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Abstract

This study's aim is to create awareness of different strategies and speaking skills used as interaction in primary school by teachers. The study includes comparisons of previous researchers and relative theoretical perspectives. Semi-structured interviews with three primary school teachers from Sweden were conducted for this study. The results reveal numerous factors such as, differences in how teachers´ experiences play a primary role in the classroom and the time invested in the subject. An additional factor expressed by all the interviewed teachers is the involvement of Lev Vygotsky's theory integrated in their classrooms. All three teachers were positive to the idea of working in pairs or groups, as this develops students’ interaction with other students. However, the conclusion demonstrates the lack of previous research concerning interaction in primary school.
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Introduction

During our internship in the field (VFU) at the primary school level K-3, we experienced plenty of interest from students to learn English in various ways. We saw excitement and eagerness to learn a new language. We observed that the English language was not used as frequently as we thought in the classroom. Most of the introductions were in Swedish, but sometimes there was a question asked in English and immediately translated into Swedish without letting the students guess the meaning or try to interact with the teacher in English. When we entered the classroom, we noticed that the students sat down by their desks and were about to start their first English lesson. The teacher started to read in front of the class followed by the students repeating afterwards. At the end of the lesson, the students were given vocabulary lists from the text to practice at home until the next lesson, where they would work with their workbooks and were then given a written exam. During these four weeks, we observed that the teacher had the same structure with the English lesson for each class. There was not much interaction going on; and according to Lundahl (2014), speaking and being able to communicate is what matter when you are learning a new language.

Students are exposed to the English language daily through various media, such as TV, films, music and social media; and when starting school, they have already acquired a whole lot of language skills, for example some vocabulary and phrases (Lundahl, 2014). Our experience with English teachers is that they tend to teach English as a foreign language by using workbooks, vocabulary tests and stencils. None of these work methods lead to a successful foreign language learning (FLL) that will lead to a deeper understanding (Lundberg, 2016) and the only speaking and interaction they seem to do is repeating after the teacher when she/he reads out loud from the textbook. When the teacher uses this method she/he lacks the meaningful and natural speaking activities where the students feel it is authentic and that they can use it outside of school as well (Börjesson, 2012).

The English subject is modeled after the CEFR (The common European Framework of Reference for Language), where there is a progression in language ability through six proficiency levels (Council of Europe, 2001). The syllabus emphasizes that the students
should be able to speak and interact by using communication and interaction strategies (Skolverket, 2011a p 32):

- express themselves and communicate in speech and writing,
- use language strategies to understand and make themselves understood.

Lundahl (2014) states that some strategies for interaction include turn-taking, which is as it sounds like and could also be called meaning negotiation. In a conversation the persons take turns in speaking. The quote above is from the core content and can be interpreted for a novice learner that they confirm their understanding in the conversation and that could be the first steps in participating in a conversation. Contributing to a discussion by asking questions or suggesting something requires a higher level of English, which will be more relevant for the higher grades. In the higher level of English, learners need to negotiate meaning by confirming an understanding and asking for clarification. Confirming understanding can be done in short phrases such as “I see”, “mm, aha” and even through body language by nodding. Communication cannot take place if the message is not understood, asserts Lundahl.

In the core content under the title of speaking and producing and interaction is it stated that the students should be able to communicate using (p32-33):

- Simple presentations.
- Simple descriptions and messages.
- Songs, rhymes and dramatizations.

Lastly, Börjesson (2012) states that it is important to emphasize that the overall objectives of language teaching. However, the importance of multilingualism is increasingly emphasized today; that is language, that enables communication between people and countries and has the potential to make the world better. In short, learners need to be educated and able to speak different languages, and to develop and use their language knowledge with security and joy of fundamental importance.

The syllabus does not say that repeating after the teacher is not good, but it should be and feel authentic for the student to repeat it in different situations outside of school (Lundberg, 2016). Pinter (2006) agrees that students need to have purpose and
meaningful pattern drilling and personalized dialogue building in order to prepare them to interact with friends in the classroom and to other speakers of the language. According to Slattery and Willis (2001), there are some things that the students need as language learners, for example, in order to feel successful when they are using English, the need plenty of opportunities to communicate and interact, enjoy their efforts at speaking in English, and know they have achieved something worthwhile. None of which we saw during our internship.
Purpose

The purpose of this study is to create awareness of how future teachers and educated teachers in the grade K-3 can develop learning strategies regarding speaking skills as interaction. The aim of this study is to provide teachers with different strategies to develop students speaking skills.

Research Questions

- What strategies and activities are teachers using to develop students’ interactive speaking skills?
- What are the reasons for using such interaction strategies and activities?
- Is there a difference in strategies and activities between experienced and less experienced teachers?
Literature Review

In this section, we will define different theories that we find relevant for developing English language learning in the mainstream classroom. Speaking skills will also be defined and different variations of concepts that are included in interaction and speaking skills will be explained. We chose to include strategies in this section because we find it necessary to describe different ways of learning how to interact and speak. The information that we submitted in this section comes from lectures in Malmö University, research literature and our own experience during our internship. The literature describes both English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL) and we find both crucial in our study since both of them focus on learning a language that is not your mother tongue.

Theory

The Behaviorist Perspective

Lightbown and Spada (2013) state that the behaviorism had a powerful influence in the 1940s to the 1970s on second and foreign language where the teaching had an emphasized in mimicry and memorization, the students learned dialogues and sentence patterns by heart. We can still see this perspective linger on when many researchers advocate pattern drilling and learning chunks of phrases in the classroom, for example, Lundahl (2014) states and shows examples of this from workbooks where the task is to ask and answer questions in a given form and some examples for answers. The behaviorists believe that language development was viewed as a form of habits seen as rules and norms. The habits from their mother tongue could interfere with the habits the new language has, but that is untrue since research found that the errors the students made where not always linked to their mother tongue (Lightbown & Spada, 2013).

The behaviorists viewed two primary processes in language development: imitation and practice. Imitation can be defined as when the learners imitate what the more knowledge persons, for example, the teacher, says. The imitation is usually on the words that give meaning and comprehension to the sentence. The imitations do not only have to be words, when the learner has proceeded in their learning they could start imitation
patterns and overgeneralizing the patterns, for example, swimmers who swim, actors who act and doctor who doc, which could turn out wrong. The practice can be defined as the learner practices and repeats some sentences and phrases. Behaviorism can offer a way of understanding how children in the early stages learn the regular and routine aspects of language.

The Cognitive Perspective

Lightbown and Spada (2013) state that psychologists argue that humans have a language specific module in their brain and that acquisition and learning are a mental process. They believe that learning can gradually develop complex syntax and that the learners’ inability to spontaneously use everything they know about a language at any given time is a mental process. The psychologists of the cognitive perspective see that first and second language acquisition uses the same cognitive processes: perception, memory, categorization and generalization. The difference is in the circumstances of the learning and what the learners already know about the language and how that prior knowledge shapes their perception of the new language; for example, there is a difference in school of how the Swedish language is learned and how the English language is learned because of the students’ prior knowledge.

Schmidt (2001; Lightbown & Spada, 2013) suggest that second language learners pay attention when learning their new language. In the beginning, they pay attention to the keywords in the sentence to help them understand the context, which will naturally lead them to not noticing the grammatical part of the language, or if they need to focus on the new words they do not understand and try to understand them, which will lead to lack of the understanding of the context too. When, for example, the vocabulary becomes familiar to the learner so that he/she can focus on new things in the language, such as grammar. Therefore, the learners become able to access their learning quickly and sometimes even automatically.

Furthermore, some researchers, such as DeKeyser (1998, 2001, 2007; Lightbown & Spada 2013), have named some development stages in the second language learning where the first stage is called declarative knowledge; that is, where the learner is aware that there is for example, a grammar rule. The next stage is when the learner has
practiced the knowledge of having a grammar rule. Then their knowledge becomes procedural knowledge. Procedural knowledge means that the learner has the ability to use the knowledge. When the learner has practiced this knowledge a bit further it becomes automatized, and the learner may forget the process of having it learned in the first stage, the declarative knowledge stage.

The Sociocultural Perspective

Pinter (2006) states that Lev Vygotsky (1896-1934) pointed out that the social environment in a child's life has an important role to play in their learning. Vygotsky was interested in the learning potential of the individual by recognizing the fact that all children were special learners in some way. He was quite interested in exploring what children could achieve with the help and support of a more knowledgeable partner. Therefore, the most famous Vygotskian concept was born; the” zone of proximal development” (ZPD). This concept defines the difference between the current knowledge of the child and the potential knowledge reachable with some scaffolding from more knowledgeable peers. The emphasis in ZPD is on development and how learners co-construct knowledge (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). Lundahl (2014) also mentions ZPD and that there is a fundamental difference between what an individual learner is able to learn individually and that with the help of someone who knows more. According to the social-cultural perspective, learning takes place through social interaction with the target language. Speaking skills are developed with other speakers and therefore learners need a learning environment full of interactions and cooperation where the teacher provides plenty of scaffolding.

Furthermore, Lightbown and Spada (2013) describe that they believe that a cognitive development, including language development, arises as a result from social interactions. He also believes that thinking and speaking are interwoven together, as speaking mediates thinking, which means that we gain control over our mental process as a consequence of internalizing what others say to us and what we say to others. This theory has a greater importance to the interaction themselves where the learning is occurring through the social interaction.
Speaking Skills

By speaking skills, we refer to what the students can develop through speech: the production of speaking, exploratory talk, pronunciation, phrases, drilling patterns, vocabulary, form and phonology. According to Read (2007), speaking is a complex skill and it should not be underestimated; and “although children are good at imitating and may acquire better pronunciation than older learners, they are still developing language and discourse skills in their L1” (p18). When you are planning speaking activities, you need to consider the students age and their level of social, cognitive and emotional development, to make their learning optimal, that is, not too easy or too difficult, and as motivating as possible.

According to Read (2007), speaking skills can broadly be divided into two areas: spoken interaction and spoken production. It is important to develop students’ competence in both these areas in order to build up confidence and foundations for future learning. The spoken interaction refers to the ability to manage exchanges with others and the ability to ask and answer questions. The spoken production refers to the ability to produce language, for example, a rhyme, retelling a story or making a description.

Gibbons (2015) stresses that learners need access to language that is ahead of what they are able to create themselves. There are many ways to make subject-based language understandable, as long as a language focus is carefully planned, for example, by using pictures or diagrams to illustrate complex ideas. This links what the teacher is talking about to what the students already know. Also, nowadays we can draw on the resources of technology. Gibbons mentions that children need to have opportunities to talk in more extended ways, so that for the benefit of their listeners, they begin to focus not only on what they are saying, but also how they are saying it. She explained how games in groups could be a form of language development for learners. This would focus on making speaking their main priority, which could process their language more deeply, and it would help build up the students´ confidence and encourage them to speak more.
Speaking Strategies

In this section we are defining different learning strategies that occur in the language learning classroom. For example, a good strategy according to Read (2007) is that not to insist on students participating during speaking activities since it could be counter-productive.

Learning by Talking

Swain and Lapkin (2002; Lightbown & Spada, 2013) have investigated sociocultural explanations in second language learning, which they say has been influenced by the cognitive theory and the output hypothesis and came up with the term collaborative dialogue. This means that learners work together and co-construct linguistic knowledge while engaging in production tasks that simultaneously draw their focus to meaning and form. These tasks bring cognitive activity together with social activity because the students are discussing and deciding together what forms are best to express their meaning. The difference between the sociocultural perspective and others is that the cognitive process begins as an external process, and through social mediated activity it becomes internalized. When the same tasks are done without working with a peer, the cognitive process is analyzed internally.

Interacting, Noticing, Processing and Practicing

Pinter (2006) believes that after children are exposed to English through listening; they soon want to participate in interactions with other children and teachers. Many children will start copying simple songs or rhymes, introduce themselves and even memorize short dialogues. By using chunks, the children can remember phrases from previously heard input and use them without conscious analysis. Chunks are often learnt from the teachers’ input but also from other text such as songs, stories, rhymes and dialogues. When the teacher, for example, uses the chunk “have a nice day” at the beginning of every lesson, some learners will pick this up and learn it as an unanalyzed chunk. All speakers use chunks; some chunks are complete, while others can be complemented.

From the cognitive perspective, there have emerged a few strategies that can be used in the second language learner classroom. Lightbown and Spada (2013) mention some of
them, including the interaction hypothesis where the students modify their speaking with how to ask clarifications- and comprehension questions, slower speech rate and gestures. Another strategy is the noticing hypothesis, where Schmidt (1990, 2001; Lightbown & Spada, 2013) suggests that nothing is learned unless it is noticed, but it is essential as a starting point where the learner becomes aware of a particular language feature. They also mention the role of practice, where it should be interactive, meaningful and focuses on task-essential forms. Read (2007) agrees with this and that you should give the students lots of opportunities in a secure and non-threatening way, for example, through choral repetition of action rhymes or choral counting games, and allow the students to join in when they are ready. Barnes (2008) states that if the lesson is not connected to existing schemes in the students’ life it is quickly forgotten from one lesson to the other.

Read (2007) advocates frameworks for speaking activities which will make the students willing to speak and encourage them to use English for real purposes that they can relate to. As the students become better at interacting with each other, the teacher needs to think of fostering activities where the students learn different norms, such as when one is speaking the other one is listening and showing respect for other opinions. She also advocates that speaking activities should be personalized and offer different choices that will lead to willingness and participation, and that will make the students feel like they have ownership of their language.

The Importance of Speaking and Interaction for Language Learning

According to Lundahl (2015), many foreign language learners think that being able to speak is what matters. The other skills are also important, but being able to ask for information, to express yourself, to tell a story and to explain something are important, and they constitute what it means to know a language. The learners of a foreign language in the early years have a mix of the different theories where the cognitive perspective has an emphasis on meaning and noticing as well as the social constructivist have an emphasis on dialogue, cooperation and scaffolding. The behaviorists perspective also plays a major part of early language learning where most of the
learning has a model based on imitation, memorization, reinforcement and repetition. The early stages of learning a new language is about building a repertoire of chunks and strings of language that are used repeatedly.

Lundahl (2014) states that in year 4 the students do not start learning English from scratch, but we believe that the students in year 1-3 do not really do that either because they meet English in their spare time through different media such as games, films and music as well. The promoted approach according to Skolverket (2011b) for young EFL learners is based on the spoken language and the principles of “listening-doing” and “listening-understanding-saying after-speaking”, this also include the memorization of chunks.

Slattery and Willis (2001) set some points on what children need as language learners, such as they need to feel successful when they are using English, have plenty of opportunities to communicate, enjoy their efforts at speaking in English and to know they have achieved something worthwhile. Slattery and Willis have also presented what the teachers can do to meet the students’ points, which is to speak a lot of English, encourage them by showing that what they are saying is more important than the teachers’ correction, show the approval for their speaking and provide activities that are fun and have a clear purpose and goals. Slattery and Willis advocate group and pair work because learners will get opportunities to use the language by asking and responding to questions.

Furthermore, Lundahl (2014) has also offered some suggestions based on the principals modelled for language teaching. He states that interaction and speaking activities should be modeled through listening, reading and viewing with a wide range of texts. These texts and viewings should be based on concrete topics that are familiar to the learners. Language should be taught holistic and not in isolated words, but rather in chunks where grammar is built in. Activities where the students are asked to express themselves should be realistic, so they should not be asked to answer they are skiing, when they are in school. The teacher should identify goals for each activity and encourage the students to identify what they are able to do in English. The teacher should also encourage the students to accept that they can understand most things without understanding everything and that they are encouraged to use strategies and guess the meaning and
context. The learning environment must be a safe place and the activities include aesthetic forms of expression such as games, drama, drawing and singing. The last thing that Lundahl mentions is that the target language should be used as much as possible and that the teacher and students make connections and comparisons to their first language.

Lundberg (2016) states that the students need to be viewed as language users and not language learners since the researchers advocates this when it comes to implementing the communicative language view. She adds that the students need to listen to a rich and varied input of the English language. She also states that if the students get a lot of linguistic input they have it easier to produce linguistic output (speech). The level on linguistic input should be higher than what the students should produce for the student to get a linguistic output development. If the students learn phrases and chunks which they later can combine, they can transform them to language users with some flow in their speaking, which leads to a higher language confidence.

Lundberg (2016) advocates that the language should be adapted to how you actually speak today, for example, the student does not have to answer, “my name is Sara” when asked “what is your name?”; it would be fine with just “Sara”. This is preferable for a novice speaker, where the learner does not need to drill sentences, but can gain confidence faster since they understand and can answer back to the receiver. Gradually, the students can have a conversation on their own where they know how to ask questions about a person and present themselves.

Other activities Lundberg (2016) advocates when teaching English are songs, rhymes and dramas. Singing is an effective tool to learn pronunciation and to get that flow when speaking. Songs and music have a relaxing effect and give the students an opportunity to use the English orally and in a safe place, since everyone is singing they do not have to feel omitted. Melody and rhythm help the students to remember the words and phrases, and anchor it in the long-term memory. Lundberg add that researchers claim that students’ interests in song and music has a connection to their communicative ability. Research also shows that students who sing a lot in English are more likely to speak without being shy. Rhymes have the same effect as songs and are fun because the students tie their tongues trying to make the rhymes. Rhymes are often short and easy to
remember, and most of the rhymes have actions included, which makes it easier to remember. Dramas is also good for the students, which could make them feel safe with either dressing up or using dolls when speaking and interacting in English.

**Scaffolding**

Gibbons (2015) states that the term *scaffolding* first was used by Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976; Gibbons 2015) in their examination of parent-child talk in the early years. Scaffolding is a temporary structure that is put up in the process of creating or repairing a building. Scaffolding is not another word for help. Rather, it is a special kind of assistance that helps learners in moving towards new concepts, skills, or level of understanding. Scaffolding is a temporary assistance by which a teacher helps a learner know how to do something so that later the learner will be able to complete a similar task alone, by, for example, using speaking exercises. These activities could, for example, be solving subject-based problems: developing recommendations for improving the school environment, for example. As Vygotsky also stated once, what a child can do with support today, he or she can do alone tomorrow.

**Scaffolding Speaking and Interaction**

According to Gibbons (2015), the first things a young child learns to do is to talk about “here and now”, to refer to the on-going activities and objects in their environment. Here-and-now language happens in contexts where both speakers can see each other, and where there are gestures, facial expressions and visual clues to help the communication. When you talk with very young children, you will be aware that they do not always provide you with enough information for you to understand them. Words such as *here* and *it* are perfectly understandable to speakers who could see what was being referred to. But if two children are talking to each other through the phone, they would have to express themselves differently and more details would have to be provided. As children get older, they gradually become able to use the English language in a clearer way to refer to things that are not in their immediate surroundings.

Lundahl (2014) states that the workbooks that schools mostly use for interaction activities are built up with some scaffolding and have a progression through the book
with different variations of scaffolding. The scaffolding could be pictures to the words you can choose from when you answer a question. Two persons drawn where one of them is asking the question and the other one is answer the question where the sentence is written with an open ending where the student can choose themselves the answer. Later in the workbooks, the pictures disappear, and the sentences are built in tables where the student themselves can build their sentences choosing the words how they would like to speak and interact from a given template.
Methodology

The interviews focus on teachers out in the field that teaches English in the grades K-3. In this study the teachers that we interviewed will be referred to as teacher one (T1), teacher two (T2) and teacher three (T3). The teachers were selected randomly after emailing schools and asking if they could participate in an interview about speaking in the English subject. According to Alvehus (2013) it is very common for a qualitative research to be based on interviews. In many ways, an interview offers an effective tool for the qualitative method, for example by integrating with its respondents and asking for motives, feelings and finding out how different people are observing a occurrence. We found three teachers that were placed in the same county but in different socio-cultural areas. These teachers are relevant to our research since they are teaching English to students in our future profession age-group.

Ethical Considerations

According to Alvehus (2013) ethical aspects must be addressed. When interviewing someone, consent must be obtained. However, through interviews, information could be leaked, and the researcher must then have a way to deal with this. According to Bryman (2008) the ethical principles have been broken down into four main areas:

- If there is harm to the participants of the interview
- If there is absence of informed consent
- If there is an intrusion of privacy
- If there is imposture involved

In the first area we thought of making the participants and their schools anonymous to protect them and make them feel more comfortable in answering our questions. We also recorded our interviews but only with sounds. As Bryman (2008) states that qualitative research is hard to make completely anonymous we decided to make the county anonymous to make it harder to identify the schools as well as the teachers for the readers.

In the second area, if there is an absence of informed consent we informed the participant what the research was about and that they would be anonymous in our study.
The information was described in the email that we sent to the teachers, where we asked for consent for participation. They were also informed that they were allowed to answer in Swedish or in English. We have also mentioned that they could withdraw from the interview and answer as they like and feel comfortable with. We also made sure to say that the recording was only for us to remember what has been said during the interview.

For the third area, we have confirmed their privacy by ensuring their names will not be published or shared with anyone who is not engaged in our degree project; their names will only be known to us (the authors), and not even shared with our supervisor.

In the fourth area, we have informed the participants that they can read our degree project when it is finished to make them feel certain that our study is about what we have said it would be.

The Interviewed Teachers of This Study

Because of the limited time frame of this study, we found it crucial for the teachers to be available and ready for the interviews shortly after we contacted them. The main focus of our interviewees was that they were K-3 teachers teaching English. We contacted four different schools in the same county and ended up getting contact with schools from different socio-economic areas. This is not something that we planned. The chosen schools were selected randomly in our contact list from our internship. We emailed the schools’ administration office where we were handed out different teachers that wanted to participate in the interview. Two teachers were very positive and excited to meet us while the third teacher called in sick and the fourth did not respond to our email until two days before the interview. Therefore, we ended up interviewing three different teachers. We sent out the questions beforehand just to prepare the teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The interviewees</th>
<th>Years of teaching</th>
<th>Years of teaching English</th>
<th>Time spent on English per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 hours per week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this study the teachers that we interviewed will be referred to as teacher one (T1), teacher two (T2) and teacher three (T3). The results include a description of a typical English lesson from every teacher, strategies that are being used to develop the interaction and speaking skills and what activities they use among others. The teachers’ backgrounds are described in the diagram which shows that T1 has the least amount of experience and the most hours per week in the weekly schedule. T2 has fifteen years of teach experience and ten years of teaching English. T2 teaches English thirty minutes per week in half class. T3 has twelve years of experience of teaching and four years of the English subject. T3 teaches English one hour per week.

**Semi-structured Interviews**

The interviews that were included in this study were semi-structured. Bryman (2008) stress that a semi-structured interview is when the researcher has a list of questions of fairly specific topics that needs to be covered. Here the interviewee has a great deal of liberty in how to reply the interviewer. Questions that are not included in the guide can be asked as the interviewer catch up on things said by the interviewees. But in both cases, the interview process is flexible. Also, the emphasis must be on how the interviewee understands events and issues. According to Alvehus (2013) a semi-structured interview is the most common one.

**The Procedure**

Our questions for these interviews were well structured and carefully thought through. It was in our biggest interest to include speaking and interaction in our questions because these are words that play a big part in this study. As soon as we came up with the
research questions we started emailing different schools in one county. We contacted the teachers and made appointments with them for the interviews, this took some time since we received many declined answers and had to email further schools; in total this took approximately two weeks. We decided to send out the interview questions in advance to the participating teachers because we wanted to prepare them beforehand so that the answers that we received were developed and thought through. However, the questions were sent only the night before the interview, so the teachers did not get a lot of time to prepare themselves. The interviews were recorded and although it might have intimidated some teachers, we found it important for our study to receive clear and understandable answers.

The interviews all took place in the teachers’ classrooms where we could observe the classroom atmosphere and this was. The teachers were all recorded so that we could use the material for writing this study correctly. Both authors in this study were equally involved in the interviews. Two of the interviews were conducted in English while one in Swedish.

Analysis

After conducting the interviews, we chose to exclude some parts from the interviews as they were of no relevance to the study. The relevant parts were carefully listened to and the tape-analysis, were transcribed for this study. We also chose to exclude pauses as well as fillers, such as “eh”, as they did not serve a purpose for the study.
Results and Discussion

This following part will include an analysis, discussion and a comparison of our previous research in relation to our research findings. We hope to answer our research questions with the help of our results and compare to what other researchers advocate. This part will also compare the teachers’ chosen methods and be linked to different theories that are relevant.

A Typical English Lesson

T1 plans lessons after the beliefs of what the students need. She starts the lesson with explaining in Swedish the goals and purpose of the lesson. She has the same structure in all her subjects. After she has explained the lesson in Swedish, she starts speaking in English and translates to Swedish because the students are in various levels of English. Then she starts revisiting what they have done previously and discusses what they had learned. T1 works a lot on the whiteboard, where she writes new words and other key words for the lesson that she believes the students need to know and learn. Then she follows what her students need which is a lot of dialogue and speaking. She does not spend a lot of time on focusing on writing and their spelling. She found out that her students know many basic words but not how to talk about them and make sentences with it. At the moment, she has a focus on how to speak with action verbs and pronouns to make sentences with it. Once they have collected words together and translated them, she plays a game where they had to control a robot and ask questions.

During her lessons, the students speak a lot of Swedish because they do not have the vocabulary and knowledge of how to put a sentence together. When the students speak Swedish to each other, she walks around and reminds them and asks them “How can we say this in English?” and they try and help each other to speak English.

T1 teacher believes it is the speaking and interaction that get the most time, but since there are students who cannot and will not speak, she also spends some time on writing. After they learned something new, the learners work with worksheets where they write new words and sentences. She would like to spend more time at speaking and interacting, which she believes she does; but it is hard since the students seem to find it
easier to write. She feels this is wrong since the students do not hear themselves talk then and she feels she needs to get better at putting more time into speaking.

T2 has 10 years of experience of the teacher profession. T2 explained that the students in the grade 2 are quite young and have not developed so much in the English language yet. T2 involves a book called *Magic*, which the class tends to use and to listen to songs and watch movies, because the book can be connected to the computer. In this book, the students get to learn new vocabularies and phrases in an exciting context. T2 uses these tools for the students to repeat afterwards, both after the teacher and after the people involved in the movies. This is because T2 believes that the students need scaffolding to succeed in their development in form of repetition. After speaking English in the classroom, the teacher translates every sentence into Swedish for the students to get a better understanding.

T2 believes that the best way to learn to speak English is to sing songs because it comes naturally and it is easy for the students to sing along with rhythms. During her lessons, the students practice their listening and speaking skills the most because she feels that they are too young and undeveloped to write. The learners see the words in various texts, when they read after the teacher, but they do not read themselves. Some of her high achieving students, try to speak as much English as they can during her lessons. They mostly talk about their interests such as YouTube and games that they play on their spare time. There is only one learner who speaks a lot of English during her lessons. A student asks for permission to go to the toilet every now and then, but that student is the only one in her class to take the initiative to speak.

T3 has twelve years of experience of the teacher profession where she taught English for about four years. She starts every lesson by explaining the goals and purposes of the lesson, in Swedish. T3 also introduces some words and phrases, for example foods, that are going to be used during the lesson and then she puts the words and phrases up on the whiteboard where she translates them in front of her students. She explained that the focus in every lesson lays on explanation and translation to get the learners to follow, she also mentioned that this is her focus since the learners are not developed in English yet. Besides explaining words and phrases T3 involves movies, videos, games and songs into her lessons. The learners are familiar with the game *Pick a color* where both
students and teachers are provided with materials needed to speak, write and listen. T3 explained that during her lessons she like to include all elements for an effective English learning.

**Chosen Strategies to Develop the Interaction Skills and Reasons for Their Use**

T1 sometimes only speaks in English and ask her students who have a higher level of English to translate what she has just said, which she believes will challenge her high achieving students and benefit her low achievements students. She always encourages them to answer in English; they are allowed to answer in Swedish, but then she asks, “How can we say this in English?”, and all of the students help to translate, since there is such a broad variation of English levels. She also uses strategies like having group work or peer activities, because she believes that the students find it more comfortable to speak with their peers than speaking with the teacher or in front of everyone. She wants the students to have fun and be comfortable when using and speaking English, which is why she does not use workbooks and text in her lessons.

T1, if she feels comfortable, can speak English the whole lesson because she has students who have a higher level of English and can translate to their peers. She believes that this has become a challenge for the other because it is almost the same students who are the translators, and the other students want to be translators as well, so they are trying to guess what she has said.

T2 uses strategies such as “exit tickets” in every English lesson to develop the students speaking and interaction. Before the students exit the classroom, it is mandatory for them to say something in English, for example, when the teacher asks, “What is your favorite colour?” the students answer back in English. She also described that they use strategies such as repetition of words and sentences. T2 uses English at the beginning, but soon after the words or sentences are translated into Swedish. T2 also says she does not have any specific strategies but that she wants to encourage her students to try to speak even if it is difficult and they feel embarrassed. Since they have limited time each
week, T2 says she focuses on speaking and wants the students to repeat a lot, in that way the students practice their pronunciation.

T3 uses peer activities to develop the interaction and speaking skills. Her main point is to go after the EPA-model (enskilt, par, alla) where the learners themselves must think and formulate themselves, then work in pairs in order for a dialogue or argumentation to be created. Finally, the pairs present in full-class where the other students get to listen to their classmates. T3 explains, the reason she works after this model is to involve everyone perspective, the learning takes place through social interaction with the target language. The speaking skills is developed with others and therefore need a learning environment full of interactions T3 also uses a strategy where she prepares the learners, and explains why English is so beneficial for them. This way, the students are prepared and understood with future opportunities. Such as talking to people from all over the world.

The strategies used by the teachers, that we summarized based on the results of the interviews are; speaking with a target language, students as translators, peer work, exit tickets with a focus on questions and answers and repetitive drills. Some of these strategies, for example peer work and repetitive drills are common for all three teachers.

**Do the Strategies Align with Previous Findings and Theories?**

T1 explained that during her lessons, and mostly during her instructions, she often uses a strategy where she ask the students who have a higher knowledge of English to translate what she just said to their peers. She believes that this both challenges her high achieving students and benefits her low achieving students. This is in align with Vygotsky's theory that students should also learn and interact from their peers. She always encourages her students to speak in English, even if her students do not know how to say a word in English. When a student approaches and says something in Swedish, she always asks the other students for help to translate the sentence into English. This is aligned with what the curriculum states that the students should be
integrated and included in the lesson and that is not only the teacher who is speaking and teaching things, which is the social cultural perspective. Read’s (2007) statement can also be connected to this, that is because T1 considers her learners’ different levels and therefore challenges them at different levels. T1 also mentioned that being a translator is something that all her students now are striving to be. T1 is working according to Read’s speaking skills that are divided into two areas: spoken interaction and spoken production.

Therefore, she also uses the strategy to work in pairs. She believes that the learners find it more comfortable to speak and engage with each other if they talk in pairs. T3 agrees with working in pairs, and she says that the reason she works this way is to involve everyone's perspective. The learning takes place through social interaction with the target language, which is in align with what another researchers state, such as Lundahl (2015). The speaking skills are developed with others and therefore need a learning environment full of interaction. This is something Vygotsky and the social cultural perspective agree upon as mentioned. Vygotsky was interested in the learning potential of the individual by recognizing the fact that all children were special learners in some way. He was quite interested in exploring what children could achieve with the help and support of a more knowledgeable partner. According to the social cultural perspective, the learning takes place through social interaction with the target language. The speaking skills are developed with others and therefore need a learning environment full of interaction.

Furthermore, Gardner’s (Pinter, 2006) theory of multiple intelligence can be applied when learning a foreign language. The learners learn the language through a variation of activities that the teachers use to some degree, with singing, dancing, games, dramas, presentations and repeating after a narrator. We do not know how much visual aid they get, other than the teacher writing new words on the board for the learners to see the word written and spoken at the same time. Since most of the learners do not have Swedish as a first language, it could be good to show a picture to the words as well. This can also be considered a form of scaffolding. As Pinter (2006) states, teachers need to consider the learners’ multiple intelligence because all students learn differently. Therefore, it is good that the teachers use different forms to teach the children to interact and learn vocabulary and chunks for interacting. When the learners find it motivating
and fun, they will soon start to copy the chunks, songs and rhymes that are being said and soon want to try and speak and use this by themselves. This is often learnt as an unanalyzed chunk (Pinter, 2006).

T2 uses a strategy where she uses exit tickets. This strategy has the purpose of getting the learners to speak, where she asks questions from the lesson or questions they should be able to answer, such as “what is your favorite colour?”. She also uses English when she speaks to her students, but translates into Swedish afterwards. She explained that she did not have any specific strategies that she used, and that her main focus in her classroom was to get her students to speak and interact. This is often done by repeating after the teacher or movies and songs. This can be connected to the cognitive perspective, where the learners pay attention to different key words in sentences. Lightbown and Spada (2013) state, after the researcher DeKeyser, that when the students practiced something enough it becomes automatized, which the teacher’s questions for exit tickets might be and the students can ask these questions themselves when they want to. Schmidt (2001; Lightbown & Spada, 2013) claimed that this will, for example, help the students understand the context of songs and movies. This will naturally lead them to not noticing the grammatical part of the language, or if they need to focus on the new words they do not understand and try to understand them, which will lead to a lack of understanding in the context.

In the literature review, we mentioned some strategies that Lightbown and Spada (2013) revealed as concerning the cognitive perspective. However, we can only discern one of these strategies used in the classroom of our interviewed teachers. If we were to discuss these strategies further, we would have to do observations in their lessons to get a better understanding for which strategies they use. The interaction hypothesis, where the students learn how to ask clarifying- and comprehension questions, is a good strategy to teach your students, which means that they can keep a conversation going in a real situation. We could not figure out if this was a strategy that any of the teachers use, other than the teachers themselves asking their students these questions. The other strategy “the noticing hypothesis” is the strategy we can see that the teachers use to a certain extent according to their answers. It is the part where they mention the role of practice, which should be interactive, meaningful and focus on task-essential forms, some of the teachers can develop their form of practices of interaction.
Chosen Activities Used to Develop Interaction Skills and the Reasons for Their Use

T1 teacher uses songs, games and role playing during her lessons. At the end of every lesson, they sing a song that the students have chosen, and it is always the same song. Even if she feels that the song is too childish and easy for them, they love it and want to sing it. When they sing, they always dance as well and do as they do in the video they are watching on YouTube. During these activities, all the students are active, and she believes they like doing them because it is different and joyful. Sometimes the students get to choose the activities they would like to do, and when they are going to sing during a lesson the student can pick which songs they would like to sing. When they have finished what they are supposed to do during one lesson are they allowed to go in internet and play elevspel.se in the English subject. They cannot choose completely freely because she wants them to choose something that will challenge and benefit their learning. Her activities always change and progress during the lessons and grades, but she finds it hard since all the students have different levels of knowledge.

T2 uses a great deal of songs in her lessons because she feels that it is easier for the learners to learn and that they are more integrated with each other. Even if students pronounce some words wrong, it does not matter because the song is playing and the student is focused on the lyrics and not what the other students are singing. She chose to use singing in her lessons because she feels that the learners appreciate it and that it comes naturally. The songs T2 chooses are repetitive and easy, and she believes the students learn more from this. The activities the students choose themselves are songs they already know or are exit tickets. The book she is using now, Magic, has not been used before, but she believes that there is progression in the book, also between books in other grades. T2 also describes that the class watched many videos from UR, and she worked from the series called The Game, which she believes was too hard for them, but it had subtitles so it worked anyway. She is aware of the students’ interests and where
they are integrated with English in their spare time, but she does not integrate their interests into her lessons at the moment.

T3 uses support questions to get her learners to develop their speaking skills. The questions are used by the students where they ask each other questions and write down the answers. T3 involves by asking “How can you ask this in English?” Later, these questions are presented in front of the class and the teacher puts the interviews up on the wall for the learners to see and reflect upon their doings. Another activity she uses to develop speaking skills is to make the students read one question in front of the whole class and see if there is anyone who can answer, the student who knows the answer is the one to go up and pick a new question. The learners have also been introduced to games on spel.se where they love to do different exercises and where even listening and reading is involved. T3 says that the students do not get a lot of time to influence the lessons. She says that the lessons are already structured and organized but when they have time in spare, the students get to decide what they want to do of relevant activities.

Are the Activities in Align with Previous Findings and Theories?

As previously mentioned before, Lundahl (2015) states that many foreign language learners think that being able to speak is what matters, and we agree with that. The other skills are also important, but being able to ask for information, to express yourself, to tell a story and to explain something is important. Moreover, this constitutes what it means to know a language. The learners of a foreign language in the early years have a mix of the different theories, where the cognitive perspective has an emphasis on meaning and noticing as well as the social constructivist, which has an emphasis on dialogue, cooperation and scaffolding. The behaviorists perspective also plays a major part in early language learning, where most of the learning has a model based on imitation, memorization, reinforcement and repetition. The early stages of learning a new language is about building a repertoire of chunks and strings of language that are used repeatedly. We could see the mix in our result and will discuss what the different teachers uses for perspective when teaching English.
As we observed in the result, all teachers did not teach English the same way. T2 and T3 had a teacher's guide that they followed to create their lessons, which they got from a textbook and movies/series from UR. T2 and T3 use activities from the teacher's guide, where they often use textbooks and movies. Activities based from this are often associated with the behaviorists perspective, where Lundahl (2014) states that the tasks that are connected to the textbooks are, to ask and answer questions in a given form and have given answers to memorize.

Lightbown and Spada (2013) state two primary processes in the language development and how these two teachers plan their lessons can be connected to one of them, the practice part, where the learners repeat and practice some sentences and phrases that the learners need to know and learn. Furthermore, this is also because the students are mostly drilling new vocabulary and repeating after the teacher or the narrator from the book or movie, which the students to T2 and T3 do. They are often doing this together, which, according to research, is a good way to do it, because the students feel safe since no one in particular is really listening to them, which the teachers we interviewed agrees with. The students are imitating the narrator and are trying to memorize the new vocabularies. From workbooks the learners have speaking and interaction activities such as dialogues. The dialogues, is according to other researchers, often written in a formal way and the students are meant to memorize them and then act them out in pairs. This can be a good way to learn phrases and chunks of words, but when these dialogues happen in real life they are not as formal (Lundberg 2016). Lundahl asserts that the workbooks have a lot of scaffolding in the form of pictures and how the dialogues could and should be, but it could also be that these dialogues are not authentic and make the students say things they are not really doing, just to practice and drill words.

T1 has a textbook that she works with sometimes, but her main focus lays on interaction between students through different activities that she mostly creates herself. All teachers use songs as activities to interact and speak during their lessons. When we asked why, all of them stated that it was a safe way to get most of the students to try and speak. Since students sing in unison, one cannot really hear each other's voices, which is in align with what other research, such as Lundahl (2016), has claimed is a good activity to use to get the students speaking and interacting. Most songs have actions, which leads
students to a greater understanding of the meaning of the words. This could be connected to Gardner's (Pinter 2006) theory of multiple intelligence, where the students learn new vocabulary through songs and actions to almost each word.

T1 also uses authentic drama situations, which such researchers as Lundberg (2016), advocate for younger students. When students get to act like another person, it makes them more susceptible to interaction. When the learning is authentic, it makes the students more motivated to learn since it is based on situations that can happen in real life. T1 had other activities such as art where a student could come up to the front of the class and make a simple presentation of their drawing to the others. It could be as little as just one sentence but that’s alright since the main key was to encourage the students to speak in front of others. This is clearly stated in the curriculum for the English subject, where it says that students should be able to express themselves through communication. Read (2007) agrees that the learning should be authentic and advocates frameworks that will make the students willing to speak and encourage them to speak in authentic and real purposes. In these activities, the teacher should also have a framework for fostering activities in the interactive activities where the students learn norms when interacting with others.

T1, for example, made a dramatization of a restaurant visit. She and her students made up the restaurant situation where they had to come up with what kind of persons should be included in the play and what could happen and what they would say. This included students more in the lessons and made it feel more authentic for them, which motivates them to learn. This is more aligned with the social cultural perspective of learning, since the students interact and learn from their peers as much as from the teacher.

Constructing a script together can also be connected to what Swain and Lapkin (2002; Lighbown & Spada, 2013) have discovered as the term: collaborative dialogue, where the students are learning by talking to each other. This, as mentioned before, means that the learners co-construct linguistic knowledge while engaging in production tasks that simultaneously draw their focus to meaning and form. After T1’s learners made up the script, they were divided into smaller groups, where they practiced their play. This also makes the students feel safer when they speak since not the whole class is listening to them when they are interacting with each other. When the students where rehearsing
their parts, they would present their plays to each other. It is also aligned with what Read (2007) advocates, that frameworks for speaking activities will make the students willing to speak and encourage them to use English for real purposes that they can relate to. This can also be seen as a fostering activity where the students learn different norms, such as when one is speaking the other one is listening and showing respect for others’ opinions. She also advocates that speaking activities should be personalized and offer different choices that will lead to willingness and participation, and that will make the students feel like they have ownership of their language, which we believe that this activity does. Gibbons (2015) states that these kinds of dramatizations can be seen as a form of scaffolding, where the learners are in a safe place with peers, learn how a conversation at a restaurant can occur and, later on, can handle these types of situations by themselves in real life.

We found that the teachers were not using games as much as we thought for teaching interaction. The students only got to play on elevspel.se, and the teachers agreed that they were not games for an interactive purpose. We experienced apps where students interacted with computers or iPad through games. These apps are linked to the behavioristic perspective since the students are just imitating words and phrases that are written or read out loud, and they move forward in the game by saying and pronouncing the words correctly. This is also a safe way for the students who are embarrassed to speak since they are only speaking to the game and everyone else is busy doing the same thing. The students get feedback from the game if their input is correct. We believe that this could be a good way for learners to gain confidence in speaking and interacting as well. Gibbons (2015) is aligned with this as she states that games in groups can be developing their language and encourage them to speak more which will build on their confidence, because they would have a focus on speaking.

When we asked the teachers if the students had any influence on the class activities, we found that they had very little or no influence at all. T1 let the students choose a song if they were singing in the lesson, and they also chose a song to end every lesson with. All students sing this song and loved it, even if the T1 thinks it is childish and too easy for them. This shows that even if T1’s students are on different levels in their language development, everyone is joining in because they think it is funny and find it motivating to speak when singing. All the teachers know what their students’ interests are and
know when their students encounter English in their spare time. However, even though they know this, they do not consider these things when they are planning their lessons. Both Lundahl (2015) and Lundberg (2016) state that the English subject should be motivating and fun for the learners, and we cannot see why you would not consider this when planning lessons. The teacher who seems to do, this but to a very small extent, is T1, who uses YouTube to find songs. The other teachers use movies that are in the students’ interest. However, they use movies because it seems easier for them since there is a teacher’s guide from UR that they follow since they do not seem to put too much time into planning and having English in school.

The Difference Between Experienced and Less Experienced Teachers

T1’s students start learning English in second grade. When the students are in third grade, they have 2 hours per week. The teacher sometimes divides it into two one-hour lessons and sometimes has a double lesson in one, depending on what she has planned. For T1 it depends how much time she has for interaction, during one lesson. Sometimes she takes a whole lesson for interaction, which is somewhere between 40-60 minutes. Further, they have role plays where the students speak a lot, since they first practice the phrases in a group and then show the play for the rest of the class. Sometimes it is just at the end of a lesson for about 10 minutes, but it depends on what she is teaching. Her high achieving students speak English to her during other lessons if they do not want the others to understand what they are saying. Sometimes even during recess the learners speak English to each other.

T1 teacher tries her best to integrate English into other subjects, but mostly art and music. One time when they had the topic “favorite seasons”, they talked about their favorite seasons and then they painted their favorite season and wrote a sentence in English for each picture. Then they presented their picture to each other and hung them up on the walls in the classroom. Another time they had to perform at the
Christmas break the song “We are the world”. They sang it in Swedish, but the last verse they sang in English. T1 thought it was beautiful and sung perfectly by them. She integrates English in almost all subjects with words and texts.

T2 answered that English is integrated 30 minutes per week and that the main focus is on the speaking skills. T2 started to teach English for the students in the second grade. The teacher sometimes integrates English more if the students want to use English more than what is offered. Every week the students have weekly meetings called “klassråd” where they are able to influence what they are going to do during some lessons. Sometimes the students during these meetings have requested to do more English activities.

T2 does not integrate English consciously into other subjects. Sometimes, the students talk English outside of the classroom. There could be questions from YouTube clips for example. They also sometimes try to interact with the teacher in English on recesses or other lessons were she correct them of how to ask and pronounce and answer them in Swedish or in English. She does not lay her focus on English at this moment, because she believes the focus should be on Swedish and math in school.

T3 answered that she teaches English 60 minutes per week. She started to teach English for the students in the second grade. She also mentions that she sometimes divides her lessons into two 30-minute lessons. And into half class because this way, the students benefit more from each lesson in forms of scaffolding and support. Sometimes during recess, the teacher notices the learners speaking English with each other which makes them integrate even more.

T3 does not integrate English into other subjects, sometimes during recess the teacher notice the learners speaking English with each other which makes them interact outside of the English classroom. Other than that, they only use English during English class.
Is There a Difference Between Experienced and Less Experienced Teachers?

As demonstrated in the table in the method section, there is quite a difference between each teacher regarding their time invested in the subject each week and in how many years they have been teaching English. T1, who has the least amount of experience, teaches English two hours a week. T2, who has the most amount of experience, teaches English only thirty minutes every week. T3, who also has a long experience, teaches her students English one hour per week. This is something that we found very interesting.

T1 described that she starts to teach English in the second grade, which the other teachers do as well. She sometimes divides her lessons into two one-hour lessons, or she has a double lesson depending on what she has planned. T2 described that she does not use English more than thirty minutes every week, and if the language is used more, it is because the students speak on their breaks. T3 explained that she would like to divide her class into two smaller groups where she can assist and scaffold the students for a deeper understanding. She believes that this would be possible if they were divided into a half class. This means that the students would only be taught English thirty minutes every week. As Barnes (2008) states, if the lesson is not connected to the existing schemes in their students’ life, they will soon have forgotten what they have learnt from one lesson to the other. We also agree with this and that if they have too little time with the English language each week it will still be forgotten to the next lesson the week after.

However, we also believe that the difference can be that the teachers are in different generations. T1 is younger than the other two and has a more recent education in how to teach English and possibly has a different understanding of how important the English language is as a global and international language. The teachers’ education can be different in that way and that is why they have a bit different learning style, strategies and more time spent on English than T1. T2 and T3 probably had their education when the curriculum of ‘94 applied and that could be a reason why they have used other strategies than T1. When we look at what is stated in the curriculum of ‘94, the goal is for the students to communicate in speaking and writing in English. The upgraded
curriculum is far more developed and states what a student should have met and know in the English subject, also what possibilities the students could gain in the future by knowing the language and culture. As quoted in the curriculum of 11’ (p.32): “Knowledge of English thus increases the individual’s opportunities to participate in different social and cultural contexts, as well as in international studies and working life.”.

As mentioned in literature review, we believe that students are far more developed in the English language than that they have to wait to continue their learning till the second grade. This is because they are influenced from a very young age with various media in today's society, which gives them a chance to develop further. Lundahl (2015) mentioned that students in grade four do not start English from scratch, and we agree. Because even if the students are integrated with English from grade two in school, there is a lot of language they have already learned in their spare time through the different medias, as mentioned before. T2 said that her students speak English on their breaks sometimes, and we believe this is because they are eager to learn more and have an interest in the language.

Lundberg (2016) writes that singing is an effective tool to learn pronunciation and to get that flow when speaking. To use this tool for interaction between students is extremely beneficial in the long term, not only on the teacher's thirty-minute lessons, but also in other subjects, for example, music. We think that the difference of the students’ English level would develop remarkably if you integrated English more in other subject as well, just a little each day. The English language is taught as a foreign language since all the students do not have Swedish as their mother tongue, even though we can presume there is a difference in how the Swedish language is taught and how the English language is taught. This is in align with the cognitive perspective, where they acknowledge what the learners’ prior knowledge about the language and their perception of the new language.
Conclusion

This part will include relevant aspects from the findings of our study, and previous research, to answer our research questions. This section will also include limitations of the study and proposals for further research will be presented.

Our research questions are as follows: What strategies and activities are teachers using to develop students speaking skills regarding interaction? What are the reasons for using such interaction with strategies and activities? Is there a difference in experienced and less experienced teachers? The findings of our research have led to multiple examples of activities and strategies used during lessons to develop students´ speaking skills in forms of interaction. Not all teachers used the same strategies and activities in the classroom, but all of them where positive to the idea of social interaction, to develop the learners´ ability to work in groups as well as to support each other. This is encouraged by the ideas of Vygotsky (Pinter, 2006). There is also a difference in the teacher's experience and how they teach English, we try to figure out what could be a cause to this.

Previous findings indicate that many teachers use songs, rhymes and games to develop the students´ speaking skills, regarding interaction. Pinter (2006) concludes that after learners are exposed to English by listening, they soon want to participate in interactions with other students and teachers. It is, for example, very common for learners to copy simple songs and rhymes to learn English. Lundberg (2016) presents findings demonstrating that singing is an effective tool to learn pronunciation and to get a flow when speaking. Songs and music have a relaxing effect and give the learners an opportunity to use English orally. Furthermore, Lundahl (2014) states that the learning environment must be a safe place and that the activities used in the classroom should include games, drama and singing. Lundberg (2016) also states that singing makes it feel safe for the students to speak since no one in particular is listening to them, which means that no one will point out their mistakes, in for example, pronunciation.

Further findings present that all teachers used the strategy to work in pairs. Gibbons (2015) reports that games in groups could be a language development situation for learners. This would focus on making speaking their main priority, which could process
their language further. It also helps build up the learners’ confidence and encourages them to speak. Slattery and Willis (2001) advocate pair and group work, since learners will get opportunities to use the language by asking and responding to questions. The reason for the used strategies and activities is mainly to get learners involved in every activity. T2 used a strategy that she calls an exit ticket, where she asks her students a simple question every lesson that the students should answer in English. Lightbown and Spada (2013) state, after the researcher DeKeyser, that when the students practiced something enough it becomes automatized, which the teacher’s questions for exit tickets might be. The students can ask these questions themselves when they want to. T1 uses a strategy where her high achieving students are used as translators that makes her other students want to strive to be a translator themselves, even if they must guess what she is saying. This is a good strategy to get her students involved with speaking and interacting. This is aligned with what many researchers state, that English should be fun and motivating for the student.

All interviews were structured and presented the same. Although, the different answers were quite remarkable. The teacher with the least teaching experience in English, integrated the subject the most every week. The two teachers with the most experience, integrated English the least. There is a big difference of how much time is integrated every week, this is something we do not know the purpose of, but would be interested in further research. We also observed that the time invested each week was not the only difference they had. The teacher with the most experience, taught English with a textbook or a movie as a base, where she used activities from the teacher's guide. The teacher with the least amount of experience only used a textbook as a complement to her teaching. She worked with a lot of role play, that both Read (2007) and Lundahl (2014) advocates. T1’s teaching is modern and authentic because she plans her lessons after the student's needs. She also integrates the most ideas from her students into her lessons where they sing songs in the end of every lesson. We found that an explanation to this could be the teachers education and that T2 and T3 was educated when the curriculum of ‘94 applied.
Limitations of the Study

The current study experienced several limitations, which may have affected our different findings. The participating teachers were all chosen randomly, which was made consciously. Our only criteria were that the teachers were teaching English in K-3. Even when pointing out that it will be a brief interview in English, many teachers chose to decline. This led to the results of less analyzation and comparisons of data. We only interviewed three teachers because of the time frame provided. Because of the low number of participants, we were not able to generalize the overall facts in the county.

An additional limitation was the amount of research found during this study. When searching for research that was relevant for this study, not many studies were found that contained interaction which was crucial for our study. Also, not many libraries and digital websites provided the right information about interaction for our specific age group. This led to the results of depending a great deal of our interviews, regarding interaction. There is a lack of research conducted on Swedish primary school levels; this must be revised.

Further Research

As previously mentioned, it would be in our interest to explore the differences between teachers with less experience and teachers with more experience deeper. Our suggestions for further research are based on interviews with plenty of teachers from a county to gain information for analyzation. Then comparing the teachers’ experiences, and research about what might be the cause of the different results. An example could be to interview various teachers from different neighborhoods and make a comparison to observe if a teacher with little experience, integrate English as much as another teacher with little experience. Also, compare if the teachers with more experience integrate English as much.

Another interesting factor to explore further is to compare what teacher has the most effective way of teaching. This means that we would have to observe the teachers’ lessons to get a clear view of what strategies they use, and which one that is more beneficial for the learners. Although this was not a focus in our study, we could not
exclude the thought from our minds. That is why we found this idea interesting to investigate further. We also feel that an observation to their English lessons would be needed to get a clearer answer of what strategies they are using during their lessons to develop the students’ interaction. Since we felt that the teachers had a hard time to give us a clear answer regarding this, perhaps because they are not confident in what sort of strategies to use.
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Appendix

Interview questions

- Hur många år har du undervisat i Engelska? How many years have you taught English?
- Beskriv, hur ser en typiskt Engelsk lektion ut för dig? Describe, how is your typical English lesson structured?
- Vad brukar eleverna göra under en typisk engelsk lektion? What do the students do during a typical English lesson?
- Hur mycket uppmuntrar du dina elever att svara på engelska? How much do you encourage your students to answer in English?
- Vilken förmåga (tala, skriva, lyssna och läsa) får mest utrymme och varför tror du det kommer sig? What skill (speaking, writing, listening, reading) gets more time during the lessons, and why do you think that is?
- Hur stort utrymme får de språkliga (talet) färdigheterna under dina lektioner? How much time do the speaking activities have during your lessons?
- Under hela veckan, hur mkt tid finner du till att göra engelska? During the week how much time do you find to teach English?
- Vad använder du för strategi för att utveckla elevers språkliga färdigheter? What strategy do you use to develop students speaking skills?
- Vilka sorts klassrumssaktiviteter använder du för att använda språket i Engelska? What kind of classroom activities do you use for speaking in English?
- Varför använder du dessa strategier? Why do you use such strategies?
- Vilka sorts strategier använder du för att uppmuntra dina elever att integreras med Engelskan? What kind of strategies do you use to encourage the students to interact in English?
- Hur reagerar eleverna till dessa aktiviteter? How do the students react to such activities?
- Talar dem engelska enbart under aktiviteterna? Do they tend to speak English only during the activities?
- Gillar eller ollitar de aktiviteterna? Do they like or dislike the activities?
• Får de själva välja aktiviteter ibland? Do they get to choose activities themselves?
• Om ja, vilka aktiviteter? If so, what activities?
• Finns där någon gång där du inte använder engelska i klassrummet? Are there any times when you don’t use English in the English classroom?
• Om ja, vad beror det på? What are the reasons for not using English in the classroom all the time?
• Skiljer sig aktiviteterna något i olika nivåer? Do the activities change from the different grades(games)?
• Integrerar du engelskan i något annat ämne? Do you integrate English in any other subjects?