose to for the beginning (. like nej det var inget förresten

AP: LAUGHING

P1: maybe handbag for for [thousand is very yeah

AP: like it was like accessories (.) then it can be a real waste of money like shoes bags (1) bracelets whatever (.) that can be a huge waste [but eh

P3: [like shoes and jackets are a quality you need quality [jackets and shoes

P1: [everything you like to wear is a waste of

AP: [it’s like winter (2) when it’s cold you need expensive clothes [to

P3: [yea

P1: warm up yourself (. you know

P2: yes but buying expensive clothes is (. kinda it’s waste of money INAUDIBLE you need but I feel like (. if I had like five hundred crowns and I can choose between buying (. like a (. one shirt that was five hundred or like a video game (. I would buy the video game ten times out of eleven (1) but that’s more kind of a waste because I would just spend a (. lot of time playing it

AP: yea

P2: so it’s not like (. the biggest waste of money you can waste but

AP: yea I think (3) if you say clothes then I I don’t think it’s [waste of money but if it’s accessories

P3: [it’s no I think it’s a waste of money if you don’t need it like the quality (. like on if you need a really really warm jacket then you should like spend (. more money so you can have it longer

AP: yea

P1: we disagree if it’s ehm accessories and we agree if it’s real if it’s real clothes

AP: but only if (.) only if you buy (. if you’re a shopaholic then it’s a waste of money but if you only buy like (. a garment not ehm

P3: like louis vuitton bags

AP: then it’s not (2) yeah but if it’s like an absurd amount of money (. like (. ten thousand for a shirt then it’s like eh [no

P3: [no no LAUGHING

AP: so we (3) half disagree

P1: ehm fifty fifty

P3: LAUGHING

AP: okay (. money makes people happy

P1: [yea

P3: [yes

P2: it’s true

P1: =yes it’s true because with money you can buy anything you want

P2: almost

P3: [LAUGHING
94. AP: [yea but I think that it’s (.) it’s a (2) the kind of happiness that you only have for a moment it’s [not forever
95. P3: [yea
96. P1: [it’s the thing you do with the money you’re happy eh to do
97. P3: =yes
98. AP: like old mill millionaires they aren’t happy some
99. P1: =yea that’s true but
100. AP: my friend his father (.) knew two guys from (.) college or something eh one of them (.) they went the same education and everything (.) one of them got like a (.) jo job as as a telephone (.) thing and the other (.) became a millionaire (.) and the millionaire took sui ehm became
101. P1: suicide
102. AP: yea suicide (.) he killed himself so I don’t think that (.) money allways (.) makes [people happy
103. P1: [it is like eh
104. P3: [ah no it not makes them happy like it makes them (.) giriga or what it’s called
105. P1: =yea that’s true they sitting with a butler (.) who’s serving them (.) and you just sit there and watch TV (.) and it’s not funny but poor (.) you can make own games with you friends and ehm
106. P3: [[yea
107. AP: [[I think when you are when you don’t have as much money you can (.) enjoy life much more because
108. P1: the money you
109. AP: [[[it’s more like
110. P2: [[travels to like
111. P3: yea because when you’re rich you can just like get things even that you don’t deserve them you just like buy things
112. P1: ehm like Mark Zuckerberg (.) he he discovered Facebook (.) and now he’s a mill eh a billionaire or millionaire
113. P3: =millionair
114. AP: he’s got a lot of money LAUGHING
115. P1: if if eh (.) I don’t think he deserves he’s really (.) it’s just a network he haven’t worked a lot and (.) he just thought of the idea with two room-mates and (.) now he’s a billionaire
116. P2: but some people that have too much much money they are like (.) they get friends because they have their money [so people are like
117. AP: [yea
118. P1: [yea that’s true so they get so the friends can get [rich
119. P2: [it’s not real friends
120. AP: they only use them for the money [they
121. P2: [yea
122. P3: [yea I think if you rich you can ehm definitely get people can take advantage of you and
123. AP: yea
124. P3: your money (.) and you don’t have real friends you just like have eh rich bitchy friends
125. AP: yea (2) so I don’t think that
126. P3: no it doesn’t makes people happy
127. AP: it it isn’t ehm constant (.) happiness (1) it’s only a
128. P1: it’s for a shorter time
129. AP: yea
130. P1: ehm at first you very happy about the money you can go eh do whatever you want (.) [but after (.) the ehm a
131. AP: [but then you get used to it like (.) this is my life I have a lot of money you don’t
132. P1: it’s like boring if you [think of if you think of
133. AP: [you don’t appreciate it as much
yea you don’t you get spoiled because you done appreciate the
if if you are poor maybe no no not poor but (.). have a
more [like middle class
[and ehm you buy you buy a iphone you appreciate it but when you got it when
you’re rich like uh (1) it’s not a big phone six thousand crowns
but but like if you have not too much money but a little bit money if you maybe go
travel (.). to another country like eh ehm like (.). one time year or one time every
second year you will be like (.). this is going to be very fun because we don’t do it so
often but if you have like extremely lot of money (.). you do it only like once a month or like
three four times a year (.). then you wont like look up at it so much
=yea (.) men eh basically you don’t appreciate [things
I think you’re you’re much more eh alone when you got
eh much money (.). yea if you got friends you can (1) I don’t know when you when
you’re rich you often rich at things like you haven’t worked for so much like ehm
networks and things like that (.). you just sit there in your (.). house and don’t do anything
and have boring the whole (.). day
yea but
so I think that we agree that it’s (.).
no [it it’s good
[it it it’s good for a short time
[[no I that’s
yea money makes people happy for a short time but then
but [often a long time
then you just then you just like don’t like appreciate the little things like (.). yea you
take and if everything for
=for granted
a for granted [and you get
[they are like oh that’s not good oh what a poor shirt
but then you can say like money makes you glad not really happy
yea (4)
yea yea
living without a car is much better for everyone
no
I don’t think it’s true [not for everyone
no it’s not true
like (.). kind of it’s better for the environment but (.). it’s really useful to have a car
yea
my dad got his job cause he [have a car then
[I mean I’m very happy that we have a car so I don’t so my
father can pick me up on eh on (.). like kvällar and so I don’t get raped and stuff.
LAUGHING
what if I get raped then (.). no one can come pick me up
because maybe after eight a clock (1) the buses stop going from (.). here OMITTED
and eh then it can be very (.). [useful to have a car
[yea (2) or like you don’t wanna walk in in a weather or
something (2) [but like
[but if all [cars disappear
and it’s good if if you going to ehm to cousins maybe it’s not funny
when you go to the first you have to (.). got to the (2) [t bay subway
to a subway
subway
then you have to
like ehm to the [centralstation
[it’s not like
LAUGH
P3: no but ehm like ehm yes but I don’t think like when we’re going far away in the in Sweden (. ) like a cousins or something (. ) eh I don’t think its good to have a car because it just eh (. ) bad for the (. ) environment but like (. ) I think then you can take a train (2) [but like small

AP: [yea but I think that that the car that it’s a

P2: =upgrade

AP: like one of the (1) best (1) ehm what’s it called

P2: uppfinning

AP: yea it’s what’s it called?

P3: invent eh

P2: invention no

AP: invention eh something but has ever been made up because it’s like really (. ) effective like

P3: yea but like [it’s really

AP: [you can like get to places really (. ) fast and easy and simple and it’s like (. ) not complicated at all [and you

P3: [yea but it’s really bad for [the environment

AP: [but that’s why we are

P1: and and if you think of it it’s very ex expensive to have a car (. ) because you have to pay for the (. ) bensin or [what’s it called

AP: [for the yeah

P2: yes

P1: just that costs maybe five hundred (. ) for sixty litres

P3: [[yea but I need

AP: [[yea it’s expensive but I think [that

P1: [like if you go if you take the (. ) trains maybe (. ) seven hundred per month (. ) and that’s

P3: but like you don’t (. ) go away far so often so I think you can eh (. ) live without a car but it’s like handy

P2: but if you have a car you have to pay like (. ) a lot of money on taxes

AP: yea

P3: yea

P1: okay we should go on to the

P2: no but it’s almost like three thousand a month (. ) I think (. ) not sure

P1: having you own room at home is not necessary disagree

P3: disagree

LAUGH

__________________________________________________
Appendix 6

Group 5 – Transcription
Mixed-ability group.

AP - Able Pupil (with a C or higher)
P - Pupil

[ - Overlapping speech
[[ - Simultaneous speech
= - Latching response
OMITTED - Omitted to protect the identity of the informants
INAUDIBLE - Inaudible utterance
(.) - Micro pause, less than 0.5 seconds
(0.5) - Pause, in seconds
LAUGH - Everybody laughs
LAUGHING - The speaker laughs
NOISE - Unrelated noise
? - Rising tone

Red - Support cues and minimal responses, not counted as turns.
Green - Interruption, unsuccessful attempt to take the turn.
Blue - Code switching.

Participants: AP, P1, P2, P3

Recording length: 12 minutes, 30 seconds

1. NOISE
2. AP: hello
3. LAUGH
4. P1: I think everybody(.) should have the same (1) possibility so even if you(.) live in the (1) city you
5. AP: =yea
6. P1: can have a car or a dog
7. AP: yeah (2) eh I think so to but eh I feel kind of sorry of(.) animals who cant go outside because I have a cat
8. P1: =yea
9. AP: and he had like(.) yea I don’t know what he done(.) what he du did but he has(.) he need to stay inside
10. P1: =yea
11. AP: and he’s like crazy(.) and going around and meow all the time so I feel kind of sorry for him so I think that (1) yea that animals should have(.) time to go out sometimes but
12. P1: [[yea
13. P2: [[yea
14. AP: maybe are kind of hard in the city
15. P1: yea
16. P2: I also think that it’s eh the animals wants to go out so but if it’s a indoor animal you can have it in the city but
17. AP: yea
18. P2: if it’s like if it has to go out it’s not pretty good to have in the city
19. AP: [no I don’t think so] because if you live in example New York you could not let your cat out on the
20. P1: [like thousand cats running on the streets
21. P2: LAUGHING
22. P3: but I mean if you have a dog and you walking with it because it’s needs to it stuff you know
23. AP: =yea [LAUGHING
24. P3: [you have to pick pick up
25. AP: the poo
26. P3: yea the poo
27. AP: yea
28. P3: and if you don’t do that I feel like you shouldn’t be having a dog because it’s not nice to step in it
29. AP: [no
30. P2: [[LAUGHING no really not
31. AP: ehm yea but I don’t think it should be forbidden it’s like
32. P2: it’s your own
33. AP: =yea decision
34. P1: maybe a cat a outdoor cat that
35. AP: yea
36. P1: if there are too many it’s can be
37. AP: chaos LAUGHING
38. P1: chaos
39. AP: yea (1) next one everybody should be a veg vegetarian
40. P1: no [no no
41. AP: [no [no no
42. P2: [no LAUGHING eh or that’s also your own eh eh [choose eller
43. AP: [yeah I think so too because meat is good but (1) eh but maybe you should eat a little bit less meat because
44. P1: [yea
45. P2: [yea the stuff LAUGHING but not really it would I don’t think it would should be a law every one can eat meat
46. AP: [yeah that yea nature stuff LAUGHING but not really it would I don’t think it would should be a law every one can eat meat
47. P1: it’s good if you are a vegetarian but you don’t have to
48. AP: [no
49. P2: [you can eat
50. P3: [but don’t you have to kill some animals or they will like (1) take over the planet LAUGHING or (1) I don’t know
51. P1: [yea
52. AP: [yea (1) I agree with that too because if we have like thousand cows running around (1) running around
53. LAUGH
54. AP: INAUDIBLE they will like morph and then thousand cows but now yea (1) but no everybody should not be it’s your own your own choice but maybe eat less meat
55. P1: [yea try to eat less
56. P2: [yea that’s
57. AP: yea (1) okay buy expensive clothes is a waste of money (1) sometimes it’s good
58. P2: yea but [you
59. P1: [but if you like the clothes (1) and it’s your own mo money so
60. P2: but it could be better quality
61. AP: =yea exactly but sometimes it’s not (.) because I bought a
62. P2: [just a eh (1) like eh a text [or you know
63. AP: [yea yea the stamp well yea yea because I bought a ehm eh a shirt (.) no not a shirt not a yea a sweater (.) and when we washed it the first time it like (2) lossnade
64. LAUGH
65. AP: yea but it became kind of (.) uncomfortable and (.) yea and it wasn’t really supercheap
66. P1: =yea
67. P2: that’s not nice when your [clothes
68. AP: [no but yea now I have this (.) kind of expensive sweater and then like (.) what the
69. P1: LUGHING it can be a waste of money
70. P2: [[]yea
71. AP: [][yea (.) it could be but sometimes it’s not it’s like really good quality but ehm non expensive clothes could be good quality too
72. P1: =yea
73. AP: I think
74. P1: should we take the next?
75. AP: we could
76. P1: money makes people happy
77. LAUGH
78. AP: yea it’s kind of (.) nice to have money but (.) if you have money in overflow (.) you don’t know how how to
79. P1: =use them
80. AP: [[]yea exactly
81. P2: [[the most important thing is to (.) be happy just with you friends or (.) [yea
82. AP: [yea I feel so to because (1) yea if you have a lot of money (.) very much money you may be (2) yea I think I have money then I will have friends but maybe you are so (.) douchy so you will not get any friends
83. P2: yea and that’s (.) [not (.) a good
84. AP: [no (.) and then you not became become happy if you don’t have any friends I think so (.) money money is not really
85. P1: friends is better than money
86. AP: yeah
87. P2: yea really LAUGHING much better
88. AP: but money is good so you can (1) yea buy things you want to buy and (.) [go out so
89. P2: [it’s like freedom
90. P1: so you can do things with your friends
91. AP: =yea exactly
92. P2: yea
93. AP: so you (.) you need them both LAUGHING
94. P1: yea
95. AP: ehm (1) but if you don’t have any money at all (2) that’s not kind of fun (.) either
96. P1: no
97. AP: because if you have like (.) really need to (.) struggle to get food
98. P2: yea if you don’t have food [it’s
99. AP: [yea so (.) you need money (.) quite of [a lot
100. P2: [but not too much just so you can (.) live LAUGHING
101. AP: =yeah yeah if you have if you can do things like (1) most of the time and (1) yea having fun (.) it’s okay
102. LAUGH
103. AP: okay should we take next one?
104. P2: yea
105. P1: living without a car is much better for everyone (.) no
106. P2: no
107. P1: if you live like outside the city (1) and you have (.) or maybe in the north where it’s (.) one kilometer
108. AP: yea
109. P1: from your LAUGHING neighbor is (.) one kilometer from from you and (.) you will do you will you want to do things (1) it’s better that you have a car so you can
110. AP: yea
111. P1: drive and
112. AP: but here in Stockholm it’s not really important because you could take the subway like everywhere
113. P2: yea but people (.) use the car (.) too much and the nature be so ehm bad or something
114. AP: =yea but it is more comfortable to go with car
115. P1: yea
116. P2: yea when
117. AP: when when you when you are (.) in the road if you say like that but if eh but if you example if you got to (.) yea what (.) what would you say like OMITTED and you go in to (.) shop something it’s like impossible to find a eh
118. P1: yea then it’s better with subway
119. P2: yeah
120. AP: yeah (1) because (1) yea it’s kind of hard to got through the (2) center city LAUGHING yea the central
121. P1: =and find a parking
122. AP: yea parking
123. P2: yea you can also take your bike if (.) it’s just a small (.) [way
124. AP: [yea yea because I I I don’t think eh (.) eh this morning when I came to school it was like (.) it was like ten cars (.) down here and (.) eh I that’s not really good because (2) it eh it could sometimes it could happened bad things and it yea but I think if you should drive your children you kid to the school you should drop them off like hundred meters from the school
125. P1: yes
126. AP: because it’s just (2) yea (2) you understand me I think
127. P2: it sounds if for the children is more
128. AP: INAUDIBLE so (1) but if you if you going like to Gothenburg it’s like (.) which I do sometimes (.) with my family
129. P1: with car?
130. AP: =yea with car (.) that may be better (.) but train is maybe better but it’s (.) kind of more expensive so [yea
131. P1: yea
132. AP: yea if in long ways car is better but (1) [in
133. P2: [not when you use it like short that’s just
134. AP: =no
135. P1: it’s comfor comfortable eh that you can use the car if you drive (.) drive somewhere (.) and when you are there you can (.) use the car
136. AP: =yea exactly (1) yea (2) number six (2) having your own room at home is not necessary (.) it is necessary
137. LAUGH
138. P1: you do (1) much stuff in there
139. AP: yea exactly if you (.) I (.) I would never (.) eh share a room with my sister INAUBIBLE
140. P2: no
141. AP: it would be really (.) pain
142. LAUGH
143. AP: but she yea because in the room you have like a (1) yea what do you say sanctuary no one could
144. P1: your (.) högkvarter
AP: exactly
LAUGH
AP: your own headquarters yea (.) because yea (.) you need a own room so you can relax
and be own your own when you want to
P2: yea you need to be (.) just with yourself and
AP: yea
P1: do homework
LAUGH
AP: yea exactly if you if you share a room (.) with (.) eh example
P2: with sister
AP: yea sister or brother (.) they could be kind of annoying when you doing homework but
they could still be annoying if you have an own room because they can come into you
room and like hehehe
P2: yea and you try to (.) put them out but they just aah LAUGHING
AP: yea I would I like that
LAUGH
AP: yea but eh yea it is really necessary to have an (.) if you have
P2: if you lock it you can
AP: =ya but LAUGHING but if if you have a (1) if you have a room to everyone (.) you
should have a room (.) by your own (.) not really
P1: sure
AP: so yea (.) how long time have we (.) twelve yea INAUDIBLE
P1: but if your brother or sister don’t disturb you then (.) it can be okay
AP: yea it can (1) are we done or?
P2: yea I don’t know
P1: nothing to say
AP: no nothing
LAUGH
Appendix 7

Letter of consent

OMITTED - Omitted to protect the identity of the informants

Ämne: Fråga om samtycke till studie i OMITTED

Hej!


I studien tar jag hänsyn till Vetenskapsrådets forskningsetiska principer. Det betyder bland annat att jag varken namnger elever eller skola i min uppsats. Det innebär också att jag raderar alla inspelade samtal efter det att jag är klar med min uppsats.

Eftersom eleverna är under 15 år behöver jag, förutom deras samtycke, ditt tillstånd för att kunna göra mina observationer. Jag hoppas att du vill ge det genom att svara OMITTED eller mig på det här mejlet.

Tackssam för snabbt svar!
Henning Sköldvall