Accommodating understanding in English: An applied linguistic analysis of UK and International university students navigating TESOL tasks

Rachel Emma Wicaksono

BA (Hons), MA (Oxon), MA TESOL, RSA Dip TEFLA, FHEA

Abstract

Two critical incidents at a UK university where I teach, and teach about teaching, English to speakers of other languages (TESOL), provided the impetus for this study. The incidents exemplified and challenged routine, taken-for-granted aspects of the overlapping contexts (TESOL, internationalising universities and Applied Linguistics) in which they occurred. In response to the critical incidents, I designed a series of classroom tasks that required my UK and International students to record interviews with each other. These interviews provided the data analysed in the first phase of this study.

In phase one of my study, I explore the relationships between accommodation, intelligibility and (mis)understanding implied by the critical incidents. My two overarching research questions are:

- in classroom talk between UK and International students navigating TESOL tasks, what conversational adjustments occur?
- what are the relationships between these adjustments and (mis)understanding?

Underpinning the second question is a series of four sub-questions. These four questions aim to explore the sequencing of conversational adjustments and misunderstanding, the relationship between adjustments and the contexts of the interaction, the global and local relationship of adjustments to (mis)understanding, and whether adjustments and misunderstanding are a problem or a resource for the interactants.

I find that, in international situations, there are various ways of (un)successfully communicating meaning in evolving contexts that are oriented to, re-created and contested through talk. My findings provide support for the importance of noticing aspects of the context which may affect accommodation in talk, and of an awareness of one's own talk and its effects on one's interlocutor. Furthermore, the findings suggest that adjusting one's talk in context-appropriate ways is the key to maximising the potential for task achievement. In phase two of the study, I describe how I translated the processural experience of working on the analysis of my data into an awareness-raising task for my students. I conclude by reflecting on the implications of my study for TESOL and for internationalising universities.

Declaration

I hereby declare that, except where explicit attribution is made, the work presented in this thesis is entirely my own.

Word count (exclusive of abstract, acknowledgements, declaration, table of contents, reflective statement, appendices and the bibliography but including the list of abbreviations): 44,809 words.

_____

Rachel Emma Wicaksono

July 2012

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

The Reflective Statement

In this reflective statement I aim to examine how my professional and academic learning has been enhanced by my research activities within each component of the EdD programme. I will summarise my learning at each of the three stages of the programme and explore the links between academic learning and my professional practice. I will conclude with a summary and synthesis of my learning experience over the programme as a whole. But before considering the three components of the programme, I will begin with a brief account of my situation prior to the EdD.

Some people get to project their communicative practices as normal, effective or desirable, and others do not

As an undergraduate at the University of Oxford reading English language and literature, I found that some of my fellow students were either baffled or amused by the way I spoke. I had to work hard to convince them that, despite my regional accent, my *ideas* were neither (at least, not always) baffling nor amusing. My own interests in other places, other varieties of English and judgements about their speakers are grounded in this experience. These interests (and an economic recession in the UK) led to training and a career in teaching English as an additional language, first in India and then in Indonesia.

In Indonesia, I enrolled on a part-time MA TESOL at the Institute of Education (IOE). During my studies the 'Asian Tiger' economic and political crisis created terrible financial troubles for the school. Through systematically collecting and analysing language learning preference data from students we were able to design and cost courses that were financially sustainable. Our success was research-informed and much of that research was inspired by the MA TESOL. An interest in the economics of education continued to develop and, in order to learn more, I began a part-time MPhil/PhD at the IOE. As part of doctoral research project to assess the contribution of class size to attainment, I began a year-long study of English language learners in large and small classes at different levels of proficiency in my Indonesian school.

With the data collected, I decided to return to the UK. I soon discovered that the Cambridge ESOL proficiency test I had used was insufficiently sensitive to any

progress that the students might have made. At this stage, having no way of collecting any similar data, I was advised to transfer onto the EdD programme at the IOE.

On return to the UK I had started work at York St John University; a small university with a strong widening participation agenda, comprised of staff and students mainly from Yorkshire, Humberside and North East of England. My first job was as co-ordinator of, and teacher on, a small pre-undergraduate International Foundation Programme, including modules such as: British Culture, English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and Communication Skills. I was also part of team that designed an MA TESOL and taught a third year undergraduate module called Introduction to TESOL. The third year UK undergraduates were a revelation. The 'English' I had been teaching in Indonesia, and continued to teach in my EAP classes, had become different in many ways from its actual use. So, at York St John I saw again, in a different context, how some people get to project their communicative practices as normal, effective or desirable, and others do not.

The four projects which made up the taught component of the EdD provided a bridge between my thinking about effective language learning (as I did on the IOE MA TESOL) and (both on to and back to) thinking about how some uses of language are considered more effective than others. As I show in a later section of this piece, the EdD thesis developed this critical variationist-type thinking further, introducing an interactionist element.

The taught component

The four modules on the taught component of the EdD were: Foundations of Professionalism in Education (FPE); Methods of Enquiry 1 (MoE1); Methods of Enquiry 2 (MoE2); and Curriculum, Pedagogy and Assessment (CPA). My projects have comprised studies of: 'professionalism' in education management (FPE); the relationships between school resourcing and student outcomes (MOE1); the achievement of bilingual pupils in UK schools (MOE2); and the assessment of my international students' reflective writing (CPA). In this section, I summarise my learning on each module and explore the links with my professional practice.

My FPE project was a literature review of models of professionalism in education with particular focus on evidence-based management. Using examples from the changes we introduced at the school in Indonesia, I reflected on how evidence-based change management worked, not only because of the data we generated for our decision-making (which was important), but also in a 'performative' way. Asking questions and searching for evidence was how we faced the financial crisis as a team: together we were 'doing being' strategic. In other words, it was the *process* of doing evidence-based management, as much as its products, which helped our school survive. Writing the FPE developed my ability to link educational theory with practice, and to improve our practice in ways which had real benefits for the staff and students at the school.

In MoE1 I used the class size and learning outcomes project I had begun in Indonesia to review the literature on additional language acquisition and on the class size debate in education. The failure of the project meant that I wrote mainly about the problems of measuring educational attainment, and the various sources of bias that can undermine the validity and generalisability of research findings.

My MoE2 project analysed a data set comprising test scores of, and closed-question survey responses for, bilingual UK primary school pupils. I took national test results in English, Science and Maths and, using regression analysis, measured the contribution of 'English (not) spoken at home' (based on a closed survey question) to test scores. While the statistical evidence of the relationship between home language and achievement at primary school was significant, the MoE1 experience of critiquing quantitative research (and the responses of my largely qualitative researcher EdD cohort) enabled me to recognise the limitations of my work and make some suggestions for further research in this area.

For my CPA assessment, I used a reflective learning journal written by international students on a Communication Skills module at York St John to explore issues around equity in assessment. I considered the tension between institutionally normative, assimilationist ideas about 'appropriate' reflective writing and my students' struggle to write in ways which appeared 'authentic' to

their assessor (me). This assessment was my first use of qualitative data on the EdD, and, as such, bridged the gap between the taught component of the programme and the institution focused study (IFS) which followed.

The institution focussed study

My IFS was about mixed nationality and mixed ability assessed group work at York St John on an undergraduate Business Management module. The mixed methods research design included open-ended survey questions (to explore students' attitudes to mixed nationality group work) and ANOVA calculations (to test the strength of the relationship between the group mark and the mean individual marks of the students within the group). The design of the project required me to reflect on the practical and theoretical challenges of mixed methods research designs.

Some of the time in which I worked on the IFS was funded by a small grant from the Higher Education Academy Business Management, Accounting and Finance (BMAF) subject centre. I published the findings of the research as a book chapter and reviewed applications for BMAF funding for other small-scale research projects. The experience of working on a mixed methods project informed my teaching on the York St John MA TESOL Classroom Language Research and Dissertation modules.

The mixed methods IFS project was a transition phase between the use of quantitative research designs to explore behaviour which I had developed as a school manager in Indonesia, and a return to an earlier interest in the close/critical reading of events, texts and spoken discourse, originally developed as an undergraduate and extended by the CPA module. This change in focus from quantitative to qualitative approaches also coincided with a change of supervisor.

The thesis

While I was thinking about my thesis research proposal, two incidents happened in the Communication Skills and Introduction to TESOL modules I was teaching. These proved critical in my choice of the following broad aims for

my work (aims which were refined as I read and wrote). These aims were (initially) to:

- Explore changing ideas in Applied Linguistics, Sociolinguistics and TESOL about world and lingua franca Englishes, and 'native-' and 'non-native' speaker identities.
- Describe the ways in which UK and international students talked to each other in the interviews I set up as part of the Communication Skills and Introduction to TESOL modules.
- Interpret these ways of talking through comparison with relevant empirical and theoretical literature, as well as through the frameworks established by the institutional/professional contexts and by the students in interaction with each other.
- Work with my students to create evidence-based learning opportunities that raised their awareness of these frameworks, and their own role in creating and contesting them.

How and to what degree these aims developed and were achieved as I worked on the thesis will become clear in the main body of that work.

The time for the writing of my thesis was partly funded by research grants from: York St John University; the Higher Education Academy Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies subject centre; and the Birmingham City University CETL. The online 'tutorial' created with my students was published under a Creative Commons license, submitted to Jorum, the national database of open educational resources, and awarded a prize at an Association of Learning Technologies conference. I also published, with two colleagues, a textbook for advanced students of Applied Linguistics that was informed by much of the thinking and reading for the thesis.

Summary and synthesis

The process of writing for the EdD has not been one of simply finding the words to document data and contexts I already understood. Instead, it has involved the trying on, modifying and adopting of various written and spoken styles, and ways of thinking about educational research. The demands, constraints and

new vistas created throughout this process have turned my research out in certain ways. The process of writing for the EdD has also involved the production of a particular academic and professional subject: originally trained to interpret English, exposed to regional, social class and age-related variations in its use, trained again to teach and test an idealised version, and then learning again how its use in interaction both creates and contests ideas about what it is. This new subject has come about through a process of creating new academic and professional knowledge, and through a process of engagement in institutionally-sanctioned language practices. On completion of the EdD I intend to continue to think about ways of encouraging my students to reflect on how their talk (and their writing) constitutes their identities in particular ways, and on the reactions of their peers, teachers and the University to these identities.

In summary, through professional enquiry, reflection and the development of particular language practices, the EdD has given me the opportunity to: listen carefully to my participants and students; not be deterred by the constant mental and emotional effort that critical reflection requires; be flexible when the unanticipated occurs; interpret, not simply record, information; collaborate with critical colleagues, considering their alternative suggestions for research designs and explanations for findings; conduct research which provides a contribution to professional and academic knowledge, and which has clear implications for professional practice.

(1,944 words)

List of Abbreviations

BERA	British educational research association
CAT	Communication accommodation theory
EAP	English for academic purposes
EIL	English as an international language
ELF	English as a lingua franca
ELS	English language skills
ESOL	English for speakers of other languages
IATEFL	International association of teachers of English as a foreign language
IDP	International development programme
IELTS	International English language testing system
RP	Received pronunciation
SLA	Second language acquisition
TEFL	Teaching English as a foreign language
TESL	Teaching English as a second language
TESOL	Teaching English to speakers of other languages
UK	United Kingdom
VOICE	Vienna-Oxford international corpus of English

Chapter One - Background to the Research

Introduction

This study was inspired by two 'critical incidents' at an internationalising UK university where I teach, and teach about teaching, English to speakers of other languages (TESOL). Both incidents touched on the issue of misunderstanding, and both exemplified and challenged aspects of the language-teaching and language-using contexts in which they occurred. My response to the two critical incidents was to design a series of classroom tasks that required my students to interview each other and record their interaction. The data generated by these interviews was intriguing, especially the parts where students seemed to be navigating through areas of (potential) misunderstanding. I began to consider various ways of analysing this data, and the possible implications of my findings for (mis)understanding in contexts of additional language teaching and additional language use.

My thesis aims to explore how (mis)understanding is managed in interaction between users of English as an international/additional language in the specific language-teaching/using contexts of this study. My hope, as an applied linguist, is that a better understanding of (mis)understanding might indicate possible alternative ways forward for TESOL in internationalising UK universities. For this reason, there are two phases to my research: an initial linguistic analysis of my data, followed by the application of the lessons generated by the experience of analysis to my teaching practice at York St John University. I also consider the wider implications for TESOL and internationalising UK universities.

The critical incidents that inspired this study took place at around the same time, in two separate classrooms, at York St John University. In one of the classrooms there were about fifty students, all from the UK, taking an 'Introduction to Teaching English to Speakers of Others Languages' undergraduate module. In the other classroom, there were about twenty International students, taking a pre-undergraduate 'Communication Skills' module. I was module director for both classes; meaning that I was teaching the UK undergraduates about teaching English, while teaching the International students about using English in a UK university. Thus the contexts of this study

were threefold: a professional context, TESOL; the disciplinary context within which TESOL is situated, Applied Linguistics; and the institutional context of an internationalising university, York St John.

These incidents exemplified and challenged aspects of the language-teaching and language-using contexts in which they occurred, and raised questions about how (mis)understanding is managed in interaction between users of English as an international/additional language in the specific language-teaching/using contexts of this study. I begin chapter one of this thesis with a description of these two critical incidents before going on to describe their overlapping language-teaching and language-using contexts. The chapter ends with an overview of the thesis structure.

Critical Incidents

In the planning stages of this thesis two interactions between me and my students took place that had an important influence on my choice of topic. In this section, I will describe the two incidents, and consider the assumptions about communication in English and TESOL that underpin them.

In the first incident, I showed a teacher training video to the UK students on the 'Introduction to TESOL' module. The aim of the video was to demonstrate ways of checking classroom language learners' understanding of new grammar and my students had a 'while-viewing' task that focussed on some relevant techniques. After the video, I turned to my students to begin a discussion based on the task. There was an uneasy atmosphere in the classroom and, abandoning the task, I asked my students what they thought of the videoed demonstration. A number said that they didn't like the teacher because she was teaching English using her 'Scottish' accent. In the discussion that followed, some students said that English language teachers should repress a regional accent and speak 'standard English'. The issue of a language 'standard' was debated heatedly; with reference to what language learners hear, what they acquire, and possible implications for identity and power implied by the idea of a 'standard' form. We talked about the students' own regional accents and dialects (Yorkshire, Humberside and the North East of England) and the practical difficulties of sustaining a completely different accent for teaching purposes.

Later, I discussed the incident with colleagues at York St John. They remarked how, despite the 'de-prescriptivisation' process that linguistics students are subjected to from the very beginning of their degree, folk beliefs about language continue to impact on their ideas about language teaching. These folk beliefs may have included the one that 'English' is the same as 'standard English', and that all variation from this cluster of dialects, including well established ones, are incorrect or inferior and therefore not appropriate for TESOL. A related folk belief that may have been in play during this critical incident was that English is the same everywhere it is used around the world, except in places where it is spoken 'badly'; places where speakers of English are in need of teaching. A

slightly different version of these first two beliefs is that 'standard English', traditionally considered a prestigious variety in the UK, is the best variety for TESOL because of the 'power' it is accorded. A different set of beliefs surrounds the students' suggestion that teachers without 'ideal' accents can, and should, modify the way they talk when in front of an ESOL class. Here there is also the suggestion that 'teacher talk' is different from 'normal' talk as well as the behaviourist-type notion that students learn by copying their teacher, with no role for universal language acquisition processes, (positive) cross-linguistic influence or individual motivations.

At same time as the Scottish teacher incident described above, I was also teaching the 'Communication Skills' module to a group of International students on the pre-undergraduate Foundation Programme. The International students had also shown interest in attitudes to different varieties of English, their own and others they were hearing for the first time, both 'local' and 'foreign'. The students asked whether their English language teachers at York St John modified their teaching voices, and they commented on how these 'teacher voices' contrasted with the various accents they were hearing outside their classroom. A number of students in part-time jobs had had the experience of being 'misunderstood' by English people. One Polish student, working in a café, told the class about how she had, she felt, clearly stated the price of a cup of coffee to a customer who replied, "What? (no pause) Oh, it doesn't matter, I'll ask somebody else".

In the class we discussed this incident and wondered where the responsibility for successful communication lies – with the speaker or with the listener? Underpinning this discussion were several questions: about the role of communication strategies; about the nature of intelligibility; and about the part played by attitudes in the achievement of (mis)understanding. The 'Polish worker' incident raised questions about how we talk to people who are speaking English as an additional language, or indeed anyone who is assumed to be a 'foreigner'. More generally, and germane to both of the critical incidents, was the question of how people achieve their affective or transactional communicative goals by changing the way they speak according to the circumstances of the

interaction; including the person they are talking to, their communicative task and the context of the interaction.

It was with the two critical incidents in mind that I decided to create an assessed task that would require the UK students on the 'Introduction to TESOL' module and the International students on the 'Communication Skills' module to talk to each other and record their conversation. The task I designed for the UK students (see Appendix A) is an example of typical TESOL practice in that it instructs the UK students to find out about the language learning 'needs' and preferences of the International students. This was an adaptation of the task set by the previous module tutor that was also a 'needs analysis', but of a recorded language learner. The task I designed for the International students (see Appendix B) instructs them to find out about the UK students' language learning experiences and beliefs about additional language learning and teaching.

By requiring the students to talk to each other in mixed language pairs I hoped that both the UK and International students would get a one-off, but interesting, experience of using their English in international situations. I also hoped that they might continue to speak to each other outside the class. These were 'non-academic' hopes, in the sense that they were not related to the students' module content or assessment.

As is the usual practice with assessments that require our students to collect data, I asked that they submit their original data together with their written work. While marking their assessments I heard parts of their recordings and was intrigued by the ways in which the students were interacting with each other. I decided that the data merited careful listening and I also began to wonder how I might use any insights generated by this listening to inform future UK-International mixed language tasks.

Of course the data was generated within a very specific set of contexts and it is these contexts that I describe in detail in the next section.

Contexts of the Study

At the time of the data collection for this study, my responsibility at York St John University was for two groups of students: UK students learning about TESOL as part of their undergraduate degree in English language and linguistics, and pre-undergraduate International students learning English as an additional language for their future studies. In carrying out this responsibility, I was working within overlapping contexts: the professional context of TESOL; the disciplinary context of Applied Linguistics; and the institutional context of York St John, an internationalising UK university. Within this contextual framework, my students engaged in a series of classroom tasks that required them to understand information about each other. The relationship between the overlapping contexts of the students' interaction and their management of (mis)understanding seemed worth exploring because of the possible implications for future developments in TESOL and internationalising universities. In this section, I describe these contexts from the point of view of how they may have contributed to a shaping of the students' interaction.

Professional context

Teachers of English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) is the name of the US professional organisation for teachers of English as an additional language, though there are a plethora of alternative titles for the profession and its activities. In the UK, for example, the name of the professional organisation is the International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (IATEFL) and TEFL (teaching English as a foreign language) is a common acronym, in popular discourse, for the activities of its members. In contexts where English is taught in schools, or where English is widely used for national communication, TESL (teaching English as a second language) is widely used (Carter and Nunan, 2001).

The conceptualisation of English as a foreign (or second) language and, by implication, separate from learners' other languages continues to have a profound influence on the profession. Manifestations of this influence include: a focus in classrooms and in research on 'errors'; beliefs about 'negative transfer'

from the learners' other languages to English; the valorisation of the 'native speaker' and of 'native' varieties of English as more intelligible than 'non-native' varieties, and therefore the best 'target' for all learners; and the characterisation of learners as deficient monolinguals rather than incipient bilinguals. An online review of the popular *Learner English: A Teacher's Guide to Interference and Other Problems* (Swan and Smith, 2001) for the tefl.net website, illustrates some of these assumptions,

> This book does something so simple yet effective, that you wonder how you ever lived without it. It gives details of the particular problems that students with particular mother tongues have with the English language. After an introduction, justifications for producing the book (if any were needed), it has 22 chapters - each dealing with a language or group of languages. (Case, 2002)

Helping to prevent or correct misunderstandings between speakers of different languages is professional ground which is enthusiastically occupied by ESOL teachers. The assumption underpinning this position is that the achievement of mutual understanding is possible, if we can solve our students' problems with English. The chapters in the book *Learner English*, reviewed above, have sections on the geographical distribution of a variety of different languages (Arabic, Indonesian, Spanish etc.), followed by descriptions of how the phonology, punctuation, grammar and vocabulary of the languages differ from 'English'. The differences between these languages and ('standard British' – that there may be other varieties is not acknowledged) English are assumed to predict (and explain) learners' communication problems, as stated in the book's introduction,

> This book is a practical reference guide for teachers of a foreign language. It is meant to help teachers to anticipate the characteristic difficulties of learners of English who speak particular mother tongues, and to understand how these difficulties arise. (Swan and Smith, 2001, p. ix)

Misunderstanding is conceptualised as a deficiency of *individual interactants,* namely, English language learners, rather than as an interactive phenomenon, or as an inevitable feature of all communication no matter which language is being used (Taylor, 1992). It is assumed that the job of a TESOL professional is to help students learn 'the English' they need to avoid misunderstandings when

communicating with other users (often assumed to be 'native speakers') of English.

TESOL is a diverse profession, of course, and alternative ways of thinking about language learning and language use are expressed in, for example: literature on world Englishes/English as a lingua franca (Seidlhofer, 2001, 2002, 2003); in areas of second language acquisition research such as 'emergentism' (Hopper, 1998) and 'dynamic systems theory' (Larsen-Freeman and Cameron, 2008); in work on language awareness training and discrimination at work (Roberts et al, 1992); and in interactionist methodological paradigms such as conversation analysis (Carroll, 2005). These alternative literatures are, however, still largely voiced outside of mainstream TESOL discourse. TESOL textbooks and many TESOL teachers continue to act out a particular version of what 'English' stands for, and what it is taken to be, in ways that underpin ideas about the nature of, and responsibility for, 'misunderstanding' in international interactions. It is this mainstream TESOL tradition which provides the professional context for the critical incidents which inspired this study and the data analysed here. My aim in analysing this data is to discover whether there is an alternative approach to 'teaching' international communication in English, one which avoids the normative, assimilationist assumptions of the mainstream TESOL profession.

Institutional context

York St John University is situated in the northern English city of York. It has around 6,000 students, about four per cent of whom are classed by the University as 'International'. It has a mission, 'to be a leading regional university with a developing internationalisation agenda' (York St John University, n.d.). I refer to it throughout this study as an 'internationalising' university.

At York St John, as mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, I teach a module for third year UK undergraduates called 'Introduction to TESOL' and a module called 'Communication Skills' for pre-undergraduates on an International Foundation Programme. This study explores the classroom talk of students on these two modules, recorded while they were working together in mixed language pairs on a series of classroom tasks designed by me, as Module Director. The 'Communication Skills' module was team-taught, so although the session aims, materials and assessment tasks were designed by me, one half of the group experienced these delivered by another teacher.

Chapter three of this thesis describes the students and the tasks in more detail, so I will only give a brief overview here. The tasks (available in Appendices A and B) required students to prepare questions for each other: the UK students for the International students and vice versa. The International students were working on a group project about varieties of English, attitudes to variety and implications for language learning and teaching. The UK students were preparing an assessed lesson plan for one of the International students, and were collecting data about the language learning needs and preferences of 'their' International student. The interaction was recorded and the recordings were submitted as part of the UK students' assessment.

In terms of the context provided by York St John for this interaction, the International students were on the Foundation Programme having achieved an overall International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score of between 4.5 and 6.0, and/or were assessed by the University as needing an extra year of high school before being allowed to continue their studies. IELTS is a proficiency test originally developed in the mid-eighties, and currently jointly administered by the British Council, Cambridge ESOL and the International

Development Programme (IDP, Australia). From an institutional standpoint, therefore, the International students were present within the interaction as 'learners' of English.

The UK students, drawn mainly from Yorkshire, Humberside and the North East of England, are assumed by the University to already have the English needed for effective interaction in an internationalising university. In other words, from an institutional standpoint, they were present within the interaction as already-competent-users of English. The International students, on the other hand, were being required to do an extra year in order to improve their ability to understand, and make themselves understood by, the UK students. The achievement of understanding was assumed to be possible; indeed, it was required by the assessed task. The admissions policy of the University and the design of the task combined to strengthen the pre-determined identities and hierarchies implied by the professional context. In the overlapping professional and institutional contexts of this study therefore, mutual understanding was assumed to be possible, but also potentially threatened by the International students' lack of proficiency in 'English'. My aim in analysing data that students submitted with their assessments is to discover whether there is an alternative approach to teaching international communication in English, one which avoids the typical 'deficit linguistics' of the institutional context of this study.

A brief note of caution on terminology; I have chosen to capitalise the word 'International' throughout this thesis, where it is used to describe the students on the Foundation Programme. The capitalisation is a reminder that the institutionally-sanctioned adjective 'International' is an identity-fixing label used by the University to describe an extremely heterogeneous group of people, which does not include EU citizens but which does include citizens of the USA. For the purposes of this study, International students include both EU and non-EU citizens who are considered by the University to have learned English as an additional language and be in need of further language development. There are, of course, linguistic ideologies, as well as practical consequences for the students, which underpin this categorisation, and it is these ideologies that I wish to be constantly reminded of by the capital letter 'I'.

Disciplinary context

The academic 'home' of TESOL is Applied Linguistics, a discipline with a focus on language problems in society including the consequences for social justice and injustice of: language policy, planning, teaching, and testing. In this section, I take three defining features of Applied Linguistics and show how each of these features characterises my study. The first feature of studies in Applied Linguistics is that language is studied in relation to real world settings. My study, of 'real world' language classroom data in the context of TESOL and internationalising UK universities, is very much in this tradition, as it is described by Brumfit (1995, p. 27),

> [AL is] the theoretical and empirical investigation of real-world problems in which language is a central issue.

The real world problem that this study aims to explore is that of (mis)understanding in interaction between users of English as an international/additional language in a language-teaching context. Specifically, I wish to consider the management of (mis)understanding from two points of view: that of the student/teacher being inducted into managing this encounter from the institutionally and professionally sanctioned position of a 'native speaker'; and the student/learner managing this encounter from the position of a 'non-native speaker'.

The second feature of Applied Linguistics, as the discipline is described by Brumfit (1995), Cameron et al (1992) and Roberts et al (1992) is that the selection and definition of a real world problem must be informed by the people who are experiencing the problem. Also, that the relationship between a problem and language is not something that applied linguists should assume; like the definition of the problem, the nature of the problem is something which should also be recognised and informed by the people who are experiencing it.

In the case of this study, the York St John students were required by me, as part of their learning experience on their modules, to undertake the series of classroom tasks which provide the data for this study. Though the students were not free to opt out of the tasks, they were 'free' to negotiate their own ways

of navigating through the interviews. Therefore, in accordance with the second typical feature of Applied Linguistics, I aim to consider the problem of task management from the students' perspective. My analysis considers classroom-based data through the frameworks established by the International and UK students in interaction with each other. My approach pays attention to the aspects of the institutional and professional context which the students orientate to, and to how they display this orientation. Such an approach to the relationship between talk and context is in the tradition of interactional sociolinguists such as Gumperz (1982), ethnomethodologists such as Garfinkel (1967), and applied conversation analysts such as Richards (2005). Their micro-analytic work has attempted to understand how the context-specific use of communicative resources can be illuminated by connecting talk-in-interaction to the management of meaning and identities by participants in institutional settings, as well as how the participants' words and actions both shape and are shaped by these contexts. By considering the problem of (mis)understanding from the students' point of view, I am accepting the Applied Linguistic advice that the nature of the problem is something which should be recognised and informed by the people who are experiencing it.

Thirdly and finally, the defining feature of Applied Linguistics, as Cameron et al (1992), Roberts et al (1992), Brumfit (1995), Sarangi and Candlin (2003) and Bygate (2005) have argued, is its offer of a real-world response to the problems it tackles. Applied Linguistics is above all, a problem-solving discipline; while any project in Applied Linguistics may begin with a description or empirical investigation of the role of language in a real-world problem, it should aim to end with the planning, testing and evaluation of a potential solution (Hall et al, 2011). Observing how my students go about their mixed language classroom tasks raises profound questions for TESOL and for internationalising universities. My hope is that a better understanding of (mis)understanding might indicate possible alternative ways forward for the learning and practice of TESOL in internationalising UK universities. For this applied linguistic reason, there are two phases to my research: an initial linguistic analysis of my data, followed by the application of the lessons generated by the experience of analysis to my teaching practice at York St John. Overall, I aim to consider the wider implications for TESOL and internationalising universities.

Text/talk and contexts

The three contexts that I wish to explore in my study are, therefore, as follows. Firstly, the professional context of teaching and learning English as an additional language (TESOL); a profession comprising, in the past and in some instances still today, textbook writers, teachers and students who consider any influence from the learners' other languages to be a hindrance and the default target to be the constellation of dialects of English known as 'Received Pronunciation'. Secondly, and in overlap with the professional context, the institutional context of a UK university with a relatively small number of International students and UK students drawn mainly from the local region. Within the overlapping area between these institutional and professional contexts is the task I designed, requiring UK and International students to interview each other in order to collect information for a written assessment; a task which also provided a context for the students' talk. Wrapped around the professional context of TESOL is the discipline of Applied Linguistics and a venn diagram of these overlapping contexts is easy to visualise. But permeating all these contexts, blurring their boundaries, dissolving the space between the centre of the circles in the diagram and their edges, is the question of the relationship between the contexts and the practices/tasks and texts/talk which constitute the contexts.

Research Aims

In phase one of this study I aim to explore (mis)understanding in interaction between users of English as an international/additional language in the language-teaching/using contexts of this study. My aim is *not* to examine the use of English as a lingua franca, or international language, per se, but to explore how language is used interactively by my students to accomplish their context-specific goals.

Observing how my students go about their mixed language classroom tasks raises profound questions for TESOL and for internationalising universities. In phase two of this study, I explore how better understanding of (mis)understanding might indicate alternative ways forward for the learning and practice of TESOL in UK universities.

Overview of the Thesis

Chapter one has provided a background for this study, including an account of the two critical incidents which inspired my enquiry and a description of the three overlapping contexts in which my data was generated: professional (TESOL), disciplinary (Applied Linguistics) and institutional (an internationalising UK university). I continue phase one of my study in chapter two with a review of empirical and theoretical literature relevant to the issues that were raised by the two critical incidents. The literature review concludes with two overarching research questions for my data.

In chapter three, Methodology, I explore how the research questions I asked at the end of the literature review might, in practice, be answered. This process results in a list of four sub-questions. I then describe in detail the process of data collection and the options for the analysis of my data, including the challenges of transcribing classroom talk, epistemological traditions in educational research, and the place of ethics in Applied Linguistics.

In chapter four, I conclude the first phase of my study by presenting the findings of my analysis and discussing how these compare to research findings reported in the literature review.

In the second phase of my thesis, which begins with chapter five, I set out a series of principles which could be used to inform practice in similar professional and institutional contexts. In this chapter, I use a worked example from my own context to demonstrate how these principles might be used to design a real-world solution to the problems I have identified. Finally, in chapter six, I draw some conclusions and make some predictions for the futures of TESOL, internationalising universities and Applied Linguistics.

Chapter Two - Review of Literature

Introduction

The chapter begins with a brief discussion of some recent challenges to TESOL's traditional beliefs about 'English', before turning to the literature on intelligibility and conversational adjustments in international situations.

As described in chapter one, the TESOL profession has historically articulated a particular version of language teaching which draws on monolithic theories of language, valorises 'standard' forms, and prioritises the 'native speaker' of these forms. English, the TESOL thinking goes, is a standardisable and standardised code which is best used by 'educated' speakers who were born and brought up in England (possibly, though not always, including a limited number of her neighbours and ex-colonies). These are similar assumptions about the nature of English to the ones which probably underpinned the first of the critical incidents, the 'Scottish teacher'.

In contrast to these assumptions, there has been, over about the last thirty years, a growing interest in certain areas of Applied Linguistics in the use of English in international contexts. This new interest in the international diversity of English has complicated what 'English' now stands for; changing what we take it to be. In this chapter I consider this new awareness of the diversity of English, putting it alongside findings in sociolinguistic studies about the ways in which language users change how they speak according to their particular circumstances. In this way, I hope to be better able to develop a detailed understanding of (mis)understanding in classroom talk between International and UK students at York St John. In the process I hope to develop some general pointers for how the task of communicating in English might be re-conceptualised for students in internationalising UK universities.

World Englishes and English as Lingua Franca

The critical incidents and the aspects of the professional and institutional contexts of the data analysed for this study imply assumptions about the use of 'English' for communication around the world. In this section of the literature review I aim to set the scene for subsequent sections, dealing with intelligibility and conversational adjustments, by briefly discussing recent challenges to TESOL's traditional beliefs about 'English'.

The students' discussion in class during the 'Scottish teacher' incident was mainly based on the assumption that 'English' is the same as 'standard English', and that all variations from this dialect, including well established ones, are incorrect or inferior and therefore not appropriate for TESOL. Also, that English is the same everywhere it is used around the world, except in places where it is spoken 'badly'; places where speakers of English are in 'need' of teaching. These assumptions echo the traditional opinions of ESOL teachers and the content of books such as *Learner English*, mentioned in chapter one. The assumptions are based on the idea that any differences between an additional language speaker's output and the 'standard' variety of their additional language are 'errors', caused mainly by first language 'interference'; the point at which errors become fixed within an individual learner's repertoire being known as 'fossilisation'.

The monolithic theories of language and prescriptivist attitudes which have historically characterised TESOL have been challenged in most detail in the world Englishes and English as a lingua franca (ELF) literature. World Englishes scholars Braj Kachru and Cecil Nelson (1996) problematise the notion of 'native speaker' by arguing that speakers of established 'new' varieties of English such as Indian or Singaporean English are *not* attempting to sound like speakers of any particular variety of, for example, British or American English. Kachru's three circle model of the spread of English (Kachru, 1985, 1988, 1992a, 1992b) describes speakers of these 'new' Englishes as being in an 'Outer circle', with speakers in the UK, USA, Australia etc. in the 'Inner circle' and all other speakers (in, for example, China, Greece and Poland) in the 'Expanding circle'. Speakers in the Outer circle, like those in the Inner circle, may have grown up

speaking a well-established variety of English; though unlike speakers in the Inner circle, they are much more likely to be multilingual.

Kachru's model of Inner, Outer and Expanding circles of English has itself been challenged for, amongst other things, its privileging of colonial Englishes as separable from other varieties and more central than them (Jenkins, 2003; responded to by Kachru in 2005). Despite these criticisms, Kachru and Nelson's (1996) argument that labelling the English of whole speech communities as 'fossilised' (and therefore deficient) ignores the socio-historical development and socio-cultural context of local Englishes and is the result of a monolingual bias, is a powerful one. Jennifer Jenkins, an early proponent of the 'English as a lingua franca' approach to international communication (2006; 2007; 2008), uses a similar point to critique much of current TESOL practice,

> the literature on teaching English still regularly contains advice for teachers [...] on how to reduce [interlanguage] errors and how to reverse fossilization, while the testing of English remains wholly predicated on the concept. There is still little if any awareness among TESOL practitioners and [second language acquisition] researchers that learners may be producing forms characteristic of their own variety of English, which reflect the sociolinguistic reality of their English use [...] far better than either British or American norms are able to. (Jenkins, 2006, p. 168)

The issue of *who* may be a speaker of English as a lingua franca is a controversial one. While some suggest that ELF can only take place between two or more 'non-native speakers' of English (for example, Mollin, 2006; Sweeney and Hua, 2010) others argue that 'native speakers' are ELF users whenever they are interacting with a speaker of English as an additional language (Gnutzmann, 2000; VOICE, n.d.; Carey, 2010; Ur, 2010).

The use of the terms 'native' and 'non-native' speaker is equally controversial (see Leung et al, 1997; Liu, 1999; Firth and Wagner, 2007). 'Native speakerism' is the assumption that the desired outcome of additional language learning is, in all cases, 'native' competence in the 'standard' variety, and that native speakers have, therefore, an inbuilt advantage as language users and teachers. 'Nativeness' is also often conflated with nationality. Since national borders are not consistent with linguistic ones however, this geography-based native/second/foreign typology is extremely problematic. In addition, the terms

(non-) native speaker idealise what are extremely heterogeneous groups of language users (Canagarajah, 1999). After all, there is:

- lexico-grammatical and phonological variation within all languages (depending on the age, location, job, hobbies, religion, ethnicity, subculture, gender, etc. of the speaker);
- no accent-free version of any language;
- variation within the speech of individuals (depending on their role in the conversation and their relationship with their interlocutor);
- mixing of languages and varieties for maximum communicative effect by multilingual speakers.

In an effort to more accurately reflect this speaker- and situation-dependent variation, Leung et al (1997) have suggested the description of speakers' linguistic repertoires in terms of: expertise (the ability to achieve specific tasks in specific situations); inheritance (the age at which a language in the repertoire began to be used, under what circumstances it was learned); and affiliation (level of comfort in using the language, feelings of belonging to a community of language speakers). In this study, I consider both UK and International students to be potential speakers of lingua franca English.

Critical linguists have argued even further than world English and some ELF scholars, suggesting that any attempt to *name* a language variety, 'new' (Singaporean or Indian English, for example) or 'old' (British English, for example), is a political act, rather than the identification of an objective, measurable reality. A response perhaps, to criticism of linguists over a decade earlier,

> To speak of the language, without further specification, as linguists do, is tacitly to accept the official definition of the official language of a political unit. (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 45)

According to Pennycook (2007), despite the huge amount of effort that goes into teaching and learning it around the world, there is no such thing as 'English'; all languages being political rather than ontological categories,

> If a real attempt were made to describe and identify all and every utterance produced under the name of English, the project would be both physically and temporally implausible (corpus linguistics only makes this marginally less so). Descriptive linguistics has of course never operated this way but has instead posited a *core* (grammar/lexicon) from which variations are deemed varieties. Yet the impossibility of accounting for English variation through the description of a *supposed core*, or of making the core a product of the variation renders this too an untenable proposition. (Pennycook, 2007, p. 94, emphasis added)

Blommaert (2003), in his critique of the lay persons' notion of 'a language', prefigures the applied aim of this study,

> Language names such as English, French, Swahili or Chinese belong to the realm of folk ideologies of language and popularized or institutionalized discourses anchored therein…When looked upon from the actual ways in which people use language in their lives, what counts are…repertoires, registers, styles, genres, modes of usage…It is our job as sociolinguists to focus on language varieties – emergent constructs reflecting ideologically regimented language use – instead of language names, and it is our challenge to make this view acceptable and understandable to outside audiences too. (Blommaert, 2003, p. 2)

An important element of monolithic approaches to language is a focus on a *core*, or 'standard', against which other varieties are judged. The belief in a standard form of English has long held a very powerful grip on the popular imagination, even though 'standard' varieties of English are inevitably social rather than cognitive entities (Hopper, 1998; Hall, 2005; Hall, forthcoming). Individual speakers have their own ultimately unique, though overlapping, linguistic repertoires (idiolects). In contrast, *groups* of speakers share different degrees of awareness of a set of conventions about acceptable, prestigious, and desirable sounds, words and syntax in specific situations.

Accents, a very noticeable feature of a language/variety, are particularly controversial in TESOL as the critical incidents described in chapter one of this thesis show. In the UK, for example, almost all official broadcast speech in the first six or seven decades of the twentieth century was in 'Received Pronunciation' (RP), the audible version of a group of dialects known as 'standard English'. Although a wider variety of accents are now broadcast, it is still common to hear ESOL teachers and others expressing the belief that anyone who doesn't speak RP has an accent, or that RP is better than other

accents, or that the people who speak in RP are better speakers of English than those who do not. These are the kind of beliefs which may have underpinned my students' reactions to the Scottish teacher and the treatment of the Polish café worker, described in chapter one of this thesis.

So, while a particular version of 'English' remains strong in the TESOL profession, it has been energetically challenged by scholars working in the world Englishes and English as a lingua franca paradigms, by critical linguists, and in certain areas of psycholinguistics and second language acquisition research. These challenges, if they are to be heard by members of the TESOL profession, seriously complicate what English stands for, change what we take English to be and require a radical review of what we teach. In the light of these challenges, the question of what it means to communicate successfully in international situations is again 'up for grabs'. If for both practical and theoretical reasons, 'standard English' is no longer necessarily appropriate as a language learning target, how is international understanding in lingua franca situations to be achieved? In subsequent sections I will explore in more detail what research has shown about intelligibility, especially in international situations, focussing on the adjustments that get made when English is being used a lingua franca.

Intelligibility

Both the critical incidents described in chapter one raised questions of intelligibility, especially in international 'lingua franca' situations. The Polish café worker wanted to know what had made her English difficult to understand. The Scottish teacher would 'make' her students more difficult to understand when they used their English outside the classroom, according to the UK students. In this section I review the literature on intelligibility, with a particular focus on lingua franca situations.

To date, there seems to be little agreement between scholars about a definition of what constitutes intelligibility or about how to measure it (Dewing and Munro, 2005; Munro et al, 2006; Jenkins, 2000). The traditional TESOL position has judged intelligibility to be the responsibility of learners of English. Where intelligibility is judged to be a problem (usually because of 'interference' from their first language) TESOL practitioners have assumed the solution to be their students' acquisition of more English. The world Englishes and English as a lingua franca (ELF) movements have challenged the idea of Inner circle speakers being norm-providers for all learners and users of English, and this has led to a new interest in intelligibility issues for speakers of English as an international language (Coetzee-Van Rooy, 2009). In this section, I review current research on intelligibility, beginning with work in the ELF paradigm and contrasting this with the world Englishes approach mentioned above.

Early work on ELF proposed the need for a description and possible codification of the English used by speakers in Kachru's Expanding circle (for example, China, Greece, Poland, Thailand etc.). In contrast to a world Englishes approach, ELF scholars were, and are, less interested in national varieties of English and more concerned with describing the English which is used between speakers from different countries, who are using English as a lingua franca. For example, using corpus data collected from mainly Expanding, but also Inner and Outer circle users, ELF scholar Barbara Seidlhofer (2004) proposed a list of typical features of the lexicogrammar of ELF users, while Jenkins (2002), documented a similar list for phonology. According to Jenkins (2006, p. 170)

Seidlhofer's intention in creating and researching the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE) of ELF data was to,

> find out which items are used systematically and frequently, but differently *from native speaker use* and without causing communication problems, by expert speakers of English from a wide range of [first languages]. (emphasis added)

Using data from the VOICE corpus, Seidlhofer (2004, p. 220) identified a number of non-Inner circle regularities in successful ELF talk, including, for example:

- non-use of the third person present tense -s ('She look very sad')
- omission of the definite and indefinite articles where they are obligatory in native speaker English and insertion where they do not occur in native speaker English
- use of an all-purpose question tag such as *isn't it?* or *no?* instead of *shouldn't they?* ('They should arrive soon, isn't it?')
- increase in redundancy by adding prepositions ('We have to study about..' and 'can we discuss about . . . ?'), or by increasing explicitness ('black colour' vs. 'black' and 'How long time?' vs. 'How long?')
- pluralisation of nouns which are considered uncountable in native speaker English ('informations,' 'staffs,' 'advices').

Like Seidlhofer's work on the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE), Jenkins's research on ELF phonology aims to identify 'non-native'-like regularities in successful ELF talk, including, for example the absence of weak forms in words like 'from' and 'for' and the substitution of /t/ and /s/ or /z/ and /d/ for both the voiced and unvoiced forms of the 'th' sound (Jenkins, 2004, p. 114 – 15). These features are part of what Jenkins labels the Lingua Franca Core; the elements of English which international communicators need to have in their repertoire for possible use in ELF situations, where they are most likely to be used and understood.

In contrast to the proposals of early work in ELF, some world Englishes scholars (Smith and Nelson, 1985; Kachru, 2008; Nelson, 2008) have tended to

focus on the *relative* nature of intelligibility rather than on its 'core' features. Smith and Nelson (1985, p. 333), for example, state that 'intelligibility is not speaker or listener-centred but is interactional between speaker and hearer', and Nelson notes that 'being intelligible means being understood by an interlocutor at a given time in a given situation' (1982, p. 59). The conceptualisation of intelligibility as interactionally accomplished links intelligibility to specific contexts of use, involving factors related to the speaker, the listener, the linguistic and social context, and the environment. The Smith and Nelson model (1985) of intelligibility consists of the following three components (the first of which, rather confusingly, is also called intelligibility):

- *intelligibility*, the ability of the listener to recognise individual words or utterances;
- *comprehensibility*, the listener's ability to understand the meaning of the word or utterance in its given context, and
- *interpretability*, the ability of the listener to understand the speaker's intentions behind the word or utterance.

The co-constructed nature of intelligibility identified by Smith and Nelson has long been a feature of the sociolinguistic literature outside the world Englishes paradigm. As subsequent sections of this chapter aim to show, sociolinguistic research has firmly established the context-sensitive, adaptive, idiosyncratic, unpredictable nature of language use. While 'lingua franca' is one possible context, we are not able to predict in advance what purchase this context (as opposed to all the other contexts in simultaneous operation) will have over the actual language use of the speakers in its database. Corpus analyses such as those carried out by ELF researchers can obtain traces of consistent use of phonological and lexico-grammatical features by a selected group of speakers who are assumed to have their communicative context in common. But the basis of the selection cannot be proved to account entirely, or even at all, for the traces of regularity, nor can the regularities be assumed to be 'as a result' of the context.

Intelligibility in EIL contexts is, as this section of chapter two shows, a contested construction, even within the relatively small sub-field of Linguistics represented

by the world Englishes/EIL and ELF paradigms. What scholars in this sub-field are most likely to agree upon, however, is that there is no causal relationship between speaking an Inner circle ('native speaker') variety of English and being intelligible in an international context. Instead, they stress that it is vitally important for *all speakers* of English (including those in the Inner circle) to practise adjusting their speech in order to be intelligible to interlocutors from a wide range of language backgrounds. The potential consequences of this position for TESOL, and for UK universities aiming to produce internationally competent graduates, are profound; undermining all previous assumptions about users of Inner Circle or 'standard' English ('native speakers') as the ideal users and teachers of English.

Accommodation

Both of the critical incidents, the Scottish teacher and the Polish worker, raised questions about how people achieve their communicative goals by changing the way they speak according to their particular circumstances, the phenomenon known as 'accommodation'.

Accommodation is the willingness and ability to modify your style of interaction in order to attend to what you presume to be your interlocutor's interpretative competence and conversational needs, and to your respective role relationships. Giles et al (1991, p. 5) identify the origins of accommodation theory in a social psychological account of speech style modifications, emerging in the early 1970s (for example, Giles and Powesland, 1975). This new approach to oral data was inspired by re-interpretations of William Labov's (1966) findings. As part of the data collection for his work on speech styles, Labov 'finished' his interview, told his interviewees that the recording device was turned off and changed the topic to one designed to elicit unmonitored speech styles. Labov interpreted the speakers' subsequent shift to speech forms considered less 'standard' as a function of a more informal context. The re-interpretation suggested by later analysts was that the interviewees were converging on Labov's own change in speech style (including, potentially, his speech rate, use of pauses, utterance length, phonological variants, smiling and gaze), rather than reacting to general notions about the more 'informal' context of the interview. In other words, the informal context was created by the talk, rather than vice versa, and the style of the talk was a 'local' matter, as dependent on the actions of the hearer as it was on the beliefs of the speaker.

By the early 1990s, research and scholarly discourse on accommodation had become an interdisciplinary field, broadly interested in the relational processes of communicative interaction and re-named Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) (Giles et al 1991). According to CAT, the processes of accommodation are both structuring of (through 'convergence' and 'divergence') and structured by (through the underlying beliefs, attitudes and institutionally sanctioned roles that are deployed to provide the rationale for convergent and divergent talk) context. Like the approach taken by interactional sociolinguists such as Gumperz (1982), communication accommodation theory is open to

both micro- and macro-contextual communicative concerns within a single theoretical and interpretative framework.

Regarding the motivation for the use of communication accommodation strategies, an issue I return to later in this section with specific reference to 'foreigner talk', it has been suggested that where a speaker needs to gain the social approval of an interactant, convergence will occur, and the greater the need for approval, the greater the degree of convergence. For example, studies have shown (Giles et al, 1991) that locals working in service industries converge on foreign visitors in terms of language choice and linguistic-prosodic-nonverbal features. This is a strategy that is motivated by the widely held belief that the more similar people are the more intelligible, predictable and attractive they find each other. Again, there are complexities, as full convergence by one speaker can also be negatively evaluated as an identity threatening act by his or her interlocutor, as in, 'I can see that you're not one of us, so why are you pretending?'.

These strategies may actually play out within talk in very complex ways: the extent and frequency of use of the strategies can vary within a conversation; speakers may both converge and diverge at different points and in different, perhaps contradictory ways. In addition, speakers may express a desire to converge/diverge but not have the linguistic competence to achieve their aims and/or instrumental, task-based motivations may override the need for social approval. In addition, a speaker's assessment of another person's speech is inevitably subjective, including for example,

> the tendency to assess speakers believed: to be competent users of the language of interaction as more 'standard' in their speech style; to represent a low status group as less standard or to converge on a *perception* of an interlocutor's speech style regardless of their actual style or to converge on the (possibly ill-conceived) attempts of an interlocutor to also converge (for example, foreigners shifting to a style designed by locals to accommodate foreigners). (Giles et al, 1991, p. 14 – 15, emphasis in the original)

Furthermore, actual communicative accommodation processes depend on a nesting of further perceptions about the current task, your own and your interlocutor's identity and your own and other's relational goals.

Communication Strategies

Questions about the role of communication strategies in successful transactional talk were raised by the second critical incident, in which the Polish student/worker was 'misunderstood' by a café customer. In the classroom discussion of this incident, the International students did not want to talk about how English language learners 'should' communicate, according a typically idealised and prescriptive mainstream TESOL tradition. Instead they wanted to know about what actually happens when people (who may be both learners and users, depending on the context) talk in international situations.

'Communication strategies' and 'conversational adjustments' are the two main types of interactional modification observed in international situations which have been identified in the literature (Wagner, 1996), and studied extensively since the late 1970s. 'Conversational adjustments' are generally defined as changes in the talk of 'native speakers', that is, language *users*. These adjustments, which are intended to compensate for the linguistic deficits of the hearer (who may be a learner, and who is assumed by the speaker to be linguistically less 'proficient') are reviewed under the heading 'foreigner talk' later in this chapter. 'Communication strategies', on the other hand, have tended to be thought of as routines employed by language *learners* to compensate for what researchers conceived of as 'gaps' in learners' knowledge of 'the target language' (though which variety should/does provide the target and, even, how identifiable as a discrete 'object' the target variety/language is, is a more recent question asked by world English scholars and critical applied linguists).

Early work on communication strategies tended to observe and categorise the ways in which additional language learners compensated for 'not knowing' a word or phrase (for example, Tarone, 1977). Later work suggested that taxonomies should follow underlying psycholinguistic processes, based on a theory of communication strategies as essentially cognitive in nature (Bialystok, 1990). Subsequently, naturally occurring discourse was examined by researchers interested in communication strategies as socially motivated interactional processes (Yule and Tarone, 1997; Tarone, 2005).

More recently, research into communication strategies has taken a different turn and attempts have been made to observe what might constitute communicative strategies in English as an international language (EIL)-contexts. These EIL-specific strategies include: making use of extralinguistic clues, supportive listening, signalling non-comprehension in a face-saving way, asking for repetition, paraphrasing, and gauging interlocutors' linguistic repertoires (Seidlhofer, 2007, p. 147).

Research in educational settings has noted the *frequency* of use of these strategies, and the infrequency of occurrences of misunderstanding (Mauranen, 2006). Mauranen's study uses data from English language seminars, lectures and plenary talks where the participants are from mixed language backgrounds (including some who speak English as a first language). She speculates that a focus on the communication of *content* as the primary goal in the academic setting may be one reason for the small number of misunderstandings in the data. She contrasts her findings with studies conducted in non-educational settings in which interactants also have been shown to orient to subject knowledge and professional competence (Wagner, 1996; Firth, 1996; Firth and Wagner, 1997). In Wagner and Firth's data, collected in international business settings, the interactants tend *not*, as Mauranen's students do, to make conversational adjustments, even when a source of trouble in the talk was noticeable to the analyst; the 'let it pass' rule. Mauranen stresses that, rather than primarily orienting to a 'let it pass' rule, her interactants put a great deal of effort into preventing misunderstanding. These efforts include proactive strategies such as frequent requests for clarification or confirmation, as well as same-turn repetition of (with rephrasing) information and provision of additional information (Mauranen, 2006, p. 135). She concludes that it is the students' use of these strategies that enable them to avoid misunderstanding, and to focus on the communication of content and the achievement of their task-specific goals.

At a more micro-level, Carroll (2005) observes the use of vowel-marking (adding an extra vowel sound, usually /u/ or /o/ to words) in English language talk between Japanese learners. Usually considered an 'error' caused by interference from Japanese, Carroll's data shows how vowel-marking does not correlate with individual speakers or particular English words. Instead it

performs a similar action to the vowel-stretching as a precursor to forward-oriented repair (otherwise known as 'word search') that has been noticed in 'native speaker' English. Vowel-marking and vowel-stretching alert an interactant to possible trouble ahead, as well as delaying production in a way that gives the speaker extra time to think of the word they are searching for. In other words, what sounds like an error to language teachers, or other interactants unfamiliar with Japanese speakers of English, is actually a communication strategy.

A more broadly interactive approach to EIL suggests that 'language awareness' is the key to effective communication. Canagarajah (2007), for example, claims that successful lingua franca users,

> are able to monitor each other's language proficiency to determine mutually the appropriate grammar, lexical range and pragmatic conventions that would ensure intelligibility. (Canagarajah, 2007, p. 923 - 924)

In summary, communication strategies have moved from being thought of as compensation for the problems caused by learners' insufficient knowledge of 'the target language' (a broadly deficit model), to being thought of as part of a successful lingua franca English users' communicative repertoire. In a parallel movement, they have also moved from being considered as a mainly linguistic, or psycholinguistic, phenomenon, to being conceptualised as being part of a socially motivated, interactional process.

Foreigner Talk

The second of the critical incidents that inspired this study raised questions about how people talk to additional language users ('foreigners') and the roles that these ways of talking might play in the achievement of mutual (mis)understanding. The Polish café worker felt that she made what she believed to be an intelligible statement about the price of a drink. She suspected that her customer's response was based on unfounded assumptions about what she was able to understand. 'Foreigner talk' is a term coined by Charles Ferguson (1968, 1975) to describe modifications made in the presence of people who are felt to have limited competence in the language being spoken. These strategies are learned by the same process of cultural transmission by which we learn other language behaviours, as Ferguson explains,

> many, perhaps all, speech communities have registers of a special kind for use with people who are regarded for one reason or another as unable to readily understand the normal speech of the community (e.g. babies, foreigners, deaf people). These forms of speech are generally felt by their users to be simplified versions of the language, hence easier to understand, and they are often regarded as imitation of the way the person addressed uses the language himself [...] such registers as baby talk are, of course, culturally transmitted and they may be quite systematic and resistant to change. (Ferguson, 1968, p. 4 - 5)

Beliefs about which ways of communicating are easier to understand than 'normal' language, which Ferguson refers to as 'folk grammatical analysis' (1968, p. 9), differ between language communities. In accommodated English, the following have been observed as being frequently omitted: the verb *be*, prepositions, articles and inflectional endings (Ferguson, 1968). Of course, like all talk, foreigner talk is a highly complex and delicate matter. The actual features of accommodation are idiosyncratic and can take various forms in the course of a single interaction as well as being inconsistently used by an individual (Hinnenkamp, 1987). Later studies used terms such as 'foreigner talk discourse' (Hatch, 1978) and 'native/non-native discourse' (Long, 1983).

Of the various ways in which the content and the phonological, lexical, syntactical and discourse features of English language talk may be adjusted for interlocutors presumed to be non-native speakers, the following have been

observed (in separate studies by: Ferguson, 1968; Long, 1983; Gass and Varonis, 1985; Varonis and Gass, 1985; Hinnenkamp, 1987; Chaudron, 1988; Lynch, 1988; Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991; Meierkord, 1998; House, 1999; Meierkord, 2000; Lesznyák, 2004; Kasper, 2006; Kasper and Ross, 2007; and Park, 2007):

- content: giving additional information about, and 'helpful' explanations of, situations and events; repetition of one's own words and the words of other speakers; choosing a narrower range of topics; more here-and-now orientation; briefer treatment of topics
- phonological: slower speech; avoiding contractions and weak forms of vowels; stressing more words; increased volume
- lexical: using less slang, fewer idioms; using more words considered 'easy'
- syntactical: avoiding syntax considered 'complex'; omitting verbs, using more tag questions; shorter utterances and an increased use of the present tense; the copula; prepositions; articles and inflectional endings
- discourse: using more gestures; more repetition and rephrasing of one's own and others' information; longer and more frequent pauses; completing others' utterances; correcting others' 'mistakes'; more abrupt changes in topic; easier 'giving up' of topics when a new topic is proposed by an interlocutor; more acceptance of unintentional changes in topic; more use of questions as a way of changing the topic; more comprehension checks; more confirmation checks; more clarification requests; more expansions; more question and answer sequences; more joining in to help another interactant find a word or phrase that might be a 'correct' expression of what he or she wants to say.

Specifically in 'preventative' occurrences of foreigner talk (of which, more below) Hinnenkamp (1987, p. 155) found:

- repetition of information, often in a series of increasingly complex ways, sometimes culminating in a summary of all the information which had been given during the turn

- requests for confirmation, sometimes after each segment of information had been given
- mixing of foreigner talk (perhaps for the bits of information that were considered important by the speaker) with more 'normal' talk
- the use of vague language.

Such 'preventative' occurrences of foreigner talk involving repetition were also found in a study of casual conversation between three Australian English speakers and three speakers of English as an additional language (Gardner, 2004). These occurrences consisted of what Gardner labels 'extended question sequences'; where an Australian English speaker asks an additional language speaker a question and then, after leaving a gap for an answer and receiving none, or after no gap at all, expands or provides an alternative version of the original question. Gardner concludes that,

> it is not impaired 'competence' of the SL (second language) speakers which leads to EQSs (Extended Question Sequences) but local trouble, that is, the need to create and maintain intersubjectivity in the face of incipient misunderstandings or breakdowns. (Gardner, 2004, p. 266)

The talk between the Australian English and the additional language speakers illustrates the following characteristics: mutual willingness of the interactants to take responsibility for achieving understanding; belief in the negative role played by misunderstanding; prior and ongoing judgement of 'competence' in English; and willingness and ability to modify their style of interaction. Gardner concludes that the result of these characteristics is a pattern of interaction which aims to minimise 'local trouble' through the use of extended question sequences.

The *sequential* relationship between foreigner talk and misunderstanding has been described in detail by Hinnenkamp (1987) using a three-part framework. In his data (collected in a German job centre used by Turkish migrant workers), Hinnenkamp observed that foreigner talk typically occurred for three reasons: firstly, after an utterance by a migrant worker which was treated by a German interlocutor as evidence of a possible *challenge to mutual understanding*, for example, a request for clarification. Secondly, foreigner talk occurred as a way of *preventing trouble*, for example by repeating a question several times before

pausing for an answer. Thirdly, foreigner talk was also found to occur where there was what Hinnenkamp describes as *interactional trouble*, for example the creation of a contrast between 'normal' talk and foreigner talk in order to highlight and defend a local (i.e. non-foreign) identity, or as a way of exonerating the 'foreigner' of the responsibility for understanding, or as a way of denying their ability to understand or contribute to the task in hand.

The occurrence of foreigner talk where there is deemed to be *interactional trouble* shows how categories of 'membership' are created, a process with subsequent interactional consequences, and another example of the sensitivity to both micro and macro contexts of talk facilitated by Communication Accommodation Theory, mentioned earlier in this section. When accommodation occurs after a challenge to mutual understanding has been recognised (or indeed prior to, and in order to prevent, a challenge) it has the, perhaps unintended, consequence of ascribing an interlocutor to the category of 'non-native speaker' (see also Park, 2007). This ascription, Hinnenkamp argues, creates a category which, in the speaker's mind may imply a *general* incompetence in English, or even, as Gumperz (1982) in his work on 'minorization' shows, incompetence in general. In other words, foreigner talk,

> as identifier of membership category may [...] be labelled '*parasitic*', in that its application draws upon negative stereotyping at the expense of the stereotyped, and to the benefit of the stereotyper, who has thus successfully legitimated his or her claim of being naturally endowed with more rights than her or his interlocutor. (Hinnenkamp, 1987, p. 173 emphasis in the original)

The use of accommodated talk to create a particular kind of relationship and accomplish what one or more of the interactants perceive to be a 'normal' situation does not have to result in negative consequences however. Accommodated talk can also provide a way of talking which allows recognised roles to come into being in a way that creates the context necessary for a particular kind of institutional relationship. Ten Have's (1991) work, for example, on doctor-patient interaction, shows that the asymmetrical relationship created by the use of doctor/patient categories acts not only as a constraint on interaction, but as a resource. In positioning each other as 'doctor' and 'patient', the interactants create a framework that provides structure and strategies for

successful interaction. Similarly, interactants can use ways of talking conventionally associated with 'being a native speaker' and 'being a language learner' as a way of achieving their mutual aim of having a conversation (Park, 2007). The benefits of 'doing' foreigner talk are that it can provide a handy and effective framework by which the conversation may proceed. Though, as Hinnenkamp and Gumperz remind us, all the benefits are not always equally shared between all the participants.

Generalising about conversational adjustments between settings is a risky business. In addition to the effect of the setting on the manner and on the effects of accommodated speech, research has suggested that there are also task-effects, discourse domain-effects, and topic-effects (Zuengler, 1989, 1991, 1993a, 1993b).

Conclusion

This study was inspired by two 'critical incidents' at a UK university where I was teaching, and teaching about teaching, English as an additional/international language. Both incidents touched on the issue of misunderstanding, and both exemplified and challenged aspects of the language-teaching and language-using contexts in which they occurred.

The issues that were raised by the two critical incidents provided a direction for a review of relevant empirical and theoretical literature. The topics covered in this chapter have addressed a number of these issues, including: the use of 'English' for communication around the world; the nature of intelligibility, especially in international 'lingua franca' situations; how people achieve their communicative goals by changing the way they speak according to their particular circumstances; the role of strategies in effective communication; and how people talk to additional language users ('foreigners').

As this chapter has shown, there is a growing interest in certain areas of Applied Linguistics in the use of English in international contexts. This new interest in the international diversity of English has complicated what 'English' has traditionally stood for in TESOL and in internationalising unversities. In this chapter I have considered this new awareness of the diversity of English, and the challenges it has thrown up for conceptualisations of intelligibility. I have put this new awareness in the context of more established sociolinguistic literature on the ways in which language users change how they speak according to their particular circumstances.

The literature on accommodation theory, including work on communication strategies and foreigner talk, has shown that:

- the range of possible conversational adjustments is diverse
- the presence and selection of adjustments made by speakers is probably sensitive to the multiplicity of contexts (person, topic, task, setting, discourse domain etc.) in which the talk takes place. Due to the complexity of interactions between these contexts, it may be impossible

to predict what adjustments are likely to be made, or account for their presence or absence in talk

- the relationship between adjustments and (mis)understanding is complex. Adjustments may or may not be a cause or an effect of misunderstanding. They may take place *before* an episode of misunderstanding and contribute to a fragile communicative environment in which misunderstanding is more likely, or they may be an attempt to *repair* misunderstanding

- in extended international interaction, it may not be possible to tell whether adjustments are proactive or reactive or both, or whether misunderstanding is a local matter (that is, a result of adjustments) or a global matter (that is, a result of proficiency in lingua franca English, or the general assumptions about language and attitudes to each other that individual interactants bring along)

- in terms of their effect, adjustments can be both a problem and a resource for interactants, depending on what each stand to gain or lose in any particular situation

Research Questions

Given the contexts of this study, as described in chapter one, and the review of relevant literature in this chapter, the two overarching research questions I wish to ask of the data collected for this study are about the relationships between accommodation and (mis)understanding, namely:

- in classroom talk between UK and International students navigating TESOL tasks, what conversational adjustments occur?
- what are the relationships between these adjustments and (mis)understanding?

Four sub-questions underpin the second of these general questions, as follows:

1. what is the sequential relationship between the adjustments and (mis)understanding in the students' talk?
2. do the adjustments made by the students relate to the contexts (professional and institutional) in which their talk takes place?
3. is (mis)understanding a local matter (relatable to adjustments) or a global matter (relatable to the participants' use of lingua franca English, or to aspects of their professional and institutional contexts)?
4. are adjustments and (mis)understanding a problem or a resource for the students?

In the next chapter I describe in detail how I went about looking for evidence of accommodation and misunderstanding in my own data. In chapter four, I say what I found out about the relationship between the two, and in chapter five I discuss possible applications of these findings. In this way, I hope to fulfil my overall aim of developing a detailed understanding of (mis)understanding in classroom talk between International and UK students at York St John. All with the applied linguistic aim of developing some pointers for how the task of communicating in English might be re-conceptualised for students in internationalising UK universities.

Chapter Three - Methodology

Introduction

In this chapter, I provide some background information on the practical, methodological, ethical and theoretical issues involved in conducting this study. In particular, I show how I met the challenge of operationalising my two overarching research questions and four sub-questions. As the wording of my questions implies, this study is not attempting to characterise a specific genre of communication per se. Instead, my focus is on the linguistic behaviour of a group of students in a particular communication context, with its starting point an interest in the phenomenon of conversational adjustments and (mis)understanding.

I begin this chapter by describing some of the practical issues involved in collecting and transcribing the data collected for this study. Then, I move from a description of practical issues to a consideration of some theoretical questions about the analysis of classroom talk, including relationships between context and talk/text, and the implications of these relationships for my data analysis. Next, I discuss the choices I made during the analysis of my data, including how I came to define accommodation and (mis)understanding. Then in the penultimate section of the chapter, I describe how I selected the extracts from my data for presentation in chapter four. In the final section of this chapter, on ethical issues, I relate the aims, methods and outcomes of this study to the disciplinary framework of Applied Linguistics.

In the next section of this chapter I will describe the participants in this study, the classroom tasks they were engaged in, and the type and amount of data that they supplied in order to conduct the analysis required to answer my research questions.

The participants

At the time of data collection I was teaching two modules at York St John University: an 'Introduction to TESOL' module and a 'Communication Skills' module. Both ran for twelve weeks in the first semester of the academic year. The twenty UK students on the 'Introduction to TESOL' module were third year undergraduates on a BA in English language and linguistics. Most of these students, like most of the students at York St John, were from the North East of England, Yorkshire and Humberside. The fifteen International students on the 'Communication Skills' module were on a pre-undergraduate Foundation Programme at the University. The International students were from China, Angola, Poland, Greece, Thailand and Libya. Most of the International students had taken an IELTS test prior to applying to the University and had achieved a score of at least 4.5. Their scores on another semester one module called 'English Language Skills' (ELS), which aims to assess the students' general level of proficiency in English, varied from 20 (E - Fail) to 89 (A+). Not all of the students on the modules participated in this study, as explained below. The students that did participate in the study are listed here, along with their ELS grades (A – D = Pass).

Communication Skills			Introduction to TESOL	
Name	*Nationality*	*ELS grade*	*Name*	*Nationality*
Xin	Chinese	E	Ursula	British
Ling	Thai	D	Valerie	
Ella	Chinese	D	Stella	
Tom	Chinese	D	Kate	
Roy	Chinese	D	Grace	
Ali	Libyan	C	Eileen	
Giorgios	Greek	C	Bryn	
Magda	Polish	B	Natalie	
Stelios	Greek	A	Andrew	
Markus	Polish	A	Claire	
Stefano	Angolan	A	Ann	

The classroom tasks

'Introduction to TESOL' module

The summative assessment for the 'Introduction to TESOL' module required students to write two lesson plans for a group of Foundation Programme students, and to write an accompanying report justifying their choice of lesson aims and approach to teaching (see appendix A for the actual assessment brief). The assessment, a typical TESOL 'needs analysis' task, had three stages, as follows:

1.   In class, working in groups of three, the students discussed, and may or may not have recorded in writing, questions for the current York St John Foundation Programme students about the Foundation Programme students' English language needs and wants, as well as their preferences for types of classroom interaction and tasks. The TESOL students then used these questions, which they may or may not have been reading aloud, to interview and record one (sometimes two) Foundation Programme student(s) each, in class time. The students were allocated to their pairs by me, according to the time at which they had arrived for the class. It was the responsibility of the 'Introduction to TESOL' students to organise and operate the recording equipment.

2.   After the interview, the 'Introduction to TESOL' students listened to their recordings for useful information about the Foundation Programme students' English language learning needs and wants. They did this outside of the class. Later, in class, they were given time to share their insights with the other two TESOL students in their group. Specifically, the assessment rubric encouraged them to consider the Foundation Programme students':

        a)   'target' language and communication needs (e.g. as future undergraduates as well as any of the other reasons for learning English they mentioned in their interview)

        b)   current language and communication abilities as evidenced by the recordings

    c)   gaps between their current abilities and their predicted/desired target needs

The TESOL students passed on their recordings to me and I gave the recordings out to the Foundation Programme students.

3.   Finally, the TESOL students worked individually to prepare two lesson plans and a report justifying their choice of lesson aims and tasks. The lesson plans, the report and the recordings were submitted for assessment.

'Communication Skills' module

The summative assessment for the 'Communication Skills' module required the International students to prepare a 15-minute group presentation, write an 800-word group report and a 200-word individual reflective piece (see appendix B for the actual assessment brief). The possible topics of the presentation and the report were: varieties of English, (mis)understanding, English as an international language, language learning and teaching. In order to prepare for the presentation and report, the students: read a journal article about teaching English as an international language, discussed some suggested questions as a group, and prepared some questions for a student on the TESOL module. The actual questions they asked the TESOL students during the interview were their own choice, though this choice is likely to have been influenced by previous discussions on the module and the suggestions of their group. The students may or may not have written down their questions.

As mentioned in the previous section, the students were allocated to their UK-International pairs by me, according to the time at which they had arrived for the class. I gave the responsibility of organising and operating the recording equipment to the 'Introduction to TESOL' students. The 'Communication Skills' students' questions, and the answers of the TESOL students, were recorded on the same occasion as the 'needs analysis' interview.

One consequence of giving the UK students the responsibility of sourcing and operating the recording equipment may have been to put them 'in charge' of the interviews. In all of the recordings submitted, the UK students began the

interview with their questions and the International students often had much less time for their questions. This may have been because the International students had fewer questions, or because one or both of the students felt that time had run out, or for a range of other possible reasons. Within each half of the interview, the recordings show that the student asking the questions takes 'speaker rights'; for example, initiating topics, ending topics and interrupting.

The TESOL students submitted their recordings to me and I passed the recordings on to the 'Communication Skills' students. The International students then listened to the recordings outside of class time and pooled any useful information they had heard in class with their group. They then prepared their group presentation and report, as well as their individual reflective piece of writing.

The data analysed for this study

After the end of the semester, I sent out a request to all the students on both modules for their recorded interviews to be used as data for this study, on the condition that their names were changed in the transcripts. Twenty-two students replied (eleven International students and eleven UK students) giving their permission. One of the UK students who agreed to participate (Kate) submitted two recordings, with different Foundation Programme students (Tom and Roy). Two of the International students who agreed to participate (Tom and Giorgios) were involved twice in different interviews (see below for details). The twelve recordings that the students submitted were between 24 seconds and thirty-two minutes each. The reasons for the shorter recordings were varied; some students initially forgot to turn on the equipment, or pressed an incorrect button/switch while recording, or had a tape that ran out, or delayed starting and/or stopped recording because of noise levels, or for other reasons only submitted a fragment. The student pairings and recording times were as follows:

1.   Claire (UK) and Markus (Poland)   11 minutes and 51 seconds

2.   Bryn (UK) and Giorgios (Greece)   18 minutes and 51 seconds

3.   Valerie (UK) and Ling (Thailand)   32 minutes and 7 seconds

4. Andrew (UK) and Stelios (Greece)   24 seconds

5. Stella (UK), Giorgios (Greece)   8 minutes and 7 seconds

    and Ella (China)

6. Eileen (UK) and Ali (Libya)   19 minutes 34 seconds

7. Kate (UK) and Tom (China)   21 minutes and 24 seconds

8. Kate (UK) and Roy (China)   13 minutes and 11 seconds

9. Grace (UK) and Tom (China)   6 minutes and 37 seconds

10. Ursula (UK) and Xin (China)   2 minutes and 41 seconds

11. Natalie (UK), Magda (Poland)   32 minutes and 12 seconds

    and Xin (China)

12. Ann (UK) and Stefano (Angola)   12 minutes and 39 seconds

The twelve recordings add up to a total of 179 minutes, approximately three hours. I listened to all three hours of the twelve interviews and selected six recordings for transcription in full and six for part transcription (all transcriptions are available in Appendix D) as follows. The number of lines in the transcript is in brackets after the students' names:

Full = Valerie and Ling (1027)

        Andrew and Stelios (8)

        Eileen and Ali (453)

        Kate and Tom (353)

        Grace and Tom (126)

        Ursula and Xin (54)

Part = Claire and Markus (26)

Bryn and Giorgios (46)

Stella, Giorgios and Ella (14)

Kate and Roy (86)

Natalie, Magda and Xin (384)

Ann and Stefano (24)

My reasons for this selection of recordings to transcribe either in full or in part, and how I decided which extracts from the data to present in the 'findings' chapter of this study, are presented in the penultimate section of this chapter, 'data analysis'.

In the next section of this chapter, I briefly explore some of the issues involved in transcribing the spoken data collected for this study.

Transcribing spoken data

The audio recordings are my primary data, but transcription was necessary in order to be able to report the data here. Transcribing the students' recordings meant listening carefully to the details of their interaction so as to be able to note down these details as accurately as possible. As Heath and Luff say (1993, p. 309, cited in ten Have, 2007, p. 96),

> The process of transcription...provides the researcher with a way of noticing, even discovering, particular events, and helps focus analytic attention on their socio-interactional organisation.

Transcribing, as a route to noticing the kind of detail which might otherwise pass unremarked, has also been used in English for academic purposes (EAP) lessons for advanced learners aiming to improve their speaking skills (Lynch, 2001, 2007). I return to this advantage of transcribing later in the thesis, where I describe phase two of this study.

There are, however, disadvantages of transcription. Like any kind of translation, in this case from speech to writing, the new format is a re-presentation of the original text. In order to capture not only *what* the students said in their interviews with each other, but also *how* they said it, I had to choose methods of transcription which would be informative but also readable. With this in mind, I decided to use the transcription conventions associated with conversation analysis, as developed by Gail Jefferson. The Jeffersonian system of symbols aims to tread a middle way between a phonetic transcription (accurate, but difficult to read without a great deal of familiarity with the international phonetic alphabet and very consuming of space on the page) and a content-focussed transcription (easy to read, but not at all an accurate representation of how the interactants are speaking) (ten Have, 2007). The result is a style of transcription which is both readable and provides an idea of how the interactants are actually speaking. There is no rule book however, and different users of Jefferson's system use slightly different sets of symbols, or develop new symbols to represent the features of spoken interaction of interest to them; see Appendix C for a list of symbols used in the transcripts of the data collected for this study.

Methodology

This section will classify and describe the various analytical fields occupied by the literature reviewed in the chapter two. I note the affordances and limitations of adopting these approaches for this study, and thereby aim to make clear the reasons for my own choice of theoretical approach.

Approaches to the analysis of classroom discourse have been commented on and classified in a range of different ways (see, for example Edwards and Mercer, 1987; Scott, 1996; Usher, 1996; Rampton et al, 2002; Seedhouse, 2004; Cazden, 2008; Mercer, 2010; Cogo and Dewey, 2012). Following Usher (1996) I will divide up the analytic approaches taken by the literature reviewed in chapter two of this study into: positivist/empiricist (I will refer to these as positivist), critical, and interpretative/hermeneutic/interactional (I will refer to these as interactional) approaches. In chapter one I critically reflected on the overlapping contexts in which my data was collected. For that reason I focus in particular here on the notion of context in the approaches to analysis reviewed here.

Positivist approaches

Positivist approaches in the literature reviewed in chapter two include contrastive analysis and corpus linguistics. These types of approaches assume that text and context are separable, and indeed that, for research to be valid, they must be separated. Also assumed is that the relationship between text (and talk) and context is a fixed one, and that the meaning of a text is inherent and is the same for all readers/listeners who are able to be 'objective'. Furthermore, the context is understood to be the 'cause' and the text is the 'effect'; a deductive, text → context, 'top-down' relationship. A determinate world is assumed and predictive generalisations about this world are the goal.

Contrastive analysis

TESOL professionals, on the whole, have not been interested, or have not felt it necessary to go beyond the notion of context implied by the methods of contrastive analysis (Lado, 1957; Lado, 1964) in which the sounds and structures in the students' first language are compared to those of an idealised

version of the target language, and any variation is described as an 'error'. In the contrastive analysis model, the relationship between context and talk is static and from first language (context) to 'target' language (talk). Today, contrastive analysis lives on in resources for teachers which explain learners' errors in English as being caused by interference from their first language (see for example Swan and Smith, 2001).

Corpus linguistics

Work in world Englishes/ELF has shown how concepts such as 'error', 'English' (the 'target' language), 'interference' and 'first language' are contested terms (Kachru and Nelson, 1996; Jenkins, 2006). Research methods have tended to be corpus-based (for example, the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English), as might be expected in research which aims to generalise about new varieties. Such work has, on the whole, taken for granted the importance of the 'international' context and the inevitability of its effect on talk. This has resulted in generalisations, about national varieties of English and 'core' lingua franca English, that are not necessarily sensitive to the multiple dimensions of specific contexts, and that prioritise the geographical and linguistic dimensions of context above all others.

The potential benefit of positivist approaches to research in TESOL is the potential for generalisability; for the discovery of findings that can be applied across multiple contexts and classrooms. The limitations of positivist approaches are a mirror image of their hoped-for benefits; where contexts and classrooms vary, and their specific relevance to language users cannot be predicted, over-generalisation is a danger. Given the work in critical applied linguistics, reviewed chapter two, questioning the existence of an 'English' with which to compare the output of a learner or an ELF user, neither a contrastive analytic nor a corpus linguistic approach seems useful to this study. Positivist approaches require a monolithic conceptualisation of language, and critical applied linguists have demonstrated why monolithism is unconvincing, unsustainable and unfair. Rampton (1997), discussing lingua franca-type situations, warns,

> With its eyes glued *only* to the properties of talk, research might end up waving an antiquated banner of holistic coherence at precisely the

moment when the crucial values become transition and hybridity.
(Rampton, 1997, p. 18)

It is important, however, to be aware that positivist approaches underpin much thinking in mainstream TESOL (including perhaps the thinking of both the UK and International students who participated in this study) and a great deal of the research on English as a lingua franca. Although, as stated above, an exclusively positivist approach to the analysis of the data collected for this study would have had few benefits, it is not necessary to completely ignore the results of, for example, corpus-based work on ELF. In the section on 'analysing the dataset' below, I argue for an approach to my data which does not discount the findings of 'top down' studies conducted in a positivist paradigm.

Critical approaches

Critical approaches to research (see Fairclough and Wodak, 1997, for a useful typology) aim to detect and unmask beliefs and practices,

> that maintain the status quo by restricting the access of groups to the means of gaining knowledge and the raising of consciousness or awareness about the material conditions that oppress or restrict them. (Usher, 1996, p. 22)

Critical linguists reject the assumption that the production of texts is separable from the contexts in which they are produced. All speakers are socially located, and the talk that they produce will always be influenced by a social interest; in other words, meaning/understanding is socially constructed (Usher, 1996). Rather than taking for granted the relationship between discourse and beliefs, objects, people and relationships, critical linguists look in detail at the role of texts in how beliefs about the social world and physical world come about, how beliefs change over time and between places, who is advantaged or disadvantaged by which kinds of texts (and talk), and how any disadvantage could be avoided or corrected.

Critical linguists have their detractors. The applied linguist Henry Widdowson (1996), for example, claims that the very explicit agenda of critical linguistics, to expose the power relations in texts and institutional practices, predetermines and therefore invalidates the interpretations of analysts in the critical tradition. On the other hand, the potential benefit of critical approaches to research in TESOL is that such approaches remind us that the contexts surrounding the texts we produce (and analyse) exert huge pressure on what (and how) things can be said, often in invisible ways. It is the critical applied linguistics of Pennycook (2007), Canagarajah (1999, 2006, 2007) and Blommaert (2003), reviewed in chapter two, which have highlighted the drawbacks of monolithic conceptualisations of English for most of its users around the world, and which have provided the impetus for this study.

Interactional approaches

Interactional approaches to research problematise the relationship between talk and context by proposing a reciprocal, or reflexive, relationship between the two (for example in the work of Hinnenkamp, 1987; Firth, 1990; Gardner, 2004; and Park, 2007). Rather than aiming to generalise about new varieties of English, such studies explore the ways in which talk may be influenced by, but also contribute to, context. Which of the dimensions of context are more important than others, how these possible influences become audible in talk, and the ever-changing and interactive relationship between talk and context, are among the concerns of such approaches. Commenting on the use of interactional approaches to analyse international communication, Firth (1990) says,

> The purpose of [such approaches] is not to examine language *per se*; neither is it to draw direct comparisons with native speaker performance; rather it is to investigate how language is *used* interactively to accomplish interpersonal goals. (Firth, 1990, p. 269)

Interactional approaches are inductive and 'bottom-up'; rather than deciding in advance on what aspects of the context help make sense of an extract of talk, analysts focus on,

> How the participants attend to, construct, and manipulate aspects of context as a constitutive feature of the activities they are engaged in. Context is thus analyzed as an interactively constituted mode of praxis. (Goodwin and Duranti, 1992, p. 9)

In contrast to positivist approaches, demonstrable evidence of a mutually accepted orientation to aspects of the context is required by the interactants, in order to be able to conclude that, in a specific case, national or linguistic identities are relevant. Such approaches take as their starting point the idea that groups actively produce their talk in cooperation with each other to achieve particular ends, contributing to the ongoing construction and maintenance of contexts, including shared meaning, self and group identity, society and culture.

Interactional approaches in the literature reviewed in chapter two include conversation analysis (for example, Gardner, 2004; Carroll, 2005), linguistic ethnography (for example, Leung et al, 1997) and interactional sociolinguistics (for example, Gumperz et al, 1979; Gumperz, 1982; Gumperz, 1999).

Linguistic ethnography

Ethnographic approaches are part of a sociolinguistic tradition and are closely associated with the work of Dell Hymes (1972) and the idea of communicative competence: the knowledge of whether and to what degree an utterance is considered by a specific community or group to be grammatical, socially appropriate, cognitively feasible and observable in practice. A broad field, overlapping with critical linguistics, interactional sociolinguistics and conversation analysis, linguistic ethnographers aim to avoid generalisations about language users and their linguistic practices. Instead they attend to the ways in which people act and react to each other, creating and re-creating the contexts in which they live. Linguistic ethnographers such as Ben Rampton (with colleagues Leung and Harris, 1997) have shown, for example, how the concept of 'native speaker' is an over-generalised category that has little actual purchase on the complex communicative competence of (not just) multilingual language users.

Interactional sociolinguistics

The approach to discourse known as interactional sociolinguistics was established by a close associate of Hymes, the anthropological linguist John Gumperz (for example Gumperz, 1982), drawing on the work of Erving Goffman (for example Goffman, 1981). Much of Gumperz's research focuses on intercultural communication and misunderstanding. It aims to show that our understanding of what a person is saying depends, not just on the content of their talk, but on our ability to notice and evaluate what Gumperz calls 'contextualization cues', which include: intonation, tempo, rhythm, pauses, lexical and syntactic choices and non-verbal signals. Gumperz adapted and extended Hymes's ethnographic framework by examining how interactants with different first languages apply different rules of speaking in face-to-face interaction. As the brief mention of his work in chapter two of this study suggests, the invisibility of these different rules mean that some interactants in lingua franca situations are in danger of being judged 'incompetent', rather than simply 'different'.

Conversation analysis

The origins of conversation analysis lie in the sociological approach to language and communication known as ethnomethodology (associated with Harold Garfinkel, 1967): the study of social order and the complex ways in which people coordinate their everyday lives in interaction with others. Conversation analysis was initially developed into a distinctive field of enquiry by, amongst others, Harvey Sacks, Emmanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson (see ten Have, p. 5 – 9), and looks both at both ordinary, mundane conversation and at institutional forms of talk. Analysts aim to show the intricate ways in which interlocutors mutually organise their talk and what these ways tell us about socially preferred patterns of interaction, including: turn-taking, opening and closing an interaction, introducing and changing topics, managing misunderstanding, introducing bad news, agreeing and disagreeing, eliciting a response by asking a question, and so on. The work of Rod Gardner (2004) and Donald Carroll (2005), reviewed in chapter two of this study, has shown how traditional TESOL assessments of learner language as inadequate and deficient (when compared, as in interlanguage theory or contrastive analysis, with 'native speaker' models) fail to take account of the co-constructed nature of understanding, and often underplay the rich variety of communication strategies displayed by multilingual speakers.

Possible drawbacks of conversation analysis have been highlighted by critical linguists (see for example Wetherell, 1998) who claim that the focus on the delicate machinery of interaction maintained by conversation analysts makes them potentially negligent of the position of text as social practice, and as a result, blind to the ideological aspects of language. Debates between conversation analytic- and critically-oriented analysts inevitably focus on the different emphases of their approach (see, in particular, the exchanges between Billig (1999a, 1999b) and Schegloff (1999b, 1999c)). But these differences should not be overplayed; Billig reminds us that he,

> share[s] Schegloff's unease about studies which pronounce on the nature of discourses, without getting down to the business of studying what is actually uttered or written. (Billig, 1999a, p. 544)

The potential benefit of interactional approaches to research in TESOL is the increased likelihood of validity; of findings that adequately capture what are inevitably complex communicative situations. The limitations are a mirror image of the hoped-for benefits of the positivist approaches described above; the irrelevance of the findings to contexts other than those in which the data was collected. Bearing in mind the complexities of the overlapping contexts for my data, described in chapter one of this study, it is unlikely that any other group of UK/International students will communicate in exactly the same way as my students, or indeed that my students will reproduce exactly the same linguistic features in other contexts. Given that the aim of my study is not to generalise about linguistic features but to explore how (mis)understanding is managed in interaction between users of English *in the specific language-teaching/using contexts of this study*, my choice of an interactional approach seems an appropriate one.

From approach to method

Although analytic traditions such as corpus linguistics and contrastive analysis have been used in TESOL and lingua franca English research, as approaches they are neither practical nor completely compatible with the aims of this study. Their findings remain of interest however, and I decided not to ignore them in the analysis of my own data. Interactional and critical approaches, with their explicit raising of the question of the relationships between talk and context, are both practical and compatible with my research aims, and it is these two approaches which I have decided to combine. Having made the decision to adopt and combine these two approaches however, I then had to grapple with the fact that, on occasions, they have been presented as incompatible, as the Billig/Schegloff debate mentioned above shows. Rampton et al, in their review of approaches to the methodology of classroom discourse, make the point that, 'In reality, applied linguistics often involves quite a lot of hybrid interdisciplinarity' (2002, p. 373). My own interdisciplinary approach is made necessary by an interest in institutional and professional contexts, and relationships between these and students' talk.

Having decided to take an interdisciplinarity approach, I found I needed a *method* of analysis which would help me to maintain a micro-focus on my data (such as that proposed by conversation analysts), while at the same time keeping a macro-focus on the bigger picture of professional and institutional contexts (as proposed by critical theorists). I aimed to use what discourse analyst James Paul Gee describes as,

> a reciprocal and cyclical [analytic] process in which we shuttle back and forth between the structure (form, design) of a piece of language and the situated meanings it is attempting to build about the world, identities and relationships. (Gee, 1999, p. 99)

However, before I could begin to use this reciprocal and cyclical method of analysis, I realised that I urgently needed to solve five key problems. What these problems are and how I went about solving them is the topic of the next section.

Data Analysis

Key analytical problems

Having decided on an interdisciplinary approach, and a reciprocal and cyclical method of analysis, I faced the following five key analytical problems as I initially listened to my three hours of recorded classroom interviews:

1. what does a conversational adjustment sound like?
2. what does a misunderstanding sound like?
3. what does evidence of a student's orientation to a particular context sound like?
4. how is possible for me to tell whether a misunderstanding is a local matter (relatable to adjustments) or a global matter (relatable to the participants use of lingua franca English, or to aspects of their professional and institutional contexts)?
5. how is it possible for me to tell whether adjustments and (mis)understanding are a problem or a resource for the students?

I will now describe how I dealt with these five key analytical problems, first in more abstract terms and then with a worked example. I will then conclude this section by commenting on how the solutions to these key analytical problems allowed me to answer my two overarching research and four sub-questions.

Analytical problem 1: what does a conversational adjustment sound like?

As mentioned in chapter two, the literature on accommodation theory, communication strategies and foreigner talk shows that the range of possible conversational adjustments is diverse, as well as being sensitive to various dimensions of the context (linguistic, proximal, temporal, geographical, interpersonal, and ideological) in which the talk takes place. Although, due to the complexity of interactions between these dimensions, it is impossible to *predict* what adjustments are likely to be made, the following features of talk might be cases of accommodation, having been observed in previous studies of conversational adjustments in international English (as noted in the previous chapter):

- content-related features: giving additional information about, and 'helpful' explanations of, situations and events; repetition of one's own words and the words of other speakers; choosing a narrower range of topics; more here-and-now orientation; briefer treatment of topics

- phonological features: slower speech; avoiding contractions and weak forms of vowels; stressing more words; increased volume

- lexical features: using less slang, fewer idioms; using more words considered 'easy'

- syntactical features: avoiding syntax considered 'complex'; omitting verbs, using more tag questions; shorter utterances and an increased use of the present tense; the copula; prepositions; articles and inflectional endings

- discourse features: more repetition and rephrasing of one's own and others' information; longer and more frequent pauses; completing others' utterances; correcting others' 'mistakes'; more abrupt changes in topic; easier 'giving up' of topics when a new topic is proposed by an interlocutor; more acceptance of unintentional changes in topic; more use of questions as a way of changing the topic; more comprehension checks; more confirmation checks; more clarification requests; more expansions; more question and answer sequences; more joining in to help another interactant find a word or phrase that might be a 'correct' expression of what he or she wants to say.

Many of the items on the list mention comparisons, that is, the use of 'more' or 'less' information, volume, idioms, tag questions, comprehension checks and so on. As it was not the aim of this study to compare my students' classroom talk with their talk in other contexts, my comparisons will be *internal* to the data. That is to say, I decided to look for changes which occurred in the students' talk *during* their interaction with each other.

These changes, or 'self repairs' might be 'other-initiated' (reactive) sequences triggered by an interlocutor's complaint, for example, 'what?' or 'huh?'. They could also be 'self-initiated' repair; (pro-active) sequences in which a speaker seems to interrupt what s/he is saying by restarting their utterance. In other words, adjustment might take place before a complaint or other kind of

problematic event, or after such an event (adjustment → problem or problem → adjustment).

Analytical problem 2: what does a misunderstanding sound like?

The rubrics of both assessed classroom tasks allowed students to comment on any episodes of misunderstanding in their recordings, but only two students chose to do so. I decided not to follow this up and so do not have access to any further commentary by the students on their interaction. There were three reasons for this decision. Firstly, I was afraid that by the time I came to ask them, both groups of students might have forgotten the intentions and understandings they had at the time of the interviews. Secondly, given that I was their Module Director, I thought that they might see a stimulated recall procedure as a test and over- or under-identify for my (and their own) benefit. This latter problem is a kind of respondent bias that Robson (2002, p. 172) refers to as the 'good bunny' syndrome; interviewees who try to give the answers they judge are wanted/expected by the interviewer. Thirdly, I thought that, given the institutional and professional contexts of the study, in a stimulated recall exercise the students might over-diagnose misunderstanding. Furthermore, from a theoretical viewpoint, the interactionist approach I had already decided to take to my data views stimulated recall data as *new data*; that is, data which is generated in a different context from the original data and which therefore (only) says something about the *new context* in which the new data was collected.

For these reasons, instead of retrospectively interviewing my students, I decided to define understanding and misunderstanding as anything that gets treated as such by the students themselves. This meant noticing episodes within the data in which the interactants acknowledged a misunderstanding, by doing something, reactively, to 'repair' the section of talk they were treating as problematic. As mentioned in the previous section on conversational adjustments, these repairs might be either other-initiated (by some kind of 'complaint') or self-initiated 'self repair', or 'other repair', where an interactant corrects their interlocutor.

Sufficient understanding for the interactants' aims to be achieved was assumed wherever there was no evidence of misunderstanding within the interaction itself. This is, of course, different from assuming 'understanding', but, in an institutional setting such as the one in which my data collection took place, I would argue that 'sufficient understanding for current purposes' is good enough.

There are two important limitations of this solution to analytical problem two. Firstly, both complaints and the adjustments that I am calling 'other repair' may have little or nothing to do with (mis)understanding. It is easy to imagine situations in which a complaint such as "what?" or an 'other repair' in which a participant repeats an interlocutor's words might, for example, mean:

- I didn't hear
- I did hear but I don't understand
- I did hear and I understand, but I am not interested
- I did hear and I understand, and I am very surprised
- I did hear and I understand, and I disagree
- I did hear and I am delaying my response to what you said to annoy you, or to give me more thinking time, and so on.

This is a limitation faced by all analysts of other peoples' talk: inevitably, matching a linguistic feature/practice to an action/function is an interpretive act.

The second limitation of my solution to analytical problem two, is that repair can be seen as evidence of misunderstanding *and* understanding. Its occurrence can be a sign of the fragility of an interaction and of its robustness; a sign of a problem and also the problem's solution (House et al, 2003). Furthermore, as we will see in the discussions of analytical problem four, there is one more issue here; not only are adjustments possibly both indicators and solutions, they may also be the *cause* of misunderstanding.

The only possible response to these limitations is to remain aware of them, and to think carefully, on a case-by-case basis, about the complaints and repair-like features/practices and the range of actions/functions they may be achieving.

Analytical problem 3: what does evidence of orientation to a particular context sound like?

Contexts, as critical approaches to analysis suggest, surround the texts we produce and analyse, and exert pressure on what (and how) things can be said, often in invisible ways. Interactional approaches remind us however that the relevance of these contexts is unpredictable and that relevance is a *member's concern*. In order to be able to notice my participants' orientation to particular contexts, I decided to listen for the specific features of 'utterance re-designs' - another way of saying 'self repairs'. The kind of self repair that gets done may provide evidence of context-specific accommodation, in other words, insight into my students' diagnosis of the *reasons* for any interactional trouble (including misunderstanding). By noticing how utterance re-designs were different from original utterances, I hoped to gain access to the dimension of the context the students were orienting to, at the moment of speaking.

Analytical problem 4: how is possible for me to tell whether a misunderstanding is a local matter (relatable to adjustments) or a global matter (relatable to the participants' use of lingua franca English, or to aspects of the professional and institutional contexts)?

Problem four is an even knottier one than problems one, two and three. Arguments about the phenomenology, including the possible causes/sources, of misunderstanding have been made from a wide range of theoretical positions, as summed up by Coupland et al's (1991, pp. 12 – 15) six-level model. I very briefly summarise the model in my own words here (in italics) and connect each of the levels to the contexts of my own research, and to the literature reviewed in chapter two, in the hope that the model will help with the solving of my fourth (and fifth) analytical problem.

Level 1

Misunderstanding is inevitable, pervasive and therefore not a problem and not of any particular interest. In research on second language acquisition (for example, Long, 1996) and in general TESOL practice, the opposite is assumed to be true: misunderstanding is seen as evidence of ongoing but incomplete learning/acquisition. As a participant in the TESOL profession, I also have an interest in misunderstanding, but not necessarily for the same reasons as its

mainstream practitioners. From the point of view of level one of Coupland et al's model, its inevitability makes misunderstanding always a local matter (relatable, or not, to adjustments). In order to keep the *local* nature of misunderstanding alive as a possibility, and in order to avoid assuming (as the mainstream TESOL profession does), that it is always a global matter (see levels two, three, four and five), I will be using level one as a way of thinking about the nature (causes/sources) of misunderstanding.

Level 2

Interactants are generally not aiming for formally correct utterances, but to maintain their own and their interlocutor's 'face'. Minor misunderstandings are common and usually ignored or 'let pass'. From this point of view, misunderstanding is the responsibility of individual interactants, but not one which exercises them a great deal. Research into communication in English as a lingua franca reviewed in chapter two has identified adherence to a 'let it pass' rule in non-educational settings. As mentioned in my commentary on analytical problem three, I will be checking my data for the students' orientation to this global perspective on misunderstanding.

Level 3

Being understandable and understanding is an individual responsibility and misunderstanding is a sign of incompetence, bad mood or bad personality. TESOL and UK universities, with their remedial programmes of study for International students, assume that individuals are responsible for misunderstanding, and that the aim of the training they provide is to treat the incompetence of these individuals. In tandem with the forms-focussed, monolithic theories of language and the 'native-speakerism' characteristic of much of the TESOL profession, incompetence is most likely to be characterised as *linguistic* (as opposed to *communicative*). As mentioned in my commentary on analytical problem three, I will be checking my data for the students' orientation to this perspective on misunderstanding.

Level 4

Given that individual interactants may have different, perhaps multiple communicative goals (task-related, identity and relational), misunderstanding,

as much as understanding, may be used to gain a strategic advantage over another individual. TESOL and UK universities have tended to assume that their students' communicative goals are task-related. I have made the same assumption, given that my participants were interviewing each other to collect usable information for an assessment. What is interesting about this particular assessment context however, is that both misunderstanding and understanding are useful to the students. While, on the one hand, the students needed usable opinions and facts from each other (requiring understanding), they were also able to use misunderstanding (as a topic for their reports and, for the UK students, as evidence of the International students' language learning needs). As mentioned in my commentary on analytical problem three, I will be checking my data for the students' orientation to different communicative goals.

Level 5

Misunderstanding is caused, not by individual, but by social, cultural and linguistic differences. Raising awareness of these differences can help interactants avoid misunderstanding. This is a relativist position on the causes of misunderstanding and is evident in work on intelligibility in English as an international language by Smith and Nelson (1985) and Kachru (2008), and in work on cross-cultural understanding by Roberts and Sayers (1987), Roberts (1996) and Gumperz (1982). Looked at from this point of view, (mis)understanding is a mutual responsibility and requires monitoring by all parties in the interaction. As mentioned in my commentary on analytical problem three, I will be checking my data for the students' orientation to this perspective on misunderstanding.

Level 6

Which interactional sequences get defined as 'misunderstanding' reflects society's ideas about what is normal and correct. These assumptions will advantage and disadvantage some individuals and groups of people, often in invisible ways. This is a critical linguistic position on the causes and uses of misunderstanding, as mentioned in the section on 'critical approaches' to the analysis of talk, above. This approach to misunderstanding ties in with analytical problem five, below, and will be discussed in more detail there.

The solution to the problem of how to tell whether a misunderstanding is a local matter or a global matter is to keep all six levels of Coupland et al's (1991) model in play while listening to my data, and also to notice which level the participants are orienting to. Their orientation may be evident in the design of any re-adjustments. It may also be evident in the *sequencing* of misunderstandings and adjustments. If misunderstanding takes place post-adjustment, then it may be more likely to be a local matter. If misunderstanding takes place pre-adjustment perhaps it is more likely to be global. These sequences could well turn out to be complex however, with unclear beginnings and endings. For this reason, it will be important to transcribe several of the interviews in full, and, in the next chapter, present at least one long extract from the data. In this way, I hope to avoid giving the impression of 'neat' sequences and to avoid over-simplifying the possible answers to research question four.

Analytical problem 5: how is it possible for me to tell whether adjustments and (mis)understanding are a problem or a resource for the students?

Problem five is another difficult one, especially given the technical problems that many of the students faced during the recording of their interviews. Where their recordings are truncated, it is impossible to be sure whether they: gave up on the interview because one of them signalled that the recording should stop; or decided of their own accord to stop; or whether the recording device failed or was switched off inadvertently; or whether they misunderstood the assessment rubric.

As their teacher, and the designer of the assessment, I know what kind of conversation I hoped they were going to have (as long as possible and covering some relevant topics) and therefore a fairly misunderstanding-free interview could be judged as successful. On the other hand, misunderstandings were a topic on which both sets of students were invited to reflect, and having many misunderstandings would also have provided lots of useful material for their assessment. Of course, task achievement may not have been the students' primary or sole interactional aim. Research on foreigner talk reviewed in chapter two reminds us that the creation and maintenance of 'non-foreigner' identity/role can be one 'cause' of adjustment (see also level six of Coupland et al's model,

above). Furthermore, the creation and maintenance of the role of 'learner' may be associated with self repair, and the role of 'teacher' may be associated with other repair and other 'helpful' strategies such as adding 'extra' information or collaborating in a word search. The institutional context for the classroom task pre-categorises the students as either International (foreigner) or UK. The professional context provides equally dichotomous and unequally powerful roles: ESOL teacher and language learning student. Transcribing several of the interviews in full will be one way of ensuring that careful attention is paid to the outcomes for students, as will the presentation of at least one extract which shows a student summarising the information they need for their assessed report.

Example

In order to show how I dealt with these five key analytical problems in practice, I will now present an analysis of an extract from my data which demonstrates my solutions, and which raises some other issues related to the use of a 'data internal' method of recognising accommodation/adjustments and (mis)understanding.

In the extract which follows (and which appears again as transcript four in chapter four), there is evidence of pro-active (i.e. self-initiated) self repair, reactive (i.e. other-initiated) self repair and an utterance which gets treated by the participants as a misunderstanding. The proactive self repair strategy of adding more 'helpful' information triggers the misunderstanding. The students are Andrew and Stelios.

With Rachel
Andrew = UK student, Stelios = International student
Lines 01 - 08 of 08.

```
01      A:    What- what parts of ummm like your lessons (.) have you
02            enjoyed (.) doing (.) with Rachel.
03      S:    (2.0) Hmm?
04      A:    What parts of your ermmm ((LS)) (1.0) foundation
05            programme have you enjoyed doing with Rachel.
06      S:    (.) We- I don't have Rachel.
07      A:    Oh you DO:N't? oh right. So what- (1.0) what lessons d-
08            what lessons are you doin'?
```

In the 'With Rachel' extract above there is pro-active self repair in lines 01 – 02 of the transcript: "what – what", an "ummm" noise and three micropauses **(analytical problem 1)**. All of these features have the effect of slowing down Andrew's delivery. After the second and third micropause, Andrew offers two items of additional information, "doing" and "with Rachel" (the second bit of additional information turns out to be the trouble source). In line 03, Stelios uses a long pause and then says, "hmm" with rising intonation. This utterance is

taken by Andrew to be a complaint, i.e. evidence of a misunderstanding, and he attempts a reactive (other-initiated) self repair in lines 04 – 05 **(analytical problem 2)**. The reactive self repair has some of the same 'slowing down' features as his first attempt at the question: namely, an "ermmm" noise and a pause. Andrew also adds a new 'slowing down' feature, a lip smack (line 04). He then makes an adjustment to his previous question, substituting "foundation programme" for "lessons". In line 06, it turns out that according to Stelios, the trouble source was not lexical but a mistaken assumption on Andrew's part.

Recognising conversational adjustments means looking for changes in the way students phrase their talk. Recognising misunderstanding means noticing episodes within the data in which the interactants acknowledge a misunderstanding, by doing something, reactively, to 'repair' the bit of talk they are treating as problematic. The extract above illustrates how this 'data internal', inductive approach to the identification of adjustment and misunderstanding will work in chapter four, where I will look at several more extracts from the students' interviews. The 'With Rachel' extract also hints at how utterance re-design can supply evidence of context-specific accommodation. By providing insight into a speaker's diagnosis of the *reason* for interactional trouble I am able to speculate about the dimension of their context they are orienting to. In the transcript above, Andrew's diagnosis was linguistic; he was orienting to the professional/institutional dimension of his context and positioning Stelios as a learner of English **(analytical problem 3)**.

The recording that was submitted by Andrew was 24 seconds long and is transcribed in full here. It is not possible to be sure at what stage in the interview this exchange took place, although the nature of the topic suggests that it was somewhere near the beginning. Line 01 of the extract contains some self repair, *before* the trouble source, "with Rachel" in line 02. Not knowing what came before makes it very difficult to guess whether Andrew was orientating solely to the global professional (perhaps getting into his teacher role by providing extra, 'helpful' information) or institutional (slowing down his delivery for Stelios as a 'non-native' speaker) dimensions of the context, or whether a previous misunderstanding had created a local context for his adjustments. This is an issue **(analytical problem 4)** that will be difficult to address except by

looking closely at sequences of adjustments and misunderstandings in the six full transcripts.

The misunderstanding between Andrew and Stelios is quickly resolved by Stelios. His two-second pause and "Hmm?" noise is interpreted as a complaint and triggers Andrew's other-initiated self repair, for which Stelios allows space. In line 06, Stelios re-frames the misunderstanding as content-, not language-related and again allows space for Andrew to make a third attempt. In this case, the adjustments that Andrew makes may have had a negative impact on their task achievement in that they waste interview time by slightly delaying the collection of information. On the other hand, misunderstanding was one of the possible topics of both students' assessed reports, making this episode a potential resource, rather than just a problem, for both of them. Other than the collection of information from each other, the students may have had identity/role-related aims in mind, or, no particular aims (perhaps having forgotten what the interview was for or having been distracted by something unrelated). In terms of roles, Andrew's adjustments suggest 'learner' for Stelios, but equally Stelios's intervention suggests 'skilled international communicator'. Working out whether and how adjustments and misunderstanding are a problem or a resource for students **(analytical problem 5)** will involve me in suggesting a range of possible options.

In the final part of this section, I show how my solutions to these five key analytical problems allowed me to answer my research questions. My two general questions are 'in classroom talk between UK and International students navigating TESOL tasks, what conversational adjustments occur, and what are the relationships between these adjustments and the achievement of (mis)understanding?' These general questions can be broken down into the following five sub-questions, here matched with their key analytical solution:

1. what conversational adjustments occur in talk between UK and International university students navigating TESOL tasks in the classroom?

In my data I will be listening for *changes* in students' talk. These might be proactive (before a misunderstanding has happened), or reactive (after what a speaker perceives to be a misunderstanding, or triggered by an interlocutor's 'complaint'). The literature on accommodation has suggested what form these adjustments may take, and these are listed above.

2. what is the sequential relationship between the adjustments and (mis)understanding in the students' talk?

Misunderstanding is a 'member's concern' and, as such, I will be listening for adjustments (after what a speaker perceives to be a misunderstanding) and utterances that get treated as complaints. Complaints (indications of interactional trouble) may include the following:

- pauses
- audible outbreaths
- noises such as "hmm?" and "err"
- non-specific questions such as "what do you mean?", "do you understand what I'm saying?", "what's that?" and "can you repeat please?"
- non-specific statements such as "that's kind of a hard question", "you don't understand what I'm saying"
- questions about the *specific* meaning of an interactant's previous utterance such as "do you mean xxx?"
- repetition of an interactant's previous utterance with rising intonation;
- repetition of an interactant's previous utterance with an 'or' option added by the repeater
- repetition of an interactant's statement as a question with the addition of a qualifier such as "totally"

3. do the adjustments made by the students relate to the contexts (professional and institutional) in which their talk takes place?

In my data I will be noticing features of self repair/utterance re-design that seem to reference the institutional or professional contexts of UK/International student

and English language teacher/learner, or the context of 'international communication' and English as a lingua franca.

4. is (mis)understanding a local matter (relatable to adjustments) or a global matter (relatable to the participants use of lingua franca English, or to aspects of the professional and institutional contexts)?

I will pay attention to the order of events: adjustment to misunderstanding or misunderstanding to adjustment (with the caveats mentioned in the discussion of analytical problem 4 above).

5. are adjustments and (mis)understanding a problem or a resource for the students?

Here I will, as an outsider to the data, attempt to judge whether, at least from the point of view of collecting information for an assessed task, the students achieved their aims or not.

Analysing the dataset

Part of my solution to analytical problem four was to transcribe several of the students' interviews in full, in order to be able to see how sequences of adjustment and misunderstanding play out over the course of the interaction. Of the twelve interviews, therefore, I decided to transcribe six in full and six in part. I found that transcribing six interviews in full gave me enough of an idea about sequences to be able to select six shorter sequences from the remaining interviews for transcription. I selected the six interviews for full transcription on the basis of the International students' nationality (in order to ensure a range of nationalities), International students' grade in the English Language Skills module and length of interview (again in order to ensure a range of short and long recordings). The nationalities that are included in the selection of full transcripts are: Thai (1), Greek (1), Libyan (1), and Chinese (2 – Tom appears twice). The length of the recordings transcribed in full ranges from 24 seconds (8 lines) to 32 minutes and 7 seconds (1027 lines).

From each of the remaining six interviews I selected one section for transcription. I chose sections where there was evidence of students displaying potential or actual trouble understanding each other, as signaled by attempts at proactive repair (adjustments), complaints and reactive repair (adjustments). The nationalities that are included in the selection of partial transcripts are: Polish (2), Greek (1), Angolan (1), and Chinese (2). The length of the partial transcripts ranges from 14 lines to 384 lines.

Next, I took the twelve transcripts (six full and six partial) and, bearing in mind my comments on the various approaches to analysis in the literature reviewed in the chapter two (positivist, critical, interactional), and their affordances and limitations, I decided on a combination of top-down and bottom-up analysis of my data.

Top-down analysis meant comparing my data to the findings of the literature reviewed in chapter two of this study. This is a findings/theory → data sequence. In my review chapter, I grouped the 'literatures' thematically, as follows:

- world Englishes and English as lingua franca
- intelligibility
- accommodation
- communication strategies
- foreigner talk

My first overarching research question is: in classroom talk between UK and International students navigating TESOL tasks, what conversational adjustments occur? My review concluded with a summary of the findings on adjustment, from these five areas of the literature. Taking a top-down approach to the analysis of my transcripts, I compared these findings with the conversational adjustments to be found in my own data.

Bottom-up analysis, on the other hand, means prioritising the data; what conversation analysts call 'unmotivated looking', in other words a data → theory approach. In a conversation analytic strategy for data elaboration, Paul ten Have (2007, p.164) recommends starting with a single case analysis. The analyst selects any section of the transcribed data then works through the section turn by turn, observing how actions (such as repair) are achieved by the manner of speaking (the 'practices') of the interactants. These 'practice/action couplings' are noted and summarised. Next the analyst selects a different section of the transcript and compares the initial summary of the practice/action couplings from the first case with those of the second and so on. Examples of this action-to-practice analysis are Schegloff et al (1977) and Jefferson (1987), both on the action of repair. In taking a bottom-up approach, I read my transcripts for episodes of misunderstanding and noticed which practices were associated with this action.

In advice for conversation analysts interested in comparing their findings between languages, Schegloff (2009) suggests: (a) (as in ten Have, above) noticing actions and linking them to practices, (b) noticing practices and asking what actions they perform (for example Schegloff, 1982, on actions performed by "uh huh"), or (c) comparing someone else's findings on practice/action couplings with the practice or the action in a different environment (for example

language or culture). Option (c) is demonstrated in Carroll (2005) on the uses of vowel-marking in Japanese English, summarised in the section on communication strategies in chapter two of this study. By allowing for a comparative approach to analysis, Schegloff implies an analytical strategy that combines both bottom-up and top-down, inductive and deductive trajectories, going between theory/findings to data and back to theory/findings.

This is a process which sounds very much like Gee's (1999) 'reciprocal and cyclical' strategy, the inter-disciplinary method I used to analyse my data. As chapter two of this study shows, there is a great deal of relevant research on topics relevant to my own, and I compared the findings of these literatures to the evidence of my own data. But I also needed a data internal method of analysis in order to get at the specific meanings-making of my students. This resulted in an analytic strategy that combined both bottom-up and top-down, inductive and deductive trajectories between theory/findings to data and back to theory/findings; Gee's (1999) 'reciprocal and cyclical' strategy.

To summarise my method of data analysis, I read through my transcripts and looked for:

- the types of accommodation mentioned in the literature reviewed in chapter two;
- episodes of misunderstanding (as evidenced by complaints and repair);
- evidence of the practice of adjustments and the actions which are performed by these practices;
- sequences of misunderstanding and repair, evidence of orientation to contexts, and outcomes for the students.

Presenting the data

In the previous section I described how I analysed my complete dataset. In the next chapter, I present eight extracts from the dataset which I hope will indicate how my students went about the management of (mis)understanding in their particular professional and institutional contexts. In selecting these eight extracts, my aim is not to examine the use of English as a lingua franca, or international language, per se, but to present a range of 'telling', rather than necessarily typical, cases (see Mitchell, 1984) which indicate how language is used interactively by my students to accomplish their context-specific goals.

The eight extracts presented in chapter four are from seven different interviews, and involve eleven different students (Kate, Tom and Giorgios appear more than once) from a representative range of nationalities and levels of achievement in the English Language Skills module. Five of the extracts are from interviews transcribed in full and three are from those that were partially transcribed. The eight extracts indicate the range, across the dataset, of: types of adjustment (practice), types of complaint and (mis)understanding (action); sequencing of adjustment and misunderstanding; orientation to contexts and outcomes for the students.

As required by the solution to analytical problem four, one of the extracts (number three) is quite long; this is in order to be able to trace *sequences* of misunderstanding and accommodation. Another of the extracts (number eight), as required by the solution to analytical problem five, shows the UK student attempting to summarise the information she needs for her assessed report. In addition to helping me fulfil the 'range' criteria mentioned above, extract one is selected for presentation because it was the only part of any of the recordings on which any of the students chose to comment in their assessed reports. Extracts three and five come from the section of the interview where the International student is asking the questions. The six remaining extracts come from the section of the interview where the UK student is 'in charge'.

The extracts shown in chapter four are numbered (one to eight), the participants are named and identified as UK or International, the number of lines of the

extract and of the full transcript is shown, and, for ease of reference, a title is assigned to each extract.

Ethical Issues

This study is conducted within the disciplinary framework of Applied Linguistics. Such a claim implies a particular stance on ethical issues, including: defining a real-world problem in which language is an issue; planning for positive outcomes for the people or groups being researched; testing and evaluating any proposed solutions; and defining, planning, testing and evaluating with the involvement of the researched people or groups. In this section I will describe how my study set out to fulfill its own ethical responsibilities, and the ethical challenges it raised. Considerations of ethics have shaped my study, from the very beginning of its conceptualisation and design. They also have a particular application in the field of applied linguistics.

In chapter one, I noted how, typically, applied linguists are interested in language problems in society which are selected and defined by the people who are experiencing them. In the case of my study, the students contributed to the definition of the problem explored here in the sense that the critical incidents I described in chapter one were precursors to the re-designing of the module assessments. The critical incidents involved some classroom discussion of varieties of English, intelligibility and accommodation. These were the issues that I used to structure my reading, as shown in chapter two, and which have guided my approach to data analysis.

Applied Linguistics is also a problem-*solving* discipline; while a project should begin, as my study does, with an empirical investigation of the role of language in a real-world problem, it should aim to end with the planning, testing and evaluation of a potential solution. Labov's 'principle of the debt incurred' (Labov, 1982, p. 173) mandates a commitment to sharing data with the communities and individuals from which the data is gathered, and to using research findings based on the data for the benefit of the community. This means making linguistic data, and the scholarly interpretations and conclusions derived from them, accessible to non-linguists. Phase one of my study was the empirical investigation of the role of language in the navigation of a classroom task in the context of TESOL and an internationalising university. The results of my empirical analysis are described in the next chapter. In phase two of my study, I

worked with my students to plan and test ways of sharing my data, feeding back the findings to my students in both classes, and trying to solve the problems highlighted by phase one for the benefit of future students. Phase two of my study resulted in an online learning activity for UK and International students at UK universities; an activity which is described in the penultimate chapter of this thesis.

In addition to the particular ethical requirements of an applied linguistic study, I also considered my more general responsibilities to the students who participated in my research, including their requirements for privacy; voluntary, informed consent; openness and disclosure; and avoiding any detriment arising from their participation (BERA, 2011). In regards to their rights to privacy, I used pseudonyms for all the students whose words are reported in this thesis and ensured that the information they provided in the transcripts included as an appendix to my study does not allow them to be identified.

The students submitted their recordings of their interview task to me as part of their module assessment. My analysis of their recordings began after I had finished marking their lesson plans, reports and presentations, so there was no opportunity for their marks to be affected by my analysis of their classroom talk. I did not teach these students subsequently, so again, there was no chance for their learning experiences to be influenced either positively or negatively by me.

The International students were in the first semester of their pre-undergraduate foundation year and all, except one, went on to study on programmes other than our BA in English Language and Linguistics. I did teach this particular International student again, in the third year of her BA. By this time, I had already completed phase two of my study and built the first version of the online awareness-raising task, which is described in the penultimate chapter of this thesis. The International student who had been involved in the initial data collection tested the online task as part of his/her third year 'Introduction to TESOL' module, and then chose to update the task for his/her final research project. The experience of being involved in phase one of this study may have influenced this students' subsequent choices, but his/her choice to continue to work on the online task suggests that the influence was a positive one. The online nature of the task created in phase two of this study means that all the

students who participated originally have had the opportunity to share in my findings and, potentially, benefit from the solution I have proposed.

Having marked their assessments, I wrote to all the students on both modules and said that I was interested in exploring international classroom talk in my doctoral thesis, at conference presentations and in other publications such as websites, books and academic journals. I told them that I wanted to use their recordings as my data and that the data (in audio and transcribed form) would be published in both print and online formats. I also said that I would change their names and remove any information that would allow them to be identified as individuals. The students were given the opportunity to ask me any questions in writing or face-to-face, and to change their minds at any point in the future by contacting me and requesting that I stop using their data. All of the students I contacted gave their consent in writing and none have since requested that their data be no longer used.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have provided some background to the practical, theoretical, methodological and ethical choices that I made during the conduct of this study, and critically reflected on the consequences of these choices. I described the participants in my study, the modules they were studying at the time of data collection, the recorded interviews that constitute the data, and the benefits and drawbacks of the approach to transcription that I adopted and will use in the next chapter. Given the varied and idiosyncratic nature of conversational adjustments in international talk and the world Englishes/ELF preference for the description of 'innovation' rather than 'error', I chose an interactional approach to understanding the relationship between the professional and institutional contexts and the students' talk. This choice had a number of methodological consequences, including the decision to pay particular attention to episodes in the data in which students demonstrated their orientation to misunderstanding, and their proactive or subsequent adjustments. Finally I reflected on the ethical responsibilities of studies in Applied Linguistics and described how I have followed through these responsibilities in my own work. In the next chapter, I describe the results of the finely-grained analysis of my data, showing how the practical, theoretical, methodological and ethical aspects of my approach to data collection and analysis described here played out in practice.

Chapter Four - Data Analysis

Introduction

In the first part of this chapter, 'Accommodation', I present and analyse extracts from my data which show evidence of conversational adjustments (repair) in my students' interview talk. By the end of this first part, I aim to be able to answer my first general research question: in classroom talk between UK and International students navigating TESOL tasks, what conversational adjustments occur? In this first part, I:

- present the extract
- describe any adjustments
- critically reflect on the connections between the adjustments I have described and the literature reviewed in chapter two of this study.

This literature included studies on the following topics:

- world Englishes and English as lingua franca
- intelligibility
- accommodation
- communication strategies
- foreigner talk

In the second part of the chapter, 'Contexts and Applications', I use examples from the extracts presented in the first part to answer another general research question: what are the relationships between adjustments and (mis)understanding? I break down this second question into the following four sub-questions, as follows:

1. what is the sequential relationship between the adjustments and (mis)understanding in the students' talk?
2. do the adjustments made by the students relate to the contexts (professional and institutional) in which their talk takes place?

3. is (mis)understanding a local matter (relatable to adjustments) or a global matter (relatable to the participants use of lingua franca English, or to aspects of the professional and institutional contexts)?

4. are adjustments and (mis)understanding a problem or a resource for the students?

Accommodation

Extract 1

In the section of the interview from which this extract is taken, Claire (UK) asks Markus (International) her final question; about the importance to him, as a learner of English, of different types of input and practice. Her first turn takes place over lines 01 – 07 of the transcript and involves much self-repair. Markus's answer begins in line 08. The transcript ends with the transition from Claire's questions for Markus to Markus's questions for Claire.

Extract 1: Keep the tape running

Claire = UK student, Markus = International student

Lines 1 – 26 of 26

```
01   C:   (.h) err (1.9) which do you feel is most important when you
02        learn English th- the writing and understanding of the
03        language or the speaking and pronunciation which do you find
04        (.h) you should (.) you: should err (.) err work more active?
05        err (.) to be emm (1.2) so to grammatically understand the
06        language or err (.) Just so you can speak and get by the
07        pronunciation which do you think is most important?
08   M:   en it depends on situation I think =
09   C:   =okay=
10   M:   =because for academic purposes=
11   C:   =enhhh=
12   M:   =you need to know [acquire] and understand every aspects of
13   C:                     [yeah]
14   M:   [English]=
15   C:   [yeah]
16   M:   =if you just want to (.) en (.) I don't know (.) go shopping
17        or go to a pub [I think] vocabulary [is more] important
18   C:                  [yeah a bar, yeah]   [is that be] °ok
19        brilliant° ok brilliant that's that's my questions finished
20        (.) en should we keep tape running when I to do mine or?
21   M:   en (.) should we what?
22   C:   sh-should we keep the tape running to do mine?=
23   M:   =en=
```

```
24    C:    =do we need a recording to do my questions (.) or?=
25    M:    =yeah yeah=
26    C:    =yeah you'd (.) okay cool
```

In the extract above, Claire's turn begins with an outbreath, an "err" sound, and quite a long pause before she asks her question, "which do you feel is most important when you learn English th- the writing and understanding of the language or the speaking and pronunciation". Without a pause or a fall in intonation to indicate the end of her turn, she carries on, and re-launches her question, changing "which do you feel" to "which do you find" before briefly pausing for an outbreath. The question continues, but with a change in emphasis from the general nature of "which is most important" to a more personalised "which should you work on". The end of line 03 to line 05 turns out to be more than just a change in emphasis, as by the middle of line 05 the focus of the question has changed from writing and speaking to grammar and pronunciation, and the turn ends with a slightly different version of the question from the original one. While the focus of the question is changing, mid-turn, there are: micropauses, a longer pause of 1.2 seconds, some "err"s and a stretched vowel sound in "you" (04). Markus begins his turn in line 08 with a hesitation noise "en" followed by his answer. This provides an opportunity for further discussion, in line 09 onwards, on the different variables that are involved when deciding on a language learning or teaching focus.

The beginning of extract one is characteristic of much of the data collected for this study. As many of the transcripts in Appendix D show, the UK students' talk, particularly their questions, often involve(s) a great deal of repetition, or what the literature on *learner talk* has called 'waffling' (Edmondson and House, 1991). This is in contrast with the International students' talk, which is characterised by very little repetition. Contrary to the literature on learner talk, in my data it is the interactants in the institutional and professional categories of 'users' of English, rather than the 'learners', who waffle. This may be evidence of the UK students' orientation to an 'international' context, in which they may consider themselves rather novice users, even learners, of 'international' English. If this is the case, the waffling in Claire's talk may be a consequence of the same reasons which have been put forward to explain additional language learners' waffle. These include: a need to construct her responses from the

bottom up each time, as a result of a lack of the lingua franca routines (chunks of language and communicative strategies) she needs for her interview with Markus. Her possible orientation to an 'international' context puts Markus in the position of being an expert and Claire in the position of being a non-expert. The pressure of feeling like a learner has the same effect on Claire's English as it does on other 'learners' of English in other situations.

But other aspects of the global context are also at work, and these are the more predictable pressures of the professional and institutional contexts which position Markus as the learner. As the assessment brief for the 'Communication Skills' students in Appendix B shows, (mis)understanding was one of the possible topics for the Foundation Programme students' presentation and report. Only Markus chose to comment on this topic, but, coincidentally, so did Claire in her own assessed report. Both were the only students to mention a specific episode of misunderstanding and they both commented on lines 20 – 26 of extract one. As far as an external observer is able to tell, the misunderstanding which takes place in these lines is the only in the whole interview. Claire mentions the misunderstanding in her assessed report as follows (she has slightly misheard her own talk and substitutes "rolling" for "running"),

> Only one break down in conversation, 'keep tape rolling' unusual use for a non native speaker.

The Foundation Programme students wrote their reports as a group, so their comment on this interview is from a report written jointly by Markus, Ali and Susan. They say,

> [Markus] was thinking about question which he was going to ask, when suddenly [Claire] asked him this question.

Markus's group report suggests that he may have been aware that Claire's questions were about to come to an end, or at least that he had understood her saying, "that's my questions finished" in line 19 to mean that it was now his turn. The comment in the group report indicates that he has been distracted from thinking about which of his questions to start with by a technical question about

the recording, hence his hesitation in replying. Claire, on the other hand, suggests that the explanation for the delayed understanding of her question was a lexical one, in other words, a matter of individual competence where the comparison is between a 'native speaker standard' and everyone else, a product (rather than process)-oriented approach to communication and a monolithic view of what 'English' is.

These possible explanations for repetition in learner language are global rather than local. In other words, they are evidence of the pressure of contextual factors playing out in the students' talk. But also apparent are the *local* consequences of Claire's style of talking. These local consequences include, for example, the fact that her initial extended question takes much longer to ask than it does for Markus to answer, and that his answer allows the interview to continue, without any negative transactional consequences for either of them. Extract one is characteristic of the interview data collected for this study; the UK students' talk takes up most of the interview time, both when they are asking and when they are answering questions. Locally, this has the effect of minimising the amount of information the UK students are able to gather about the International students' learning preferences, as well as providing a smaller sample of data for the UK students with which to determine their interviewees' learning 'needs'. Furthermore, an impression is created of International students as having less to say, or as having fewer linguistic resources. Of course, both explanations for Markus's limited participation in the extract above could be true, but it is very useful to remember that this impression may not be shared by both interactants. The impression of International students having fewer ideas, or insufficient English with which to express them, is one which may be created by local patterns of interaction (interacting with global aspects of the context). These patterns are complex, however, and not necessarily generalisable to interaction with other interlocutors or other tasks.

From the point of view of beginning to think about the practical implications of the data in extract one, two initial suggestions are emerging. Firstly, it may be interesting to ask students to consider their assumptions about each other's use of English, in particular, the relevance of their roles as learners and users in the achievement of (mis)understanding. Secondly, it may be interesting to ask

students to consider the consequences of their talk for the roles that they make available for each other, and the usefulness of these roles for their task achievement.

Extract 2

Extract two is taken from the beginning of an interview between Bryn and Giorgios. As was the case with all the interviews, Bryn (the UK student) starts with his questions. His first question, as the extract below shows, is about Giorgios's previous English language learning experience.

Extract 2: What kinds of things?

Bryn = UK student, Giorgios = International student

Lines 01 – 16 of 46

```
01   B:   So whilst you've been learning English what kinds of
02        things have you done already (.) what kind of areas have you
03        covered whilst you've been here.
04   G:   (.) What do you mean?
05   B:   (.)(.h ) Well, have you looked at (.) Um (.) Travelling and
06        Directions °have you looked at° °°how to you know like how
07        to°° °actual words. Like in the supermarket° like buying and
08        selling [food?]
09   G:              [yeah] if I improve my. (.)
10   B:   And so what kind of areas have you looked at what have you
11        covered.
12   G:   Oh, any notes
13   B:   Any notes yeah.
14   G:   Err
15   B:   So what topics have you looked at?
16   G:   About the communication? What likes?
17   B:   Well, anything really, a bit.
```

Bryn begins the interview with an extended question sequence which includes the 'fronting' feature observed in accommodated talk; he says, "so whilst you've been learning English what kinds of things have you done already", instead of "what kinds of things have you done while you've been learning English". Bryn pauses for less than a tenth of a second in line 02 before repeating his question. Version two of the question varies the grammatical form of his first attempt; in version one, Bryn starts with a reference to a period of time, "whilst you've been learning English" and follows up with a question about what has been studied during that time. In version two, this 'fronting' feature is abandoned

and Bryn reverses the order of the two parts, beginning with 'what', followed by 'when'. He also substitutes different words; "learning English" changes to "here", "things" becomes "areas", and "done already" becomes "covered".

The above may be examples of the 'lexical simplification' observed in the accommodation literature. However, we cannot be sure; 'simplification' being a judgment that inevitably varies between speakers and contexts. What can be said about these lexical substitutions is that they are alternatives which, in this case, do not seem to have the effect of making Bryn's talk more comprehensible to Giorgios.

In line four of extract two above, there is a micropause after Bryn's extended question before Giorgios asks what Bryn understands as a clarification question, "what do you mean". Clarification questions have been identified in the teacher talk literature as a feature typically used by teachers, rather than by students, so here (in the context of the TESOL task) Giorgios is 'taking over' the right to ask questions from Bryn. After another micropause and an audible outbreath, Bryn tries his question again (third attempt), again using lexical substitution, "looked at" (05) and "do you know how to" (06). It is possible that "you know like" in line 06 and the rising intonation in line 07 are an attempt by Bryn to ask a comprehension question, as identified in the teacher talk literature, and in line 08 Giorgios says "yeah", perhaps meaning to indicate a positive answer. His subsequent micropause (09) is however taken by Bryn to suggest that Giorgios still does not understand and Bryn takes this opportunity to try his question again, several times, with much lexical and grammatical substitution. In line 15, Giorgios tries a clarification question for a second and third time.

'Teacher' is an identity more likely to adhere to the UK students, given the professional context of the talk and the design of the task. Yet, as this extract suggests, for the students in this study there also seems to be some flexibility of role, with the typical features of teacher/expert and learner/novice talk swapped backwards and forwards between the interlocutors. While the wider professional context of the talk might make the pre-existing categories of teacher and student seem the most relevant, the talk itself shows style-shifting between

these two roles. This may be because the individuals recognise their positions within overlapping categories and, therefore, view the ways of talking sanctioned by these categories not as a structural constraint but as a resource for self-positioning, for claiming a particular role. Both Bryn and Giorgios have 'teacher' type features in their talk perhaps because both are indentifying with the role of expert in this interaction; Bryn because of his self-identification as a 'trainee' ESOL teacher and Giorgios because of his many years of experience with English as an international language.

On the other hand, there are also local explanations for the ways in which this particular extract unfolds. Bryn asks his first question with the verb "done", and then changes it to "covered", neither of which seem to be understood by Giorgios. Bryn responds by trying "looked at", further lexical variation which is also accompanied by grammatical variation between fronted and non-fronted utterances. This variation creates a communicative environment which is arguably linguistically more complex than is necessary for the rather simple question Bryn is presumably trying to ask. Giorgios is not able to find a way through the complexity, despite repeated attempts to clarify Bryn's meaning, and they both fail to achieve the transactional aspect of the task. Bryn is left with the same question that he started out with and Giorgios is left not being able to answer the question. Equally, Bryn has not been able to communicate his message, while Giorgios has been understood by Bryn, as Bryn shows in lines 05, 12 and 16. In other words, it is local patterns of interaction which are responsible for what happens when students talk, and in this extract the result of their talk is misunderstanding, as much as any global concepts of role which they bring to the interaction.

Bryn may have brought assumptions about the way that teachers talk to his interaction with Giorgios and these assumptions may be playing out in this extract. But the local effect of Bryn's talk is to create an opaqueness of meaning which forces Giorgios into a teacher-type role, as shown by his multiple efforts to clarify Bryn's meaning. The students' assumptions about their role in the interaction are both brought from outside *and* they are created anew in each specific interaction. Context both pre-dates interaction and is freshly forged each time a speaker makes a contribution to a specific interaction.

The practical implications of the data in extract two are similar to those explored in the discussion of extract one, given that the topic explored in both extracts is related to issues of professional context. In attempting to raise students' awareness, it may be interesting to ask them to consider their assumptions about the relevance of their roles as learners and teachers/users in the achievement of (mis)understanding. Following on from this, students could be required to consider the *consequences* of their talk for the roles that they make available for each other and the usefulness of these roles for their task achievement.

Extract 3

The modifications which Valerie (UK) might make when she is talking to a 'foreigner' are a topic which is discussed extensively in the interview between Valerie and Ling (International), as the full transcript in Appendix D shows. Lines 1 – 261 of the transcript are taken up by Valerie's questions for Ling. The remaining 766 lines comprise Ling's questions for Valerie. This is an unusual distribution; as previously mentioned in chapter three, most of the interviews were mainly taken up with the UK students' questions for the International students.

The extract below (lines 651 – 693 of 1027) is taken from Ling's section of the interview. The topic of 'variety' explored in the extract is first introduced in line 440 when Ling says to Valerie, "do you speak a particular variety of English?". Valerie replies, saying that she does indeed have an accent; that her accent is typical of people from her region of the UK, East Yorkshire; and that her friends consider her accent to be "broad". She gives an example of a feature of her regional accent: "ole" instead of "hole".

Valerie goes on to say that many people in the UK speak with regional accents; she wonders whether the students of English language teachers with regional accents acquire the accent of their teacher. Ling agrees that people in her country also have different accents depending on where they live, but then in line 505 she asks for the second time whether Valerie has an accent. Valerie replies saying, "yea. definitely east yorkshire very very broad!". In her next turn Ling asks a question about the meaning of the word "accent", even though she has already used the word herself and has also mentioned the variety of regional accents in her own country. Valerie checks that this is a question about the meaning of the word, and Ling confirms that it is, so Valerie gives a definition and then an example of a Cockney accent before asking Ling whether she can hear the difference between her own accent and mine, as Ling's teacher at the time of the recording.

Next, Valerie asks Ling whether the different UK regional accents cause comprehension problems for Ling, Ling says 'yes' and then asks Valerie

whether she would try to modify her accent if she was teaching English, to which Valerie says 'yes' and gives the "ole" example again. Still on the same topic, Valerie first gives the "t'shops" example as another feature of her accent and says again that she would not use her regional accent if she was teaching English. In line 643 Valerie asks "D'you understand what I mean?" and then, after an outbreath, starts the example of "t'shops" that is in progress when the extract (lines 651 – 693) begins below.

Extract 3: Off t'shops

Valerie = UK student, Ling = International student

Lines 651 - 693 of 1027

```
651 V:   so:: (.) instead of saying TO::,
652 L: ˚˚ah [yea˚˚
653 V:      [˚the english yorkshire accent˚ they just say T'-
654 L:   Oh!=
655 V:   =d'you see: what I mean, they sa:y: I'm off T'- (.) shop.
656 L: ˚˚↑o:[::h↑˚˚
657 V:       [instead of sayin TO: (.) the shop.
658 L:   D- I: ↑think↑ sh:- ah (.) to: da shops is very: easy for
659      understanding… but a tu- csh ↑↑
660      [:h↑↑ I CA:N'T UNDERSTA::ND!]
661 V:   [Uhhh hu hu (.) (gasp)      ]=
662 V:   =but <that's juhust> (.) <that's just whe::re [that's]
663 L:                                         [BUT IT] JU:=
664 L:   =↑U:SED↑ IN YOU::R (.)↑FA↑MILY.
665 V:   YE-HE[A::. tha-]
666 L:       [AA:↑A::::]::↑AH ˚↑↑he he[he he↑↑˚ ]
667 V:                              [er:: it's] U:SE u- wi- BY:
668      people from East ↑York↑shire. [it's u:sed by a:ll people in
669      my: <who
670 L:                              [↑Ooooh.↑
671 V:   speak my accent.> they JUst say T'- (.) SHOP,=
672 L:   =˚oo↑oo↑[oh˚
673 V:          [<goin [T'- SHOP,>     ]
674 L:          [BUT you can un-] understand, (.)˚oh↑o:h↑˚ but-
675      An- .h (pause) I think because you are habit of your:
676      language,=
677 V:   =y:Ep.
```

```
678  L:   bu- sah when you wi'- (.) speak with foreigner, .h °a::h°
679       (0.9)Do you want to: m::ake da. (.) incent for corre-.
680  V:   [>YEA. I mean DEFinitely] if I was< teachin::  a foreigner I=
681  L:   =[°yea  ↑aa:::h↑°nyea::  ]=
682  V:   =would not sa:y that. [becau]se Obviously: I'd be TEACHin=
683  L:                        [hhh  ]
684  V:   =yuh the wrong ↑wa-[ha:y to ]say it↑. (gasp)
685  L:                     [hahaha? ]=
686  V:   =I ope you sa:y (.) <I'm going to:: the shop.> because of us-
687       otherwise, you wouldn't understa:nd (.) >would you you wun:t<=
688  L:   =↑AH [<YE:::A       I     THI:NG: SO::> ↑ ↑↑haha↑↑]
689  V:        [>>IF I SAID TO YA<< .hh       ↑i'm OFF T'-hu- ]sho-hop.↑
690       (gasp) youd think whats she ↑off: on[a↑bou- hu hu hu (HIC)]
691  L:                                       [↑↑REALLY HARD FOR YOU!↑↑]
692  L:   e-hehm [(SNIFF)]
693  V:          [(GASP) ]
```

Valerie's turns in the extract above show a number of content-related, phonological, lexical, syntactic and discourse features which may be evidence of both reactive and proactive foreigner talk. In terms of content, for example, Valerie (line 653) says "the english yorkshire accent", despite having already established that she is talking about her regional accent (East Yorkshire) almost 200 lines earlier in the transcript. The addition of "english" in line 653 is an example of 'helpful' extra information that is also repetition, as well as being as an example of fronting, a feature that was also noticed in Bryn's talk in extract two. In line 655, Valerie says "d'you see what I mean" which Ling, in her next turn (656), after one further repetition by Valerie of her example, seems to treat as a request for confirmation, saying "oh!".

On the other hand, there are no end-of-turn summaries in Valerie's talk, perhaps because of their interaction consists mainly of very short turns with ongoing repetition of the same example throughout this extract. There are no obvious examples of vague language in this extract either, though Bryn's talk in extract two does show extensive use of phrases such as, "what kinds of things" and "you know like how to".

It is difficult to comment on whether the range of topics is narrow or not, though it is clear from the transcript Ling's choice of topic gets extensive treatment by

both interlocutors. This is partly, it seems, because Ling repeatedly asks for clarification of related aspects, for example the question about the meaning of 'accent', despite the possibility that these are aspects of the topic of which she has previously demonstrated a good understanding. Valerie also repeats a great deal of topic-related information; an action which has the interesting effect of giving Ling's topic very full treatment (not a typical characteristic of foreigner talk) while at the same time fulfilling the function of reactive repetition (a typical characteristic of foreigner talk).

In terms of the phonological features that have been found to be typical of foreigner talk, Valerie fairly frequently uses increased volume in this extract; for example in lines 651 and 657 where she says "to" in a voice that is louder than the surrounding talk. Interestingly, Ling also uses volume in her talk in a way that seems similar to Valerie; that is with the effect of stressing what she may feel is key information. Valerie slows down her rate of delivery by elongating vowel sounds, adding in micropauses and reducing her overall speed (line 686 shows example of all three features). Her main strategy for slowing down her rate of delivery seems to be the elongation of vowel sounds, rather than, as some of the other UK students do in the extracts presented here, by adding in pauses. This creates an appearance of fluent delivery which in turn has the effect of creating the feeling of an interaction that is going well, for both participants.

Studies of foreigner talk suggest that typical lexical features include the avoidance of idioms and slang, and using more words that the speaker may consider are 'easy' to understand. Valerie does not in fact avoid idiomatic speech in this extract, indeed the example that Valerie chooses to illustrate her point require the use, frequently repeated, of "off to", meaning 'to be going to'. Valerie also says "on about", meaning 'talking about' in line 690, but either Ling is familiar with this expression, or the topic is so well established by this time that Ling is able to successfully conclude the discussion of this topic by saying loudly "really hard for you" (691). Subsequently both participants make a simultaneous noise that seems to indicate a mutual satisfaction with their communication on the topic of "t'shops".

In contrast to her use of idioms, which are a non-typical feature, Valerie frequently demonstrates the substitution of one form of words for another in this extract, a strategy which has been described as a typical feature of foreigner talk. This substitution practice, or self-repair, either within the same turn or within subsequent turns, is very common in the interviews analysed for this thesis, and can be observed in all of the extracts presented in this chapter. In this extract, Valerie tries out a number of different ways of saying that people in East Yorkshire say, 'I'm *off* to the shops' over the course of lines 662 to 671, and not for the first time in the interview. She says:

1. that's just
2. that's just where
3. tha-
4. it's use
5. u-
6. wi-
7. by people from East Yorkshire
8. it's used by all people in my
9. who speak my accent
10. they just say t' shop
11. going t'shop

There seems to be substitution first of "with" for "where", and then of "by" for "with", then of "all people in my" for "people from East Yorkshire" and then "who speak my accent" for "all people in my". The trigger for this self-repair comes in lines 663 - 664 when Ling says, "it just used in your family". Valerie responds by trying out different ways of saying that the feature she has mentioned is regional, rather than being restricted to her own family. In subsequent lines of the transcript, Valerie seems to be searching for a phrase that re-deploys Ling's word "use" in a way that clarifies the geographical extent of the feature and is understandable by Ling. Bryn tries something similar in extract two, replacing "done" with "covered" and then "covered" with "looked at". In Bryn's case however, he doesn't re-deploy bits of Giorgios's language as Valerie does Ling's, perhaps because they have not got to a point in the interview at which Giorgios has been able to make a re-usable contribution.

Syntactical features of foreigner talk, mentioned in chapter two of this thesis, include: the avoidance of syntax considered complex, the copula verb 'to be', prepositions, articles and inflectional endings; the increased use of tag questions and present tense verbs; and shorter utterances overall. In line 687 Valerie uses a tag question, "you wouldn't understand, would you", but in general there is little evidence in this extract of adjustments in her syntax which are related to Ling's talk. There is perhaps evidence of avoidance of inflectional endings in extract one when Claire says, "work more active" in line 04, and there are others in some of the transcripts discussed later in this chapter.

Valerie and Ling do not abandon their topic but give it a full and apparently mutually satisfying treatment. They coordinate their treatment of the topic by recycling bits of each other's language. This is done not as a way of correcting or repairing something the other has said, nor as a way of supplying language that the other is assumed to lack (as in the interview between Kate and Tom in extract eight below), but in a collaborative fashion that appears to be understood to be mutually supportive. Indeed, what is most noticeable about Valerie and Ling's talk, especially in comparison with some of the other extracts presented in this chapter, is the tight latching and frequent overlaps between their turns, their frequent use of backchannelling noises such as "ahh", and "ooh", and their frequent use of talk that is either louder and/or higher pitch than that which surrounds it.

For example, Ling uses her first long turn in line 658, after three backchannelling turns, as an opportunity to repeat almost exactly what Valerie has said about "t'shops", and to emphatically agree that the 'East Yorkshire' version is indeed more difficult to understand. Over the next ten lines of the extract, Valerie and Ling use and re-cycle each other's use of the words "just" and "use". After Ling's repetition and agreement turn which begins in line 658, Valerie says "that's just that's just where that's", with a micropause after the first "that's just" and an elongated vowel sound in "where". While Valerie is saying "that's" for the third time, Ling joins in with the suggestion that it is only Valerie's family who use "t'shop". In fact Valerie has already said that this is a general feature of her regional accent. Ling begins her overlapping turn by recycling,

loudly, "but it just used...". Valerie corrects Ling's statement over lines 665 to 671 of the transcript, recycling the bits of talk they are using for this topic and either elongating the vowels in "use" (667 and 668) or saying "just" (671) more loudly, in a way which emphasises the common language they have created specifically for their topic.

Valerie and Ling repeat their own, and each other's information, over many lines of transcript, gradually evolving a mutually acceptable way of referring to their topic. Extended and repetitive recycling of matching topic and language elements could be seen as proactive behaviour in a communicative environment that the participants believe to be fragile or as a reaction to earlier problems that suggested fragility. Or extended recycling could be rapport-building primarily, with only the secondary effect of reinforcing or checking understanding. In the case of Valerie and Ling, their mutual efforts seem to be viewed by both in a positive light, as evidenced by their willingness to cooperate in the numerous recyclings up until the point where both signal their satisfaction with each others' understanding of the topic. Bringing a topic to a mutually satisfying conclusion requires a willingness and ability to notice which parts of their English are sufficiently shared and what needs avoiding or modifying if they are to communicate successfully.

As the discussion in chapter two showed, features of foreigner talk are part of our general language socialisation and are acquired at the same time as we acquire other aspects of our language knowledge. However, as studies have shown, the use of *specific* features by individual speakers is related to the type of task that has generated the talk, as well as the setting of the talk and the interactants' beliefs about the roles and language identities that are appropriate for each other.

Crucially, the relationship between the use of specific linguistic features and the beliefs about the (in)competence of an interlocutor which trigger their use, is a cyclical one. By orienting to the possible fragility of a communicative context, due to the presence of a person identified as additional language speaker, foreigner talk is made more likely, while certain features of foreigner talk (such as repetition, lexical and syntactic substitution) have been shown to contribute

to this fragility. And yet, as Valerie and Ling demonstrate in this extract, where orientation to the possibility of misunderstanding is mutual, and there is time to work things out, these potentially negative features of English language foreigner talk can result in the creation of an intricate tapestry of talk designed with a specific task and interlocutor in mind, and which is fully capable of satisfying the needs of both. At the very least, as chapter two suggested and as is demonstrated here, the style of talking known as 'foreigner talk' is likely to be both highly idiosyncratic and unpredictable in its occurrence, form and consequences for speakers and listeners.

In extract three above, there seem to be elements of foreigner talk in Valerie's contributions, including, for example, the use of increased volume, repeating elements of information previously provided and slowing down the pace of her talk by elongating some vowel sounds. However, there are some similar features in Ling's talk, such as the asking what seems to be an unnecessary question (from a purely transactional point of view) about accent; a question which successfully elicits a repetition of some content from Valerie. Ling also slows down the pace of her talk by elongating some vowel sounds and uses increased volume. On the face of it, and from the point of view of foreigner talk which inevitably only analyses accommodation within the UK students' turns, it is possible to analyse these features within the context of a single speaker's contribution. What this perspective is in danger of missing however, is what the broader scope of accommodation theory may be more sensitive to; namely, that what seems to be foreigner talk in Valerie's turns may (also) be evidence of a convergence on Ling's speaking style motivated by the widely held belief that the more similar people are, the more intelligible, predictable and attractive they find each other.

In fact, it is surprisingly difficult to account for any of what appears to be accommodated talk as 'divergent' (I am competent and you are, as a foreigner, not) or 'convergent'. Valerie and Ling's talk is an example of how convergence and divergence can play out within talk in very complex ways: with speakers both converging and diverging at different points in their interaction and in different, perhaps contradictory ways. To add to the complication, their assessment of each other's speech is inevitably subjective, including for

example, their convergence on a *perception* of the other's speech style regardless of their actual style, and the possibility that they are converging on a style which has already been designed to accommodate the other. For example, Valerie converges on her subjective assessment of Ling's use of English and Ling converges on Valerie's foreigner talk.

Any attempt to delineate between the assumptions and beliefs about roles and identities that speakers bring to the interaction, and the roles and identities that are created as they talk, turns out to be rather futile. Foreigner talk can be simultaneously proactive and reactive, convergent and divergent, a resource for and barrier to the achievement of mutual understanding. What may start out as pre-existing beliefs about another's communicative competence play out in interaction in ways which are creative of competence, and therefore of the degree to which communicative goals are able to be achieved and roles/identities convincingly claimed. From a practical point of view, with the awareness-raising aim of this study in mind, students also need to be encouraged to look at the consequences, as well as what they assume to be the causes, of their talk, and the interaction between these two.

Extract 4

In extract four, Andrew is asking Stelios a question about his language learning experience at York St John. In line 03 of the extract, Stelios reacts to Andrew's question in the preceding turn with a long pause and a "hmm" noise. This is taken up by Andrew as evidence of trouble; specifically, as a complaint, a way of requesting clarification of his previous utterance.

Extract 4: With Rachel

Andrew = UK student, Stelios = International student

Lines 01 - 08 of 08

```
09      A:    What- what parts of ummm like your lessons (.) have you
10            enjoyed (.) doing (.) with Rachel.
11      S:    (2.0) Hmm?
12      A:    What parts of your ermmm ((LS)) (1.0) foundation
13            programme have you enjoyed doing with Rachel.
14      S:    (.) We- I don't have Rachel.
15      A:    Oh you DO:N't? oh right. So what- (1.0) what lessons d-
16            what lessons are you doin'?
```

In line 04, Andrew repeats his question using the same words as in his previous turn, "what parts of", but instead of saying "lessons" he substitutes "foundation programme". Andrew's substitution comes after a number of features which delay its delivery; "ermmm", a lip smack and a one second pause. "Foundation programme" is the institutionally-sanctioned name for Stelios's current academic course of study, in contrast to the more generic "lessons". The question that was re-launched in line 04 is then completed with the same words as were used in the first attempt, "have you enjoyed doing with Rachel".

Stelios, after a micro-pause and a false start "We – I" (06) supplies what appears to be the explanation for his initial hesitation: Rachel is not his teacher; Andrew has made an incorrect assumption which Stelios wishes to correct, before, or instead of, answering the question. Andrew accepts the correction (07) and, without pausing, asks another question. In Andrew's third question,

after a short pause of one second to re-launch the question, Andrew changes the focus of the question from asking about *enjoyable* parts of lessons with Rachel, to asking a more general question about the *type* of lessons Stelios is currently having. The third question, as well as including a one second pause mid-question, starts and then re-starts twice: "So *what-* (1.0) *what* lessons d-*what* lessons are you doin'?".

In extract four, Andrew's repair strategy (04 - 05) suggests that he has placed Stelios's misunderstanding at the *intelligibility* or *comprehensibility* levels of the world Englishes model. The Smith and Nelson (1985) model of intelligibility, the world Englishes model, stresses the role of the listener in determining the *intelligibility*, *comprehensibility* and *interpretability* of an utterance. In contrast, Stelios's response to the exchange is to clarify that, for him, the problem is actually one of *interpretability*. In this extract, Andrew seems to treat the problem signaled by Stelios in line 03 as a possible issue of lexical (non-) competence; Stelios does not appear to understand his question, perhaps the blocking word is "lessons". Andrew attempts to solve the problem by trying again with an alternative phrase which he will have frequently heard used at York St John to describe Stelios's current programme of study (like using a familiar brand name like 'Hoover, instead of a more generic and perhaps less familiar term like 'vacuum cleaner').

Andrew's diagnosis of their misunderstanding will seem very familiar to users of TESOL textbooks, both teachers and learners, and to examiners of English language proficiency. On the whole, textbooks and examination criteria refer to a candidate's ability to use smaller or greater amounts of more or less frequently occurring vocabulary and grammar. The speaking component of the IELTS test, for example, uses the presence of idiomatic language to differentiate candidates at level 7.0 from those at level 6.0. Andrew's repair strategy (04 - 05) suggests that he has placed the misunderstanding at either the *comprehensibility* or the *intelligibility* levels of the world Englishes model. At the level of *comprehensibility*, understanding is a result of the listener's ability to understand the meaning of the word or utterance in its given context. *Intelligibility* is the ability of the listener to recognise individual words or utterances. In contrast, Stelios's response to the exchange is to clarify that, for

him, the problem is more one of *interpretability* (the third component of the world Englishes model), that is, his ability to understand Andrew's intentions behind the word or utterance, Andrew's incorrect assumption about his teacher. Stelios orients to the assumptions behind Andrew's question rather than to the reason it is being asked, which is to find out what he has been studying. In doing so, he successfully resists the linguistic incompetence interpretation and makes it clear that Andrew is the one who is mistaken.

With the awareness-raising aim of this study in mind, students could be encouraged to consider all three levels of the world Englishes model of intelligibility when diagnosing the reasons for, and observing the effects of, (mis)understanding in their own talk. They could be encouraged to stand back from their own advance predictions and to think about intelligibility as something which is achieved between willing subjects, in real time and in specific contexts.

Extract 5

Extract five is taken from the interview between Stella (UK), Giorgios (International) and Ella (International). In the extract below, Giorgios, who appeared earlier in extract two being interviewed by Bryn, asks Stella a question about the importance of grammar versus vocabulary for additional language learning. Giorgios goes on to suggest an answer which may be different from the one Stella initially gives, either in substance or in emphasis.

Extract 5: Grammar or vocabulary?
Stella = UK student, Giorgios = International student and Ella = International student
Lines 01 - 14 of 14

```
01    G:   en (.) do you think grammar vocabulary is most important when

02         you learn a foreign language?
03    S:   Grammar=
04    G:   =Yeah=
05    S:   =en (.)
06    G:   Grammar and vocabulary
07    S:   Yeah °grammar and vocabulary° en ↑ I think it's Important but
08         if it's (.) if the other person (.) like the foreign language
09         person(.)say a Spanish en can just understand some words that
10         I'm saying then it's ok cause you are communicating (.) so I
11         (.) I don't (.) it's a little bit important but I don't think
12         it's really important
13    G:   =The vocabulary is important=
14    S:   =Yeah I think so yes
```

Giorgios begins this extract with a question about whether additional language learners should pay more attention to the grammar or the vocabulary of the language they are learning. In line 03 it is not clear to a listener of the recording whether Stella is offering an answer, "grammar", or whether her answer is delayed by an initial repetition of what she has indentified as the key word in the question. In line 04, Giorgios, in a series of tightly latched turns, says "yeah", a practice that subsequent extracts analysed in this chapter show can be used to

achieve a number of different actions, including agreement and/or encouragement to continue. In line 06, Giorgios repeats "grammar or vocabulary" in a way that prompts Stella to say "yeah" and then at a lower volume than the surrounding talk, to repeat "grammar or vocabulary". This previous work seems either: to have been to demonstrate to each other that the terms of the question have been clearly established; or an attempt by Giorgios to head off a conclusion that grammar is more important than vocabulary. Throughout her long turn in lines 07 – 12, Stella uses "it", by which she seems to mean 'grammar'. She concludes with the summary, "so I think it's a little bit important, but I don't think it's really important", with stronger stresses on "little" and "really". Giorgios provides a summary of her answer in line 13, "so vocabulary is more important" and Stella agrees with him in her next turn, with a stress on "I" rather than "think" which suggests that she is emphasising her personal opinion rather than any doubt she has regarding the matter.

The problem with trying to label any particular stretch of talk as any one of the communication strategies that have been observed in international English contexts (Seidlhofer, 2007) is illustrated here by Giorgios's utterance in line 06, "grammar or vocabulary". This utterance could be categorised as 'supportive listening', if he is reminding Stella what the key words in his question are; that is, if his aim is communicative. His utterance could, however, also be categorised as an attempt to steer Stella away from her initial, tentative answer in line 03, "grammar"; that is, if his aim is substantive.

This problem is equally likely to occur when we try to label stretches of talk as other communication strategies such as, 'making use of extralinguistic clues' or 'signalling non-comprehension in a face-saving way'. Similarly, the strategies of 'asking for repetition' and 'paraphrasing' could be deployed with a *communicative* aim in mind, but could also be used to guide the discussion in a particular direction; changing the *substance* of an interlocutor's contribution. Furthermore, all of the strategies listed might be used to create, or resist particular, possibly multiple, roles and possibly complicated identities. An example of this is the summary supplied by Giorgios in line 13, "so vocabulary is more important"; which could be being put forward as the opinion of an expert, someone who can speak from experience about the best way to learn

an additional language, or, in the context in which the interview takes place, a 'mere learner' of English.

In other words, the difficulty of trying to specify particular strategies is that the utterances which may be considered to be associated with these strategies, such as 'signalling non-comprehension', potentially have a wide variety of unpredictable effects on the interaction. The potential overlap between 'communication strategies', and the use of strategies identified in the previous section as frequently observable in 'foreigner talk', such as giving extra 'helpful' information and providing summaries of previous stretches of talk, can both be seen in Giorgios's contribution above. The question arises, therefore, of the difficulty of saying whether these are examples of Giorgios, the International student as expert user of an additional language, 'doing' foreigner talk for Stella or whether these are examples of Giorgios using appropriate communication strategies in an EIL context.

Lingua franca English scholars, such as Canagarajah (2007), who have taken a more broadly interactive approach to lingua franca communication, have avoided making lists of strategies and instead have suggested that *noticing* an interlocutor's use of grammar, lexis and pragmatic strategies, what might be called 'language awareness', is the key to lingua franca communication. This broader approach eschews the specification of any particular communication strategy as necessarily useful in advance, and implies the need for online monitoring of each other's talk.

Traditionally, work on communication strategies specified an interlocutor's role in talk in advance (learner or user) and labelled stretches of talk as examples of particular strategies. Later approaches re-configured the target from being 'native speaker' English to being English as an international language, but continued to attempt to identify pre-determined and discrete strategies. Interactive approaches, on the other hand, have suggested that language awareness, rather than the deployment of any particular chunks of language, is the key to successful international communication. What extract five suggests is that trying to spot communication strategies as clues of what one's interlocutor is trying to do in his or her talk may be one element of successful interaction. In

other words an interaction-specific awareness of how general strategies are being deployed by an interlocutor might be a useful ingredient of an awareness-raising activity, like the one for which this study aims to provide an empirical basis.

Extract 6

In extract six below, Eileen (UK) seems to be trying to get ideas for a lesson aim for her assessed lesson plan and is asking Ali (International) to comment on which area of English grammar he thinks he needs to improve. The strain on their interaction which may be related to Eileen's diagnosis of Ali's misunderstanding of her 'default', version of English, is not, however, allowed by either of them to permanently damage their achievement of the task. In line 119 of the transcript, Ali makes an "err" noise, which, in combination with his micropause and audible outbreath, is taken to mean by Eileen that he does not understand her question.

Extract 6: Verb grammar

Eileen = UK student, Ali = International student.

Lines 116 - 124 of 472

```
116 E:              [laughs] is that like urm (.) more
117     like verb grammar or sentence structure or is that (.)
118     j'you understand what I'm saying [yeah]
119 A:                              [yeah] (.) (.h) err
120 E:  Y'you don't understand what I'm saying he he (laughs)
121 A:  Yeah=
122 E:  =Okay, okay that's fine=
123 A:  =Yeah.
124 E:  (.h) urm (.) right. In - in class, j'you prefer to
125     to do anything that where err the teacher is standing
126     and talking to you using the board (.) or do you
127     prefer (.) textbooks or worksheets.
128 A:  Yeah, I prefer worksheets an (.)
129 E:  Yeah
130 A:  And text book from the book
```

In response to what Eileen has treated as a complaint, she says, with a false start, "y'you don't understand what I'm saying". Eileen ends her turn with some laughter (120) which is not reciprocated by Ali. In line 121 Ali responds to her statement of his non-understanding with "yeah". Eileen does not repeat or re-formulate her question, but abandons it, saying "ok, ok that's fine". Earlier in this

transcript, there is evidence of Eileen's orientation to the possibility of miscommunication, specifically, to Ali's non-understanding of her questions. As line 117 and 118 in the transcript show, Eileen abandons her question after providing the two options "verb grammar" and "sentence structure", and before completing her offer of what might have been either a third option or a rephrase of the existing two options, "or is that" (117). There is a micropause (117) after which, not having received the encouragement from Ali to continue with this line of questioning that she might have expected, Eileen abandons her question.

Rather than giving Ali more time to decide on his answer, or deciding that he may have understood "verb grammar" and "sentence structure" but may have misunderstood the two different meanings of "like" in her question, Eileen diagnoses the problem as having been caused by Ali's general non-understanding of her what she may consider to be her 'default' or 'correct' version of English. She asks him whether he understands her (118) and after an overlapping "yeah" which she interprets to mean 'no', followed by Ali's micropause, audible outbreath and "err" (119), she says, "Y'you don't understand what I'm saying" (120). Ali's response to Eileen's very clear orientation to *his* responsibility for their failure to communicate is to say "yeah" (121); but it is unclear from this response whether he means contradict or agree with her. Eileen takes "yeah" to mean agreement with her diagnosis and successfully re-establishes the question-answer format of the interview by asking a different question which Ali goes on to answer in a way that is acceptable to Eileen.

Eileen's overt and repeated orientation to Ali's non-understanding as being the reason for their inability to communicate in this instance might have threatened their willingness to continue, had they not worked together in other ways to develop a way of tying together the sometimes disjointed pieces of their interaction. One way in which they do this is to echo each other's use of "yeah" throughout this otherwise troublesome question and answer sequence. In line 128, for example, Ali launches the first half of his reply to Eileen's question with a "yeah". After the first half of his reply in line 128, which he ends with a micropause, Eileen responds with a "yeah" (129). Ali takes this as an opportunity to continue with his answer in line 130, linking it to the first half of

his reply with a repetition of "and". "Yeah" is frequently used in this part of the interview by both participants. In lines 118 and 119 both Eileen and Ali say "yeah" at exactly the same time. The multiplicity of possible uses of "yeah" mean that it can be flexibly used by both participants. For example, in lines 116 to 130 above, "yeah" seems to be understood by the participants as meaning:

- a question has been asked (118)
- the answer is 'no' (lines 121 and 123)
- 'I understand your question' (128)
- 'do continue' (129).

"Yeah" provides a way for the interactants both to agree with each other and to 'speak the same language' as each other. In frequently repeating each others' "yeahs" the participants find a way to collaborate in a communicative situation which has been plagued by misunderstanding. The "yeahs" thread through both Eileen and Ali's talk; tying their turns together in a way that creates an impression of continuity and agreement that seems as, or even more, meaningful to the interactants than Eileen's overt and repeated orientation to the fragility of their interaction.

There is evidence here of the pressure of context on interaction; Ali is present in this interview as a person who 'needs to learn more English' in order to improve his ability to communicate effectively in a UK university. In addition, the UK students have been tasked with identifying the language learning needs of the International students. What may have been:

- the need for more thinking time on Ali's part
- Ali's unfamiliarity with the multiple uses of "like" in Eileen's variety of English
- Eileen's lack of awareness of this feature as characteristic only of some varieties of English
- the kind of routine, but minor, disruptions to be expected of all communication,

seems instead to have been diagnosed by Eileen as evidence of Ali's lack of competence in English.

In extract four, Andrew indicates that he thinks his choice of the word "lessons" is the reason for the misunderstanding, though, of course, it is not clear to the analyst whether he views this as a matter of his own, or Stelios's, incompetence as a speaker of English in an international situation. In extract six, it seems clearer that Eileen is giving Ali the responsibility for the misunderstanding, "you don't understand what I'm saying", followed by an abandonment of her line of questioning. As applied linguists have pointed out (for example, Graddol, 2006), the English used in international contexts may not be the same as the English used in local, British contexts. And one of the dangers of assuming that the linguistic norms of a UK university with an internationalisation agenda should necessarily be those of its Inner circle (or native speaker) English speakers is that international communication is made more difficult, as Eileen and Ali experience. Despite the difficulties that may be related to this assumption of Inner circle norms as the only or best for English at UK universities, Eileen and Ali show how interactants can and do work together to ensure they are able to carry on with the task in hand.

Proponents of the idea of a lingua franca core have suggested that successful speakers of international English need to have a linguistic repertoire of phonological and lexicogrammatical forms of English which are widely intelligible across groups of English speakers from different first language backgrounds. There are a number of instances in the transcripts of where 'core' features can be observed in the talk of the International students. For example, in line 679 of extract three Ling says, "Do you want to: m::ake da. (.) incent for corre-.", where the absence of weak form of "to" and the substitution of /d/ for voiced forms of the 'th' sound can be observed. In line 08 of extract one, Markus says, "en it depends on situation I think" using (in this case, not using) a definite article in a way that has frequently been observed in lingua franca talk. The lingua franca core idea avoids the danger of assuming that, for example, internationally, it is Received Pronunciation that is the most intelligible way of talking; an assumption that world Englishes scholars have long argued against. The lingua franca core position, with its list of internationally intelligible features,

avoids the prioritisation of one national variety over others, but still holds onto a pre-determined idea of intelligibility. Like the pre-interactional work on communication strategies cited above, certain linguistic features are assumed to have static meaning, external to any specific interaction.

In contrast to this position, the discussion of extract six, and of the other extracts in this chapter, shows how these assumptions potentially block successful task achievement. Where the relationship between language and communication is allowed to be more free-flowing, as in the "yeah" example in extract six, task achievement seems more likely. On the other hand, abandoning the effort to be sensitive to possible relationships between language and communication, for example using a word like "like" repeatedly, is also likely to be unhelpful. The linguistic resources of the interactants make the interaction more or less likely to be successful. However these linguistic resources are not irrevocably tied to any particular set of meanings. Instead, they mutate in interaction, picking up new meanings, and performing new actions, as the interaction proceeds. But this mutation, with the effect of use changing meaning, is only likely to be allowed to happen where interactants are willing for it to do so. In institutional and professional contexts which base much of their practice on beliefs about the existence and value of (UK) English, the flexible, online, production of meaning in lingua talk is less likely to occur. In these contexts, it seems possible that students are more likely to say, "you don't understand" and change the subject.

One practical implication of these findings for students at an internationalising university is that any effort at awareness-raising would likely need to include examples of successful communication between speakers of non-UK varieties. Or, perhaps more powerfully, would be an exercise that required the students to look at their own use of English in an international situation, and note examples of successful communication, despite so-called 'non-standard' use of linguistic resources.

Extract 7

In the exchanges below (extracts seven and eight), Kate is asking Tom about the 'difficulties' he faced as a young learner of English in China. Extract seven comprises a series of tightly latched turns from line 51 onwards in which Kate and Tom work together to identify the two countries from which Tom's teachers came, Australia and Ireland.

Extract 7: Australia?

Kate = UK student, Tom = International student

Lines 49 - 59 of 353

```
49   K:  Listening, yeah? (.) What do you find hard about listening?
50   T:  en because en well en China my my tutor was (.) was a a (.) was
51       was (.) a foreign people came
52   K:  [sh-whi-in-en]
53   T:  [Austra     ] Austral=
54   K:  =Australia or Austral?=
55   T:  =Australia=
56   K:  =Australia?
57   T:  Yeah, And another one came from (.) another one came from A-Aland
58   K:  Ireland?
59   T:  Yeah=
```

Kate has several strategies for what could either be an attempt to check Tom's meaning, or correct his pronunciation of the names of the two countries: Australia and Ireland. The first strategy, in line 52, is a quick fire series of noises which are difficult for a listener to the recordings to interpret. In overlap with these noises, Tom has already started his first attempt at a specific answer which he repeats, with an added sound, out of overlap. Kate takes her next turn after Tom's repetition and added consonant /l/. She uses the strategy of repeating Tom's answer as a two-part "or" question which, again, is followed immediately by Tom's confirmation of his answer, "Australia". Kate's final strategy in this extract is to, again, immediately after Tom has finished saying "Australia" to repeat his answer as a question. Tom confirms that her repetition is correct in line 57 and goes on to talk about the national origin of another of

his previous teachers. His turn contains a micropause and a subsequent re-start, then two attempts at the country name, "A-Aland". Kate takes the next turn and uses it to repeat Tom's answer; possibly to check her understanding or maybe to encourage him to alter his pronunciation to more closely match her own. Tom's answer in line 59 suggests that he is assuming the former, which he confirms with a "yeah".

Extract 8

A few lines later, Kate has returned to the topic of Tom's 'difficulties'. In extract eight, below, she repeats Tom's answer to her question about the reason for his difficulties, this time with grammar, adding a qualifier, "totally" (70).

Extract 8: Difficulties with grammar?

Kate = UK student, Tom = International student

Lines 67 - 76 of 353

```
67    K: Okay, so (.) really it's grammar you find difficult i-is the
68       grammar (.h) difficult for because it's so different to Chinese?
69    T: Yes, different=
70    K: =TOTALLY different
71    T: en, not really s-some ha-[half-half]
72    K:                          [some things are similar] half and half
73       okay, so grammar (.) quite difficult and listening quite difficult
74       and many pronunciations? (.) Possibly or not will you ok with
75       that?=
76    T: =en (.) I'm not sure.
```

Kate's explanation for Tom's difficulties with grammar follows on from her earlier explanation for his difficulty in understanding his Australian and Irish teachers. She asks (67 – 68) if the reason for Tom's difficulty with grammar is that Chinese is 'so different' from English. Tom initially says, 'yes, different' (69) and his answer is immediately followed by a turn in which Kate emphatically re-states her earlier explanation, "TOTALLY different" (70), in which the word "totally" is louder than the surrounding talk. Tom hesitates and then provides three modifications of the explanation they seemed to have just agreed upon, saying (71):

1   not really

2   s-some

3   ha-half-half

Kate overlaps with Tom's turn, demonstrating her acceptance of his modification by rephrasing his idea, twice (72):

1   some things are similar
2   half and half

Again, as with Tom's earlier attempt to contest her explanation for his difficulties with listening, Kate abandons the topic with exactly the same words, 'ok, so' with fall-rise intonation on 'ok', (73). In lines 73 – 74, Kate says, 'so grammar (.) quite difficult and listening quite difficult and many pronunciations? (.)'. Kate links three short phrases with the connector 'and'; she pauses after the first clause and she keeps the grammar 'simple' by repeating the same syntax, 'x quite difficult' twice as well as omitting all verbs. Her modified talk is a resource with which Kate is able to display her orientation to the 'teacher' or 'expert' identity available to her in the interview.

At the end of this extract Kate sums up her understanding of Tom's English language learning needs (lines 73 – 75) providing four opportunities for Tom to supply confirmation of her analysis:

1   so grammar (.)
2   quite difficult and listening quite difficult and many pronunciations? (.)
3   possibly or not
4   will you ok with that?

Tom does not take the floor at any of the opportunities Kate provides until she asks him directly whether he can confirm her summary. Tom hesitates and says, 'I'm not sure' (line 76). It is not clear from the data which aspect of the summary Tom is not happy with, or whether he is resisting the act of being summarised itself. Having had her explanations for his language competence modified by Tom twice, Kate finds that despite having taken up the position of 'teacher' in the interaction, she is not in control of the outcome of this section of talk. Kate and Tom collaborate on the co-construction of meaning and of their roles in the talk, but the interview format leaves open the possibility for contestation throughout. Tom has used English in a variety of contexts, with a

variety of English speakers and makes this experience relevant in an interaction in which he positions himself as an experienced student, and therefore, a competent language user in, and on the topic of, classroom contexts.

Misunderstanding between interactants where one, or more, person is using English as an additional language tends to be characterised by TESOL professionals as a deficiency of *individual interactants*, rather than, for example, something which is an inevitable feature of all communication no matter which language is being used. It is assumed that interactants are likely to be moderately aware of miscommunication, though perhaps more acutely aware of other's failures than their own. This theoretical ground is enthusiastically occupied not only by additional language teachers, but also by 'successful teamwork' consultants and cross-cultural trainers. For these language and culture professionals, achieving mutual understanding is possible if only we could learn the right words and ways of talking. From this perspective, for additional language teachers, the 'right' words are just *more* words in the target language.

An implication of these types of analyses is that 'different' languages and 'different' cultures are a potential cause of misunderstanding. A further implication is that training for both parties in additional languages or effective communication skills can result in the achievement of understanding. The TESOL profession is built on the assumption that incompetence or lack of proficiency in English of an individual writer or speaker is the cause of failure to communicate an intended message when the language of that communication is English. Furthermore, many ESOL teachers (and many members of the general public) assume that (mis)understanding is the *inevitable* outcome where the language of communication is English and one or more interlocutors are not sufficiently 'proficient' users of English.

The professional context of extracts seven and eight provides a possible explanation for a number of features of the talk observable there, including Kate's attempts to correct Tom's pronunciation and suggest alternatives, and to summarise his account of his learning experience. As a trainee ESOL teacher, she has assumptions about the differences between Tom's first language(s) and

his 'target' 'language', and these assumptions underpin the strategies she uses to 'help' Tom communicate effectively. But there are also local consequences of her strategies and these include the opportunity they provide for Tom to reject her suggestions and resist being summarised. Tom's actions go some way to undermine the effectiveness of Kate's TESOL-talk and to challenge the assumptions which underpin them.

The relationship between context and talk is shown to be operating at both a global and a local level, but in a way that blurs the distinction between levels. What is outside the talk (global context) modifies, but it also modified by, what is inside the talk (local context). In terms of the potential professional or institutional significance of the extracts, bearing in mind the awareness-raising aim of this study, students could be sensitised to the ideas about 'English', language and learning that are typically taken for granted in the TESOL profession and encouraged to look for evidence of these in their talk. Subsequently, the students could be encouraged to note how these TESOL-type ways of talking are accepted or resisted by the (institutionally and professionally-labelled) 'learners' in the interaction.

Conclusion

The eight extracts from my data presented above illustrate the kinds of conversational adjustments which occur in talk between UK and International university students navigating typical TESOL tasks. The adjustments include those observed in previous studies of accommodation in international English (as noted in the chapter two). Here I will briefly summarise the different types of accommodation that appear in my data, in terms of content, phonology, lexis, syntax and discourse.

Typical content-related ways of 'doing' accommodation observable in my data include: giving additional information about, and 'helpful' explanations of, situations and events; repetition of one's own words and the words of other speakers; choosing a narrower range of topics; more here-and-now orientation; briefer treatment of topics. For example in lines 1 – 7 of extract one, Claire provides a 'helpful' suggestion of possible answers to her question, repeating the suggestion (using different words) and then finishes with a repeat of her original question. It is not possible to comment on the *range* of topics or the here-and-now orientation, given the fact that the topic they are discussing has been selected for them. Sub-topics, however, represented by the questions the students planned to ask, are given both briefer and more extensive treatment. Extensive treatment may form part of an extended question sequence, as in extract one, from Claire and Markus's interview. Or, like the dropping of an unsuccessful question by Bryn in his interview with Giorgios, topics may get limited treatment. Or, like Ling's questions for Valerie about her accent, when these are successful, the topic is greatly extended.

Phonological accommodation that has been noted in the literature includes slower speech, avoiding contractions and weak forms of vowels, stressing more words and increased volume. Similar ways of accommodating are also to be found in my data, for example, Valerie and Ling in extract three both slow their speech by drawing out vowel sounds, avoiding some contractions and stressing more words. Their volume rises and falls to match changes in volume made by either one or the other of them. In contrast, in extract two, Bryn uses lower

levels of volume at certain points in his interview which are not matched by Giorgios.

Lexical accommodation occurs in the transcripts in ways that have also been noted in the literature. For example, in extract four, Andrew tries 'lessons' first of all and then, when Stelios signals lack of understanding, substitutes a word possibly considered easier or more familiar to Stelios, 'foundation programme'. In extract two Bryn changes "learning English" to "here", "things" becomes "areas", and "done already" becomes "covered".

Syntactical changes that have been observed in the literature include avoiding syntax considered 'complex', omitting verbs, using more tag questions, making shorter utterances, an increased use of the present tense, and omitting the copula, prepositions, articles and inflectional endings. Some of these features are observable in my data. For example, in extract three Valerie uses a tag question, "you wouldn't understand, would you" (687), in extract one Claire says, "work more active" (04), and in extract two, Bryn begins the interview with an extended question sequence which includes the 'fronting' feature observed in accommodated talk. Overall though, the syntactical changes that have been observed in the literature on accommodated talk are less obvious than the other types of accommodation mentioned here.

Accommodation related to discourse observed in the literature includes using more gestures and more repetition, rephrasing of one's own and others' information, longer and more frequent pauses, completing others' utterances, correcting others' 'mistakes', as well as more joining in to help another interactant find a word or phrase that might be a 'correct' expression of what he or she wants to say. Where topic management is concerned, in accommodated talk there are more abrupt changes in topic, easier 'giving up' of topics when a new topic is proposed by an interlocutor and more acceptance of unintentional changes in topic. Where questions are concerned, in accommodated talk there are more use of questions as a way of changing the topic, more comprehension checks, more confirmation checks, more clarification requests, more expansions, and more question and answer sequences. In the transcripts analysed here there is a great deal of discourse-related accommodation,

including features that are confirming and also contradictory of the literature. For example, Valerie and Ling do not abandon their topic but give it a full and apparently mutually satisfying treatment. In contrast, Bryn gives up on his attempt to ask a question of Giorgios relatively quickly. Self and other-repetition features regularly in all of the transcripts, questions are used as a way of changing the topic, and both UK and International students use confirmation checks and clarification requests. Only Kate (UK) joins in to help Tom (International) find a word that she believes him to be looking for. In my data, discourse-related accommodation seems to occur more frequently than any other kind.

Repairs appear particularly frequently in my data and these are generally, though not in extracts seven and eight, self- rather than other-repair. Self-repairs which are 'other-initiated' (reactive) sequences triggered by an interlocutor's complaint, include those in extract two when Giorgios says to Bryn, "what do you mean" and when Stelios says to Andrew "hm?" in extract four. Self-initiated repairs (pro-active) sequences in which a speaker seems to interrupt what s/he was saying by restarting their utterance are even more frequent than other-initiated and are found in all the transcripts. The students appear to be putting a great deal of effort into preventing misunderstanding by focusing on the communication of content and the achievement of their task-specific goals. Their desire to create and maintain intersubjectivity (mutual understanding), in addition to their prediction of potential misunderstanding, results in a pattern of interaction which has frequently been found in research on accommodation in international situations.

So, in response to my first research question about the conversational adjustments which occur in talk between UK and International university students navigating typical TESOL tasks in the classroom, my data demonstrates that accommodation frequently occurs in many of the ways that have also been noted in the literature on international communication. However, I have also shown that generalising about conversational adjustments between interactants is risky. In talk between UK and International students navigating TESOL tasks, the actual selection of conversational adjustments occurs in highly idiosyncratic and unpredictable ways.

Contexts and Applications

In the second part of this chapter, I focus on answering my remaining overarching research question, using examples from the extracts presented in the first part. The question is: what are the relationships between these adjustments and (mis)understanding?

This question has four sub-questions, as follows.

1.   what is the sequential relationship between the adjustments and (mis)understanding in the students' talk?

This question asks about the (sequential) relationships between misunderstanding and adjustments in the students' talk. The answer to this question has probably already become apparent in the analysis of the extracts in the first part of this chapter – accommodation happens both before and after episodes of mutual misunderstanding, often within the same interview. Furthermore, where proactive accommodation, such as an initial extended question sequence, takes place very early in the interview and is followed by a complaint, it becomes very difficult to tell whether subsequent accommodation is reactive or proactive.

2.   do the adjustments made by the students relate to the contexts (professional and institutional) in which their talk takes place?

Sub-question two asks whether the presence and selection of adjustments made by the students is related to the contexts (professional and institutional) in which their talk takes place. Based on my analysis of the data, the answer to this question is 'probably', but in what are, again, unpredictable ways. In extract four, for example, Andrew attempts to solve some interactional trouble using self-repair; he tries his question again with lexical substitution, using an alternative phrase which he perhaps believes may be more familiar to Stelios. Andrew's diagnosis of their misunderstanding is a familiar one in the professional context of TESOL, reinforced by the context of a UK university that typically positions International students with English as an additional language as in need of support with their English. And yet, despite the fact that the

rationale for Andrew's accommodation may have been to provide what he considers a simpler version of his message, it is not possible to be totally confident that his utterance re-design is actual evidence of *context-specific* accommodation. Understanding the speaker's diagnosis of the reason for actual or potential interactional trouble, and the relationship between the trouble and what they perceive to be the context of their interaction, remains a hermeneutic process.

The interview between Valerie and Ling demonstrates this very clearly. Their extended and repetitive recycling of matching topic and language elements *could* be seen as proactive behaviour in a communicative environment that the participants believe to be fragile (because of their positioning of Ling as a learner of a native-speaker 'owned' English and as therefore not yet competent in its use). Or, on the other hand, their extended recycling could also be about rapport-building, an interactant-specific issue without any particular orientation to their professional and institutional contexts. Of course, where accommodation is reactive, it may also be a primarily local issue, and, again, one which has little or no connection to wider professional and institutional concerns.

3.   is (mis)understanding a local matter (relatable to adjustments) or a global matter (relatable to the participants' use of lingua franca English, or to aspects of their professional and institutional contexts)?

Sub-question three asks whether (mis)understanding is a local matter or a global matter. The answer to this question, as shown by my analysis of the data collected for this study is 'both'. As the literature review in chapter two showed, features of foreigner talk are part of our general language socialisation and are acquired at the same time that we acquire other aspects of our language knowledge. However, as my data shows, the use of specific features by individual speakers is related to the type of task that has generated the talk, as well as the setting of the talk and the interactants' beliefs about the roles and language identities that are appropriate for each other.

Crucially, the relationship between conversational adjustments and the beliefs about the (in)competence of an interlocutor which trigger them, is a cyclical one. By orienting to the possible fragility of a communicative context, due to the presence of a person identified as additional language speaker, foreigner talk is made more likely, while certain features of foreigner talk (such as repetition, lexical and syntactic substitution) have been shown to contribute to this fragility. And yet, as Valerie and Ling, for example, demonstrate, where the orientation to the possibility of misunderstanding is mutual, and there is time to work things out, these potentially negative features of English language foreigner talk can result in the creation of an intricate tapestry of talk designed with a specific task and interlocutor in mind which is fully capable of satisfying the needs of interactants.

4.   are adjustments and (mis)understanding a problem or a resource for the students?

This brings me to my final sub-question, on whether adjustments and (mis)understanding are a problem or a resource for the students. The answer, according to my analysis of the data collected for this study is, again, 'both'. The use of accommodated talk to create a particular kind of relationship and accomplish what one or more of the interactants perceive to be a 'normal' situation does not always result in negative consequences for the achievement of the communicative task. Accommodated talk can provide a way of talking which allows recognised roles to come into being in a way that creates the context necessary for a particular kind of institutional or professional relationship. The students can use ways of talking conventionally associated with 'being a native speaker' and 'being a language learner' as a way of achieving their mutual aim of having a conversation.

Conversational adjustments provide a handy and effective framework by which the conversation may proceed. In the case of Valerie and Ling, for example, their mutual efforts seem to be viewed by both in a positive light, as evidenced by their willingness to cooperate in the numerous recyclings up until the point where both signal their satisfaction with each other's understanding of the topic. In the case of Kate and Tom however, their interaction suggests the possibility

of dissatisfaction with each other's understanding of the topic. A useful reminder that all the benefits of accommodated talk are not always equally shared between all the participants.

Summary

In brief the answers to my research questions are as follows:

Research Question 1: what conversational adjustments (repair) occur(s) in talk between UK and International university students navigating TESOL tasks in the classroom?

Answer: a wide range of lexical, grammatical, phonological, discourse- and content-related adjustments.

Research Question 2: what are the relationships between these adjustments and (mis)understanding? In order to answer this question, I have asked the following four sub-questions.

Sub-question 1: what is the sequential relationship between the adjustments and (mis)understanding in the students' talk?

Answer: adjustments are both proactive and reactive, though it is sometimes difficult to be sure of the exact relationship between misunderstanding and accommodation.

Sub-question 2: do the adjustments made by the students relate to the contexts (professional and institutional) in which their talk takes place?

Answer: probably, but it is not possible to be absolutely sure how.

Sub-question 3: is (mis)understanding a local matter (relatable to adjustments) or a global matter (relatable to the participants use of lingua franca English, or to aspects of the professional and institutional contexts)?

Answer: both, but, again, it is not possible to be absolutely sure in what way.

Sub-question 4: are adjustments and (mis)understanding a problem or a resource for the students?

Answer: both.

Conclusion

The real-world problem to be studied and solved in my study is complex and multi-faceted.

First, there was the over-arching issue for the students of their module assessment. Both the UK and the International students conducted the interviews in order to collect information about each other. Although the interviews themselves were not directly assessed, it was essential for a certain amount and type of information to be gathered in order to be able to fulfill the requirements of their assessment. In the case of the UK students, they were required to submit plans for two lessons based on the language learning needs and preferences of the International students they spoke to, and a report justifying their planning decisions. The UK students, therefore, needed to collect information about the International students' opinions of their English language learning needs and preferences for certain types of classroom activity. The UK students also needed a sample of the International students' English in order to be able to make a preliminary judgment about the language 'gaps' that their planned lesson could usefully fill.

Second, the students were presented to each other as 'UK' and 'International'; implying inherent and ever-relevant difference rather than similarity.

Third, the students were meeting for the first time; there was therefore a need to establish a sufficiently cooperative relationship for the interviews to be able to go ahead successfully.

Fourth, there was only one opportunity for a meeting, so all students were under pressure to collect the information they needed for their assessment.

These aspects of the professional and institutional context in which the task took place meant that the International students were presented as 'learners' of 'English', with incompetence implied by the former and a monolithic code for which England is the standard-bearer implied by the latter. The UK students, on the other hand, were presented in this specific institutional and professional

context, as experts in what the International students lacked, 'correct English'. The UK students may (or may not) have been aware of the extent of their own exposure to a narrower range of varieties of English than the International students, and therefore that they have had less practice in understanding different varieties and in using communication strategies to help with the joint achievement of understanding. For these reasons, both groups of students were likely to have been burdened with the fear that they themselves might contribute to a fragile communicative environment and/or with the fear that their interlocutors might also be hampered in their ability to understand, or make themselves understood. The institutional and professional context of their talk brings along with it a heightened sensitivity to the possibility of misunderstanding.

On the other hand, there is much evidence in the eight extracts above of the students' willingness to try and maximise their chances of getting useful information for their assessments. On the whole, misunderstanding is treated as a threat to their successful completion of their assigned task. There is also evidence that students attempt to avoid or recover from misunderstanding with accommodation, that is, by modifying their talk, based on their beliefs about each other and the task. On the whole, the UK students' modifications seem to be underpinned by judgements about the International students' lack of competence in English and the contribution this makes to (what the UK students perceive to be) a fragile communicative environment. These are judgements which may be formed prior to the interview and which may be based on the nature of their understanding of the job of an ESOL teacher. Other possible contributions to the assumption of lack of competence are the institutional categories provided by the University, the nature of the task as a 'needs analysis', or more general beliefs about the link between English language competence and nationality and their 'ownership' of English. The UK students' judgements about the International students' competence in English are modified or confirmed during the course of the interview, as the extracts above show. In summary, the transcripts of the interviews seem to indicate that both UK and International students bring the following four elements to their specific task and its professional (TESOL) and institutional (UK university) context:

1. a belief that misunderstanding provides a threat to ongoing interaction
2. a belief that misunderstanding is also a professional/institutional resource. In other words, without misunderstanding, teaching would not be needed and the tasks would be pointless
3. a mutual willingness and ability to experiment with a variety of conversational adjustments in order to minimise misunderstanding and therefore sustain their interaction
4. prior and ongoing judgement of their own and each others' communicative competence and the contextual factors that, they believe, influence competence.

The local consequences of these four elements are the various patterns of interaction observed in the eight extracts. These include: the use of various complaint strategies to indicate misunderstanding, self-repair (for example in the extended question sequences), other-repair (for example where 'answers' to an interlocutor's word search is suggested); the flexible use of backchannelling noises or words to mean a variety of different things, and attempts to summarise and resist being summarised. These patterns of interaction arise in person- and topic-specific ways in an attempt to minimise trouble, either anticipated or already apparent, and then sometimes do, but sometimes don't, create new problems in an ongoing process. Misunderstanding is not necessarily extrinsic to the interaction, success is not determined in advance and competence is a quality that only has ongoing relevance as it is played out in person- and task-specific ways in the interviews.

Assessments of competence which pre-date specific interactions, and which may be based on personal beliefs or institutional categories, may or may not be made relevant to the interaction. The achievement, or appearance, of competence is as much a product of specific interactions as it is something which is brought to the interaction by the participants. Misunderstanding occurs and is managed locally; competence comes into being and is modified locally in ways that may not always accessible to the interactants while they talk. Crucially, however, beliefs about an interlocutor's talk may result in ways of talking that reproduce these beliefs, especially where there is a handy institutionally- and professionally-sanctioned explanation. The misunderstanding

in the interviews that occurs and is managed locally could equally be read by the interactants as resulting from a lack of competence on the part of the International student who is still learning English or from a lack of competence on the part of the UK student who has no previous practice in using English in international situations. Given the pressure of the institutional (UK university) and professional (TESOL) frameworks within which the interviews took place, it is easy to imagine how these 'deficit linguistic' readings are likely.

From a theoretical viewpoint, the discussion of the eight extracts has demonstrated that the students bring assumptions about each other to their interactions and these assumptions play out in the way that they talk to each other. But the local effect of their co-management of their task complicates, and sometimes undermines, these global assumptions. (In)competence and (mis)understanding become a *joint production*, an internal matter to the talk. Furthermore, the students' assumptions about their role in the interaction are both brought from outside, (and can therefore be, potentially, described by the students themselves), *and* created anew in each specific interaction (and thus can only be understood internally). Context both pre-dates interaction and is freshly forged each time a speaker makes a contribution to a specific interaction. The talk becomes a context for subsequent talk in ways that can be unexpected and, on reflection, challenging of previously held beliefs.

In a practical sense, the data in the previous sections of this chapter show how people modify their talk in generally similar ways based on socio-cultural beliefs about what is 'easier' or 'more difficult' to understand; beliefs which seem to be acquired as part of the overall language acquisition process. These beliefs interact in unpredictable ways with cultural and individual beliefs: about certain groups of people (foreigners, language learners, International students or 'non-native speakers' for example); about task- and setting-related roles (interviewer/interviewee, teacher/student etc.); and about the nature of language (standards, ownership, boundaries etc.). Language teachers modify their talk, as do people in lingua franca situations, and as do people talking to 'foreigners' in both social and service settings. Importantly, the modifications that get made then go on to influence, or even determine, how much talk gets understood. This in turn, influences the achievement of the task and the extent

to which the beliefs about groups and the claiming of roles which underpinned the accommodation in the first place get reinforced, or sometimes challenged.

It is impossible to be sure what triggers accommodated talk because this information may be held secretly or unconsciously by the interactants, who may also be unaware that they are modifying their talk at all; neither can we judge whether any particular kind of accommodation is 'good' or bad' outside of a specific context of interaction. What we can observe is the local occurrence and management of misunderstanding, and the effects of this on the interactants' identities, roles, and achievement of their communicative task. This conclusion leads into phase two of this study (described in the next chapter), in which I consider, as an applied linguist, what might be done about this state of affairs from within 'Introduction to TESOL' and 'Communication Skills' modules in a UK university with an internationalisation agenda.

Chapter Five - Applications

Introduction

In chapter one, where I presented the disciplinary context of this study, and again in chapter three, which explored the ethical dimension of Applied Linguistics, I reflected on my responsibility for the following ways of doing and using research:

- sharing research findings in accessible ways with the speech communities from which they collect data
- using research findings to create solutions which meet the needs of the speech communities I research, when and where needs arise
- disseminating knowledge about the many ways in which language shapes lives, in the hope of challenging language-related discrimination against individuals and groups.

After the two critical incidents described in chapter one, I decided to design a series of classroom tasks that would bring UK and International students together and involve them communicating in English, a solution which provided me with the data for this study. Subsequent to my analysis, described in chapter four of this thesis, I decided to share my research findings in a way that is accessible to the students who provided the data (and others like them) and which provides a potential solution to meet the needs of students at intenationalising universities. How I went about planning and creating this solution is described in detail in phase two of my study, comprising chapters five and six.

My analysis of the data presented in the previous chapter seems to suggest that (mis)understanding is the product of a complex interaction between global and local factors; where the local factors play an important role in the ongoing maintenance, and sometimes resistance, of the global factors. In terms of local factors, in some of the extracts, the students used communication strategies that have been noted in the literature on foreigner talk, teacher talk and lingua franca talk. In other examples, the students evolved what seemed to be novel,

locally effective strategies; strategies which seemed to have a positive impact on their ability to maintain their interaction. In all of the examples, the students modified their talk. In some of these examples the modifications seemed to have a positive impact on facilitating understanding. In other examples, however, the modifications seemed to make understanding more difficult to achieve. In many of the examples, the students had strategies for dealing with misunderstanding of even the most profound kind. In terms of global factors, the students seemed to enter into the interaction with the expectation that misunderstanding was likely and that, therefore, proactive action in the form of accommodation was needed. In this particular task, and of course in the professional (TESOL) and institutional (UK university) context for the task, misunderstanding is constructed both as a threat to local interaction and as a professional/institutional resource. In other words, without misunderstanding, English language teaching and learning would not be needed.

In reflecting on how I could use these findings in my teaching, I began by trying to set out a series of principles, derived from my analysis of the data. In the first part of this chapter, I begin by describing the background to the development of the principles (which I suggest could be used to inform practice in similar professional and institutional contexts), and then go on to set out the principles themselves.

Once I had settled on the principles, I decided to test their robustness by exploring how they might be used to steer my teaching practice. This initially involved sharing the principles with my students and then working with them to try and operationalise the principles for teaching purposes. My initial attempts at operationalisation underwent several stages of revision in the light of student feedback. In the second part of the chapter, entitled 'practice', I demonstrate how I operationalised the principles, revised their operationalisation based on student feedback, and then went on to design a practical language awareness-related solution to the problems identified by my data analysis.

Developing Some Principles

Background

In this section, I aim to describe the background to the development of a series of principles, which were derived from my analysis of the data collected for this study.

Calls for 'evidence-based practice' have become common in education in recent years and it would be difficult to argue that individual intuition provides a preferable basis for decision making. But the generation of evidence on which to base professional practice can turn in to 'ten top tips', a danger recognised by ten Have,

> There seems to be a tendency [...] to summarize the conclusions of a consideration of practical problems and general interests in terms of relatively simple recipes or 'rules of thumb'. (ten Have, 1999, p. 199, cited in Richards, 2005, p. 5)

Rather than being a list of 'rules of thumb' for successful international interaction, the principles I describe here are based not only on my research *findings*, as reported in chapter four, but also on my experience of the *process* of making methodological and theoretical decisions about the analysis of my data, and the impact on my findings of these decisions. None of the principles are original, in the sense of never having been formulated before. What is unique, however, is the trajectory of this study from the description of an authentic problem, to situation-specific data collection and a reflective approach to analysis, to the setting out of principles and the design of a real-world solution to the problem I originally identified.

The formulation of these principles and the design of a practical activity based on them is a very important part of my work as an Applied Linguist in my particular professional and institutional context. My detailed analysis of eight short extracts in chapter four of this study demonstrates how the treatment of interactional sequences as 'unintelligible', 'incorrect' or problematic can implicitly or explicitly disadvantage people or, more likely, groups, by proposing certain

ways of talking as (ab)normal and (un)desirable. When ESOL teachers and university policy makers assume that successful international communication is essentially an *individual* problem for 'International' students, the ideological and interactive nature of (mis)understanding and its potential to contribute to professional, institutional and societal value systems and associated social identities becomes hidden from the students who accept these assumptions as reality. McDermott and Gospodinoff (1979) comment on the reasons for this phenomenon,

> people usually develop metacommunicative procedures for altering their communicative codes in order to make sense of each other. When communicative differences become irremedial, it is because there are sound political or economic reasons for their being so. (1979, p. 277)

Where both the TESOL profession and UK universities have economic reasons for the creation of a 'non-native speaker', 'learner' (or similar) category, an applied linguistic effort is urgently required in order to re-orientate students and student-teachers. This re-orientation is one which needs to attempt to prevent students from conflating one variety of English with English as an international language, and to encourage them to share responsibility for successful communication in mixed language situations.

This is not an easy task. In general, public understanding of how language shapes lives remains limited, and opportunities to be a socially responsible applied linguist do not lie solely in the hands of individuals. In practice, the power to liberate and oppress, to privilege and marginalise, is distributed in complex and often invisible ways throughout the whole of society, including individuals and groups, students and teachers, workers and management. Given these constraints, it may be most fruitful to think of applied linguistics practice as bottom-up community activity. And so, in the absence of ready-made solutions to communication 'problems', I concluded that the most effective course of action in providing professional development opportunities for (TESOL) students in an internationalising university was to avoid trying to legislate on ways of talking. Instead, I decided to try to raise my students' awareness of their *own* speaking and listening practices, and the effects of these on each other and their task achievement.

In order to get ideas for activities that would fulfil my applied linguistic aim, I consulted language awareness-raising studies carried out in institutional contexts (for example, Gumperz, 1979; Roberts and Sayers, 1987). Roberts and Sayers describe training with a very similar aim to the kinds of activities I planned to design. Their work involved helping minority ethnic and white workers, managers and trade unionists to improve their communication, but did *not* try,

> to teach people how to talk to a particular ethnic group. We are trying to help people to be more flexible and sensitive in dealing with all individuals. We are helping people to look into themselves and use resources which are in each one of us but which previous training, experience and systems have prevented us from using. There is no set of styles to switch between, rather a developing sensitivity which helps us question our own behaviour and not judge others by our own culture. (Roberts and Sayers, 1987, p. 133).

Gumperz recommends that awareness is raised of the ways in which conversations are created step by step, as meaning is jointly negotiated. His practical suggestions include recording conversations, and requiring the interactants to listen to their recordings and discuss whether, and if so, where, things have gone wrong (Gumperz, 1979, p. 274 – 275). Similarly, Keith Richards (2005), in an introduction to a collection of chapters on the uses of applied conversation analysis, illustrates what he calls a 'discovery to informed action' model for raising self awareness; a model described as 'interventionist applied conversation analysis' by Charles Antaki (2011, p.8) and as 'discursive action method' by Lamerichs and te Molder (2011, p. 184). Richards suggests that both practising professionals and trainees,

> …could be sensitized to interactional possibilities that they had not hitherto considered, not in terms of procedures that they might follow […] but in terms of responding to competencies that [conversation analysis] has been able to expose. By thinking in terms of raising awareness, directing attention, developing sensitivity, challenging assumptions, etc., [conversation analysis] can contribute to informed professional action, helping professionals to deepen their understanding and develop new competencies. (Richards, 2005, p. 5 - 6)

How, in practical terms, to raise awareness is considered in a recent discussion in the online UK Linguistic Ethnography Forum. In the discussion, Ben Rampton suggests ways of helping students learn about the relationships between signs, practice and ideology, between language and culture. These ways include

reading case studies and doing projects and, 'one of the most accessible, absorbing and effective ways of teaching people at any level' the micro-analytic data session (Rampton, 2012, p. 10). The data session, as described by Rampton,

> normally involves asking one of the session participants to bring along a couple of minutes of audio and video interaction that they think could be particularly significant for whatever it is that they're interested in, and then collectively immersing ourselves in the recording and transcript for a couple of hours, running with people's interests and interpretations, while at the same time pushing them to make their claims accountable to evidence, assessing their plausibility etc. In some respects, the traditional data-session in conversation analysis is an important model here, with its orientation to slowness, smallness, 'why this now', 'what next'. But…we also work outwards to larger scale processes…It's extraordinary how often this process of slow, intensive micro-analysis hits newcomers as a revelation, vividly disclosing intricate details in the processes of social construction that they'd never imagined. (Rampton, 2012, p.10)

In this thesis, I 'micro-analysed' data that was significant to my own pedagogic interests, running with the idea of 'lingua franca', in the hope of shedding light on the processes of social construction in an internationalising university. Out of this experience came the four principles, listed below; principles which, as I go on to describe, helped me to decide what to do with a classroom situation in which the critical incidents I initially described could come about.

The principles

Having described how the idea for a set of principles came about, in the next section of my thesis I intend to lay out these principles. Their aim is to raise students' language awareness, as befits a communicative context in which generalisations about 'how to talk' are not possible.

As phase two (chapters five and six) of my thesis shows, my study is neither research-only nor pedagogy-only, but an applied linguistics project that insists on the importance of an understanding of the problem and a proposal for a solution. The principles I describe here are based both on my experience of the process of analysing of my own data and on the findings of the analysis. Given the specific nature of the contexts in which the data collection took place, the principles have been formulated with my International and UK students in mind. In other words, the principles are translatable by me into a practical classroom task that is usable by my students. They embody an approach to mixed language communication situations that is aware of, and prepared to challenge, professional and institutional assumptions about linguistic competence, and is aware of the co-constructed nature of understanding, the role of familiarity in intelligibility, and the need for self-monitoring and flexibility in choice of communication strategies. Above all, the principles provide a platform for the design of a classroom task that is suitably reflective of the whole process of undertaking this study. Written as if addressing their users, the students, they are as follows:

Principle 1: Make audio recordings of your talk. Without recordings most, if not all, the interesting details of the interaction are lost, leaving only a vague impression of outcomes and very little information about the features of the interaction that led up to the outcomes. These (largely inaccurate) impressions are likely to be consistent with pre-existing beliefs about a person, task or situation. These beliefs can only be challenged by very careful listening to what is actually happening in specific interactions.

Principle 2: Transcribe sections of your talk as a way of paying attention to what is happening in a recorded interaction. But be aware that if a transcript is to be

fairly easily readable, it will inevitably involve selecting some features of the talk and disregarding others. Recognise that this is the first act of analysis. Compare your transcription/initial analysis with that of your interlocutor and consider similarities and differences, and the possible reasons for these.

Principle 3: Peruse your data, noting how you and your interlocutor usually treat each other's utterances, and what happens if there is a deviation from this internally generated 'normality'.

Principle 4: Reflect on possible relationships between professional/institutional contexts and your data. We always bring assumptions about each other and about the nature of our current task to our interaction, and we can *speculate* about what our assumptions, and those of our interlocutor, might be. But what we can *see* in the data are the actual consequences of the way we talk for the roles/identities that we make available for each other, and the usefulness of these roles for our task achievement. In addition to speculating about global causes, we need to observe local causes and their immediate and potential longer term effects.

The main implication of the data analysis in chapter four of this study is that there is probably not any particular way of talking that is responsible for misunderstanding. Instead, there are difficult-to-predict and endlessly varying ways of (un)successfully communicating meaning in evolving contexts that are created as the talk itself evolves. Because of the uncertainty surrounding the generalisable effects of different ways of accommodating, or not accommodating, another speaker, it seems unlikely that there exists any detailed recipe for successful lingua franca communication, other than:

- noticing aspects of the context that might be affecting the talk
- being aware of how one is talking and the effects of one's own talking on one's interlocutor
- where necessary, being able to adjust one's own way of talking to maximise the chance of achieving the task which provides the impetus for the talk.

The principles I described in the previous section are based on my own experience of working on the analysis of my own data, as well as on the findings of the analysis. In this section, therefore, I use a worked example from my own context to demonstrate how the four principles I set out in the first section of this chapter might be used to inform the design of a real-world solution to the problems I have identified.

Operationalising the principles

Having identified the principles, I then wanted to see whether I could share this experience, and my findings, with my students in a practical task.

The first step in creating an awareness-raising task based on the four principles outlined above was to think through what aspects of their talk I wanted the students to pay attention to. This was in response to principle three: peruse the data, noting how interactants usually treat each other's utterances, and, where there is a deviation from this internally generated 'normality', what the response of the interactants is. I wanted the students to suspend their judgment on what form their interaction might take and consider instead how the interaction looks from their interlocutor's perspective and intentions, as shown through their talk.

In my initial attempt, I used the features I had found in my own analysis of the data, read against the awareness-raising work of Gumperz (1979), Roberts and Sayers (1987), Richards (2005), Young (2008), Thornbury and Slade (2006), Brown and Yule (1983), ten Have (2007), Scollon and Scollon (1995), Schegloff (1999a, 2007), Tannen (1989), Carter and McCarthy (1997), Roberts and Moss (n.d.a) and Roberts and Moss (n.d.b). This led me to compile a list of possible interesting features for students to listen out for in their own talk and that of their interlocutors:

1. asking a question
2. asking the same question more than once
3. changing the pitch of their voice, making it higher or lower
4. changing the speed of their talk
5. changing the volume of their talk
6. disagreeing or agreeing with what someone else has said
7. giving their personal opinions or stating facts
8. hesitating
9. laughing
10. overlapping with another speaker
11. referring back to an earlier part of the same interaction
12. referring to another interaction (with the same or a different person)

13. repairing/correcting/reformulating what they or someone else has said or the way they said it (are they examples of self-initiated self repair, self-initiated other repair, other-initiated self repair or other-initiated other repair?) How many 'turns' does it take before the repair sequence is complete? Who completes the repair?

14. repeating their own, or their interlocutor's, words

15. reporting the words of someone else outside the interaction

16. saying more (or less) than the other people in the interaction

17. sighing

18. starting a new topic, developing a topic, ending a topic, changing the topic

19. starting to say something and not finishing it

20. starting to speak while or after someone else has been speaking (change of speaker), were they 'given' the floor, or did they do something to take it? How did it happen? Is there an equal balance of 'turns' in the interaction?

21. summarising what another person has said

22. using 'have', 'give', 'get, 'take', 'go' in combination with other words, for example, 'give someone a ring', 'have a good talk', 'take a long walk', 'got so many messages', 'got all mixed up'.

23. using 'heads' like 'you know my neighbour? She....' 'that girl you met last week, have you....', 'that boy over there, he looks..'

24. using 'tails' like 'you always do that, you do', 'it's quite bad, you know', 'he's actually quite annoying, that man', 'they tend to do that don't they, students'.

25. using discourse markers such as: 'and', 'but', 'then', 'first', 'I mean', 'anyway', 'on the other hand', 'next'

26. Using ellipsis (missing out words), for example 'wonder if he'll be there', 'just got back from town', 'got a terrible headache', 'interesting, isn't it?'

27. using fixed expressions like 'it's on the tip of my tongue', 'watch your step', 'you can't be too careful', 'at the end of the day' 'as a matter of fact'

28. using formal language

29. using hedging language like 'might', 'could', 'kind of', 'sort of', 'probably', 'somewhat', 'actually', 'really', 'basically', 'generally', 'perhaps', 'normally', 'slightly', 'at least'

30. using pronouns like 'him', 'her', 'hers', 'she'

31. using question tags like 'it's cold, isn't it?', 'yeah, it does, doesn't it?', 'he isn't working today, is he?'

32. using signposting language like, 'a kind of food called', 'York is a place where...' 'I just want to tell you about...'

33. using sounds like 'mmm' or 'hmm'

34. using taboo language or slang

35. using vague language like 'a bit', 'thing', 'stuff', 'a few', 'sort of'

36. using words like 'this', 'that', 'there', 'now', 'then'

37. using words or short phrases that stand alone like 'yeah', 'OK', 'right', 'really', 'oh dear'

Feedback on the principles

I initially intended to ask the students to look through a transcript of their mixed language classroom talk to see whether they could find any of the features on the 37-item list in the previous section. I showed this list of features to a group of four International and UK students I was teaching and asked for their feedback. All four said that the list was off-puttingly long and that I should try to focus on some essential questions or group the features in some easier-to-read way. Accordingly, I tried a different approach, and at a subsequent meeting showed the students four general questions about the kind of action that utterances implement (adapted from Schegloff, 1996 cited in ten Have, 2007, p. 121):

1. what actions are being accomplished in and through the interaction – description with examples from the data (formulation).
2. what do the participants do to let you know that this is the action they are accomplishing (they don't have to be aware they are doing it, but there has to be evidence in the interaction that this IS what they're doing, perhaps there will be a response or reaction in the interaction that follows the 'doing' (grounding).
3. what features of the interaction/particular practice lead to a particular recognisable action (explication)?
4. look at subsequent interaction, where is the evidence that this action was accomplished?

The students said that, for them, this new list of questions was both too vague and too technical. My next step was therefore to create a shorter, themed version of the first list of questions and to combine it with the idea of looking at the possible effects of the features, as the second list suggested. The resulting list of questions was grouped into five sections A – E, with A as a compulsory question and the option to choose one of questions B – E, as follows:

A   What is the **main aim** of the discussion? Who decided that this is the aim? Does the recording show that that everyone agreed with this aim? How do the people in the discussion show that they agree or disagree

with this aim? In addition to what people say, try to listen for how they say it; for example, do they put stronger stress on some words, does their intonation rise or fall, do they speak louder or more softly and so on?

In the discussion:

B   Does anyone **misunderstand** what another person is saying? How do they show that they have misunderstood? What is the reaction of the misunderstood speaker? Is the misunderstanding sorted out? How? Who sorts the misunderstanding out? What is the effect of any misunderstanding on the group's achievement of its aims?

C   Does anyone **disagree** with **what** another person is saying or **how** they are saying it? How do they do this? What is the reaction of the corrected speaker? Is the disagreement sorted out? How? Who sorts the disagreement out? What is the effect of any disagreement on the group's achievement of its aims?

D   Does everyone have an **equal opportunity** to speak? Does anyone interrupt another speaker? How do they interrupt? What is the reaction of the other speakers to the interruption? What is the effect of the distribution of opportunity to speak on the group's achievement of its aims?

E   does anyone: laugh; sigh; hesitate; repeat (maybe using slightly different words) an opinion or question several times; repeat (maybe using slightly different words) another person's opinion; use slang, idioms or taboo language; mix different languages? How? What is the effect of any of these features on the group's achievement of its aims?

Designing the awareness-raising task

Having worked with the students to arrive at a list of awareness-raising questions which they agreed was less technical and more concise than my original attempt, I designed an activity which can be done in class or by students working independently. I decided to call the group activity a 'tutorial'.

The decision to require students to record their classroom talk was based on principle one. Without recordings most, if not, all the interesting details of the interaction are lost, leaving only a vague impression of outcomes and very little information about the features of the interaction that led up to the outcomes. The next step in the tutorial is based on principle two: transcribe. My experience of my own data analysis had shown me that transcription is a valuable way of starting to close pay attention to features of the talk. Principle three, 'peruse', underpins the list of questions A – E in that it encourages the students to note how they themselves are talking and how they treating each other's utterances. Principle four is that students should reflect on possible relationships between the way they are talking and their global professional/institutional contexts, but also keep in mind the ways in which they are co-creating local contexts for each other.

I called the activity, 'English as a lingua franca: an introductory tutorial' and published it online (Wicaksono, n.d.). In addition to the questions A – E the website has a brief introduction to ELF and to the interactional approach I am taking to the understanding of how talk works.

Feedback on the task

The website has an example, in the form of a short video, of how two of the students involved in its creation (Andrew and Stelios) used the principles to do some thinking of their own. In the video, Andrew and Stelios discuss, using the awareness-raising questions A – E, the 'with Rachel' extract which appears as extract four in chapter four of this study and is reproduced below.

Transcript 4: With Rachel

Andrew = UK student, Stelios = International student

Lines 01 - 08 of 08.

```
17      A:    What- what parts of ummm like your lessons (.) have you
18            enjoyed (.) doing (.) with Rachel.
19      S:    (2.0) Hmm?
20      A:    What parts of your ermmm ((LS)) (1.0) foundation
21            programme have you enjoyed doing with Rachel.
22      S:    (.) We- I don't have Rachel.
23      A:    Oh you DO:N't? oh right. So what- (1.0) what lessons d-
24            what lessons are you doin'?
```

A rough transcript of their videoed conversation about the 'with Rachel' extract, demonstrating how they used the questions A – E, follows. Because, in this case, I am interested in *what* Andrew and Stelios are saying, rather than *how* they are saying it, I have not transcribed their talk in the same detail as the extracts in chapter four; features like pauses, overlap, false starts and fillers such as 'sort of' or 'kind of' have been omitted. In the video, Andrew and Stelios are seated, and Andrew is holding a copy of their transcript of the 'with Rachel' extract. On a table, out of sight of the camera, are the awareness raising questions A – E. After some talk about the nature of their current task, they say,

Stelios: You put a verb into the sentence and you put after that "Rachel" which is the tutor but actually it wasn't that and that's why I asked "Hmmm".

Andrew: Yea, absolutely. Yes so at line one, this is actually me talking, and as Stelios was saying, you've got this staggered start, "what- what parts of", and all of these hesitancy markers, and the micropauses that he was talking about just further stagger and draw out this question, and I think maybe that's part of the reason it's hard to take in exactly what's being asked, and, yea, absolutely, the sense I got was that as I'm asking the question, and I'm getting no feedback of understanding, like receipt markers like "mmm" or head nodding, so I kept trying to align my question which I was going to get some kind of acknowledgement from.

Stelios: Yes but really you have left it at "enjoyed", and it would have been a perfect sentence.

Andrew: Absolutely and in retrospect I think that's one of the things I've learned is to not worry so much about having all the behaviours of understanding, and then trying to go further and further until I get that, but just going with what I've said in the first place, if it's not understood then obviously you can make that known when it's your turn, but I kept trying and so you get this very extended and complex question and, yea, at the end of line two there "with Rachel", as we both agree that's the trouble source it becomes...

Stelios: Yes "Rachel" is the trouble yea...

Andrew: That detracts from the question itself, so in line three when Stelios...

Stelios: Yes I think when I said "mmm", it was like 'OK what are you talking about?', it was like not understanding the sentence so you tried to change it again, but I'm thinking, 'what happened?', he tried to change it again, and instead of "lessons" which is a very simple word, you put "foundation programme", which is more complex.

Andrew: Yes, so in trying again I've actually opted for a lexical item which I thought was the trouble source, that he didn't understand "lessons", and actually opted for something which was even more obscure, a lower frequency word, which just seems totally counter-productive, and obviously at line six it turns out that wasn't the problem.

Andrew and Stelios, as the transcript of their discussion above shows, talk about local matters such as self-repair, repetition, and word substitution, and on the global topic of Andrew's assumptions about Stelios's (in)competence in English. They are able to notice various features of their talk and link these to their institutional and professional contexts, noticing ways in which they are drawing on, contributing to and contesting these contexts. Andrew and Stelios were very committed to the ELF project and to making the resulting website a success. They helped me to arrive at the awareness-raising questions A – E and, as collaborators on the project, were very likely to want to make the questions appear effective. For this reason, Andrew and Stelios cannot be assumed to represent the larger group of students from whom I collected my data or of UK/International students in general at York St John University.

Since its initial creation, the tutorial has undergone two major revisions based on feedback from students and feedback received at conference presentations. I currently use the tutorial to teach the UK students on the 'Introduction to TESOL' module, there is also a link to the tutorial from the York St John Study Development webpage, accessible by all students in the University and the public. More research, as I mention below, is necessary in order to be clearer about the benefits of a language awareness approach to communicating in lingua franca English in the contexts of this study. Ideally, feedback should be sought from International students already studying for an undergraduate degree (i.e. not only those on the pre-undergraduate International Foundation programme as Stelios was) and from UK students in subject areas other than TESOL. As well as asking students about their experience of the tutorial, analysis of recordings of students' use of the awareness-raising questions should be conducted.

Conclusion

In the first section of this chapter, I set out a series of principles, derived from my discussion of the data, which I used to make suggestions for practice in similar professional and institutional contexts to those within which this study was conducted. In the second section of the chapter, I used a worked example from my own context to demonstrate how these principles might be used to design a practical contribution to a solution to the problems I identified through my data analysis.

Chapter Six - Conclusions

Finally, in chapter six, I draw some conclusions and make some predictions for the futures of TESOL, internationalising universities and Applied Linguistics.

Looking back

Critical applied linguists and some world Englishes scholars have challenged the traditional TESOL understanding of English as a fixed, bounded system with a static relationship to social/national identities within stable communities. On the edges of the profession there has been a shift from thinking of languages as 'products' with identifiable 'cores', towards a focus on the 'processes' and 'practices' of language. This has, in turn, required researchers to consider what constitutes data and what methods of analysis are likely to provide most purchase in lingua franca settings.

My study has shown that there is probably not any particular way of talking that is responsible for misunderstanding. Instead, there are difficult-to-predict and endlessly varying ways of (un)successfully communicating meaning in evolving contexts that are created as the talk itself evolves. Because of the uncertainty surrounding the generalisable effects of different ways of accommodating, or not accommodating, another speaker, it seems unlikely that there exists any detailed recipe for successful lingua franca communication. This is an important matter for all analysts of (mis)communication, as well as for ESOL teachers, additional language learners, lingua franca English speakers and UK university internationalisers. Our decisions about what to teach or correct, and our reasons for (not) listening or talking to each other, predispose us to accommodate each other in various ways, unavoidably participating in the creation of the outcomes we are claiming to describe. For an additional language teacher responsible for diagnosing students' acts of miscommunication, this is a major responsibility; as well as one which s/he will observe her/his learners exercising over each other. For university policy makers, UK and International students' entire experience of university, their degree classification and future success may be affected. For the students

themselves, their outlook on their life, possibly for the rest of their lives, may be impacted.

For these reasons it is essential that awareness is raised of the:

- changing and changeable nature of international English
- interactive nature of (mis)understanding
- importance of sensitivity to contexts and how they get created and can be challenged by certain ways of talking
- range of possible ways of accommodating other speakers
- importance of monitoring the effects of accommodation on our interlocutors and the achievement of our communicative task.

The worked example from my own context demonstrates how the four principles I set out in chapter five might be used to inform the design of a processural and reflexive real-world solution to the problems I have identified. In my own practice, as the Director of 'Introduction to TESOL' and 'Communication Skills' modules, I have used the awareness-raising activity that a group of International and UK students at York St John helped me to design and build. I incorporate the theories and findings of world Englishes and ELF scholars in my lectures, and require my students to demonstrate understanding of critical perspectives on language and language teaching in their assessed writing. I continue to lobby our Study Development services to combine their provision for UK and International students (currently the responsibility of separate teams). Through in-house presentations and our University magazine, I have questioned the assumption that 'English' is a monolithic entity best spoken by its 'native speakers' and the related idea that UK students bring the all linguistic resources they need to communicate successfully in an internationalising university. Writing skills are, understandably, the focus of any Study Development provision for UK students, but I use every opportunity to point out the importance of speaking for learning, despite the potential difficulty for teachers of the lack of rules about how to communicate effectively in an international situation.

Looking ahead

The TESOL profession is undergoing change, albeit at the margins, as ideas about English are slowly starting to alter and assumptions about what students should be aiming for and how best to achieve their aims are challenged. But governments and textbook publishing companies may continue to promote monolithic, 'native-speakerist' ideas about English. Teachers may continue to feel like they should only teach their students fragments of an 'approved' code, rather than ways of using these fragments flexibly to achieve their situation-specific goals. Teachers may also continue to teach 'speaking' as if it were a separate skill from 'listening'. They may also continue to tell their students that there is context-free (in)correctness (also known as 'good' or 'bad' English), and that Received Pronunciation and other 'approved' ways of talking are always correct. In other words, the teaching profession will continue to operate from the top down. There will be little or no space in lessons for the development of language awareness, and little or no attempt by teachers to facilitate their students' generation of context-specific insights into the 'English' they need. On balance, there are possible changes ahead in TESOL but there are also strong constraints on change.

In internationalising English universities, there is less hope for change. The UK Higher Education sector benefits from traditional ideas about 'good' English being spoken in England and attracts international students on this basis. However, as this study has shown, UK students do not always bring the English they need for successful lingua franca communication. Nor do they bring the knowledge about language and communication, or the attitudes to difference and 'foreignness', which are conducive to successful interaction in mixed language situations. The constraints on change are strong and the likelihood of change in the near future remains low.

All of this means that applied linguists have essential and urgent work to do. This work will not be straightforward, as the people we are working with may not be aware of the need for, and may resist, the changes we propose. And we have no choice, if the change is to be effective and ethical, but to involve them at every stage of the process. Our message is not a simple one, and that will

make it difficult to communicate. 'Context' (the global factors that are assumed to determine talk) will continue to be used as explanations for (mis)understanding. It will be difficult to promote the noticing of local factors/features and the processural creation of context through talk. If change is to come, it is more likely to come from the bottom than from the top, given the professional constraints on change noted above. In support of change, I will continue to collect feedback from students on their experience of the ELF online tutorial and use this feedback to improve the effectiveness of the awareness-raising activity it includes.

As applied linguists, we urgently need to raise our students' and our institution's policy makers' awareness of the role played by accommodation in the management of (mis)understanding, and in the construction of (in)competence, (un)intelligibility, relationships, roles and task achievement. Above all, we must find effective ways of encouraging our students to pay attention to how their talk works.

References

Antaki, C. (2011). 'Six kinds of applied conversation analysis'. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Applied Conversation Analysis: Intervention and Change in Institutional Talk.* Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

BERA. (2011). *Ethical guidelines for educational research.* Available at: http://content.yudu.com/Library/A1t9gr/BERAEthicalGuideline/resources/index.htm?referrerUrl=http%25253A%25252F%25252Fwww.yudu.com%25252Fitem%25252Fdetails%25252F375952%25252FBERA-Ethical-Guidelines-2011. [Last accessed 17th February 2012.]

Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication Strategies in Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Billig, M. (1999a). 'Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in Conversation Analysis'. *Discourse and Society,* 10 (4), 543-558.

Billig, M. (1999b). 'Conversation Analysis and the claims of naivety'. *Discourse and Society,* 10 (4), 572-576.

Blommaert, J. (2003). 'Situating language rights: English and Swahili in Tanzania revisited'. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies 23.* Available at: http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/groups/ldc/publications/workingpapers/download.aspx. [Last accessed 17th February 2012.]

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brumfit, C. J. (1995). 'Teacher professionalism and research'. In G. Cook and B. Seidlhofer (Eds), *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bygate, M. (2005). 'Applied linguistics: A pragmatic discipline, a generic discipline?'. *Applied Linguistics,* 26 (4), 568-581.

Cameron, D., Frazer, E., Harvey, P., Rampton, M. B. H., and Richardson, K. (1992). *Researching Language: Issues of Power and Method.* London: Routledge.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). 'Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca'. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 197-218.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2007). 'Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition'. *Modern Language Journal*, 91 (focus issue), 923-939.

Carey, R. (2010). 'Hard to ignore: English native speakers in ELF research'. *Helsinki English Studies*, 6, 88-101.

Carroll, D. (2005). 'Vowel-marking as an interactional resource'. In K. Richards and P. Seedhouse (Eds), *Applying Conversation Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Carter, R. and McCarthy, M. (1997). *Exploring Spoken English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carter, R. and Nunan, D. (Eds) (2001). *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Case, A. (2002). *Review of 'Learner English - A Teacher's Guide to Interference and Other Problems'.* Available at: http://www.tefl.net/reviews/learner-english.htm. [Last accessed 26th November 2009.]

Cazden, C. (2008). 'Reflections on the study of classroom talk'. In N. Mercer and S. Hodgkinson (Eds), *Exploring Talk in School: Inspired by the Work of Douglas Barnes*. California: Sage.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Coetzee-Van Rooy, S. (2009). 'Intelligibility and perceptions of English proficiency'. *World Englishes*, 28 (1), 15-34.

Cogo, A. and Dewey, M. (2012). *Analysing English as a Lingua Franca: A Corpus-driven Investigation*. London and New York: Continuum.

Coupland, N., Giles, H. and Wiemann, J. M. (1991). 'Talk as 'problem' and communication as 'miscommunication': An integrative analysis'. In N. Coupland, H. Giles and J. M. Wiemann (Eds), *'Miscommunication' and Problematic Talk.* London: Sage.

Derwing, T. and Munro, M. (2005). 'Second language accent and pronunciation teaching: A research-based approach'. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 379-397.

Edmondson, W. and House, J. (1991). 'Do learners talk too much? The waffle phenomenon in interlanguage pragmatics'. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood-Smith and M. Swain (Eds), *Foreign/Second Language Pedagogy Research.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Edwards, D. and Mercer, N. (1987). *Common Knowledge: The Development of Understanding in the Classroom.* London and New York: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997). 'Critical discourse analysis'. In T. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. London: Sage.

Ferguson, C. A. (1968). *Absence of Copula and the Notion of Simplicity: A Study of Normal Speech, Baby Talk, Foreigner Talk and Pidgins.* Paper presented at the Pidginization and Creolization of Languages conference, Kingston, Jamaica, April 1968. Available at: http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000 019b/80/35/08/72.pdf. [Last accessed 1 May 2011.]

Ferguson, C. (1975). 'Towards a characterization of English foreigner talk'. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 17 (1), 1-14.

Firth, A. (1990). 'Lingua franca' negotiations: Towards an interactional approach'. *World Englishes*, 9 (3), 269-280.

Firth, A. (1996). 'The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 237-259.

Firth, A. and Wagner, J. (1997). 'On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research'. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 285-300.

Firth, A. and Wagner, J. (2007). 'Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA'. *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 800-819.

Gardner, R. (2004). 'On delaying the answer: Question sequences extended after the question'. In R. Gardner and J. Wagner (Eds), *Second Language Conversations*. London: Continuum.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology.* Cambridge: Cambridge Polity Press.

Gass, S. M. and Varonis, E. M. (1985). 'Variation in native speaker speech modification to non-native speakers'. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 7 (1), 37-57.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method.* London and New York: Routledge.

Giles, H. and Powesland, P. F. (1975). 'Accommodation theory'. In N. Coupland and A. Jaworski (Eds), *Sociolinguistics: A Reader and Coursebook.* London: Macmillan.

Giles, H., Coupland, J. and Coupland, N. (1991). 'Accommodation theory: communication, context, and consequence'. In H. Giles, J. Coupland and N. Coupland (Eds), *Contexts of Accommodation. Developments in Applied Sociolinguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gnutzmann, C. (2000). 'Lingua franca'. In M. Byram (Ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning.* London: Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Goodwin, C. and Duranti, A. (1992). 'Rethinking context: an introduction'. In A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (Eds), *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graddol, D. (2006). *English Next.* British Council Learning. Available at: http://www.britishcouncil.org/learning-research-english-next.pdf. [Last accessed 1 May 2011.]

Gumperz, J., Jupp, R., and Roberts, C. (1979). *Crosstalk: A study of Cross-cultural Communication.* London: National Centre for Industrial Language Training in association with the British Broadcasting Corporation.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (1999). 'On interactional sociolinguistic method'. In S. Sarangi and C. Roberts (Eds), *Talk, Work and Institutional Order: Discourse in Medical, Mediation and Management Settings.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hall, C. J. (2005). *An Introduction to Language and Linguistics: Breaking the Language Spell.* London and New York: Continuum.

Hall, C. J. (forthcoming). 'Cognitive contributions to plurilithic views of English and other languages'. *Applied Linguistics.*

Hall, C. J., Smith, P. H. and Wicaksono, R. (2011). *Mapping Applied Linguistics: A Guide for Students and Practitioners.* London and New York: Routledge.

Hatch, E. (1978). *Discourse Analysis and Second Language Acquisition.* Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Have, P. ten (1991). 'Talk and institution: a reconsideration of the 'asymmetry' of doctor-patient interaction'. In D. Boden and D. H. Zimmerman (Eds), *Talk and Social structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Have, P. ten (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide.* London: Sage.

Hinnenkamp, V. (1987). 'Foreigner talk, code switching and the concept of trouble'. In K. Knapp, W. Enniger, and A. Knapp-Potthoff (Eds), *Analyzing Intercultural Communication.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hopper, P. (1998). 'Emergent grammar'. In M. Tomasello (Ed.), *The New Psychology of Language.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

House, J. (1999). 'Misunderstanding in intercultural communication: Interactions in English as a lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility'. In C. Gnutzmann (Ed.), *Teaching and Learning English as a Global Language.* Tübingen: Stauffenburg. 72-88.

House, J., Kaspar, G. and Ross, S. (2003). 'Misunderstanding talk'. In J. House, G. Kaspar and S. Ross (Eds), *Misunderstanding in Social Life: Discourse Appriaches to Problematic Talk.* Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Hymes, D. (1972). 'On communicative competence'. In J. B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds), *Sociolinguistics: Penguin Modern Linguistics Readings.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Jefferson, G. (1987). 'On exposed and embedded correction in conversation'. In G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (Eds), *Talk and Social Organization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The Phonology of English as an International Language. New Models, New Norms, New Goals.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2002). 'A sociolinguistically based, empirically researched pronunciation syllabus for English as an international language'. *Applied Linguistics,* 23 (1), 83-103.

Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes: A Resource Book for Students.* London: Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2004). 'Research in teaching pronunciation and intonation'. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 109-125.

Jenkins, J. (2006). 'Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca'. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40 (1), 157-182.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitudes and Identity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2008). 'ELF at the gate: the position of English as a lingua franca'. *Modern English Teacher*, 17 (2), 15.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). *The Alchemy of English: the Spread, Functions, and Models of Non-Native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon Institute of English.

Kachru, B. B. (1988). 'The sacred cows of English'. *English Today*, 4 (4), 3-8.

Kachru, B. B. (1992a). *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures* (second edition). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1992b). 'World Englishes: approaches, issues and resources'. *Language Teaching,* 25 (1), 1-14.

Kachru, B. B. and Nelson, C. (1996). 'World Englishes'. In S.L. McKay and N. H. Hornberger (Eds), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (2005). *Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon.* Hong Kong SAR, China: University of Hong Kong Press.

Kachru, B. B. (2008). 'The first step: The Smith paradigm for intelligibility in world Englishes'. *World Englishes*, 27 (3-4), 293-296.

Kasper, G. (2006). 'When once is not enough: Politeness of multiple requests in oral proficiency interviews'. *Multilingua - Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*. 25 (3), 323-350.

Kasper, G. and Ross, S. J. (2007). 'Multiple questions in oral proficiency interviews'. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 39, 2045-2070.

Labov, W. (1966). *The Social Stratification of English in New York City.* Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Labov, W. (1982). 'Objectivity and commitment in linguistic science: The case of the Black English trial in Ann Arbor'. *Language in Society*, 11 (2), 165-201.

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across Cultures.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Lado, R. (1964). *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lamerichs, J. and te Molder, H. (2011). 'Reflecting on your own talk: The discursive action method at work'. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Applied Conversation Analysis: Intervention and Change in Institutional Talk.* Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Larsen-Freeman, D. and Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex Systems and Applied Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. and Long, M. H. (1991). *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research.* London: Longman.

Lesznyák, A. (2004). *Communication in English as an International Lingua Franca: An Exploratory Case Study.* Herstellung und Verlag: Books on Demand GmbH, Norderstedt.

Leung, C., Harris, R. and Rampton, B. (1997). 'The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities'. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31 (3), 543-60.

Liu, J. (1999). 'Nonnative English-speaking professionals in TESOL'. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33 (1), 85-102.

Long, M. H. (1983). 'Native/non-native conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input'. *Applied Linguistics*, 4 (2), 126-41.

Long, M. H. (1996). 'The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition'. In W. Ritchie and T. Bhatia (Eds), *Handbook of Research on Second Language Acquistion.* New York: Academic.

Lynch, A. J. (1988). 'Speaking up or talking down: Foreign learners' reactions to teacher talk'. *ELT Journal*, 42 (2), 109-116.

Lynch, T. (2001). 'Seeing what they meant: transcribing as a route to noticing'. *ELT Journal*, 55 (2), 124-132.

Lynch, T. (2007). 'Learning from the transcripts of an oral communication task'. *ELT Journal*, 61 (4), 311-320.

McDermott, R. P. and Gospodinoff, K. (1979). 'Social contexts for ethnic borders and school failure'. In R. Harris and B. Rampton (Eds), (2003), *The Language, Ethnicity and Race Reader*. London: Routledge.

Mauranen, A. (2006). 'Signalling and preventing misunderstanding in English as a lingua franca communication'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 117, 123-150.

Meierkord, C. (1998). *Lingua Franca English: Characteristics of successful non-native-/ non-native-speaker discourse*. Available at: http://webdoc.gwdg.de/edoc/ia/eese/artic98/meierk/7_98.html. [Last accessed 1 May 2011.]

Meierkord, C. (2000*). Interpreting successful lingua franca interaction. An analysis of non-native-/non-native small talk conversations in English*. Linguistik online 5, 1/00. Available at: http://www.linguistik-online.de/1_00/MEIERKOR.HTM. [Last accessed 1 May 2011.]

Mercer, N. (2010). 'The analysis of classroom talk: Methods and methodologies'. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80, 1-14.

Mitchell, J. (1984). 'Typicality and the case study'. In R. F. Ellen (Ed.), *Ethnographic Research: A Guide to Conduct*. Academic Press: New York.

Mollin, S. (2006). 'English as a lingua franca: A new variety in the new Expanding Circle?'. *Nordic Journal of English Studies,* 5 (2), 41-57.

Munro, M. J., Derwing, T. M. and Morton, S. L. (2006). 'The mutual intelligibility of L2 speech'. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28 (1), 111-131.

Nelson, C. L. (1982). 'Intelligibility and non-native varieties of English'. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Nelson, C. L. (2008). 'Intelligibility since 1969'. *World Englishes*, 27 (3-4), 297-308.

Park, J. (2007). 'Co-construction of nonnative speaker identity in cross-cultural interaction'. *Applied Linguistics*, 28 (3), 339-360.

Pennycook, A. (2007). 'The myth of English as an international language'. In S. Makoni and A. Pennycook (Eds), *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Rampton, B. (1997). 'Language crossing and the redefinition of reality: Implications for research on code-switching community'. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies 5*. Available at: http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/groups/ldc/publications/workingpapers/download.aspx. [Last accessed 17 February 2012.]

Rampton, B., Roberts, C., Leung, C. and Harris, R. (2002). 'Methodology in the analysis of classroom discourse'. *Applied Linguistics*, 23 (3), 373-392.

Rampton, B. (2012). 'Wed, 2 May 2012'. In UKLEF e-seminar 2012: *Intercultural Communication in a Multilingual World* 30 April – 18 May 2012. Available at: http://www.uklef.net/events/event201205.html. [Last accessed 6 June 2012.]

Richards, K. (2005). 'Introduction'. In K. Richards and P. Seedhouse (Eds), *Applying Conversation Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Roberts, C. and Sayers, P. (1987). 'Keeping the gate: how judgements are made in interethnic interviews'. In K. Knapp, W. Enniger and A. Knapp-Potthoff (Eds), *Analyzing Intercultural Communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Roberts, C., Davies, E. and Jupp, T. (1992). *Language and Discrimination: A Study of Communication in Multi-ethnic Workplaces*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.

Roberts, C. (1996). 'A social perspective on understanding: some issues of theory and method'. In K. Bremer, C. Roberts, T. Vasseur, M. Simonot and P. Broeder (Eds), *Achieving Understanding: Discourse in Intercultural Encounters*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.

Roberts, C. and Moss, B. (no date a). *Doing the Lambeth Talk: Real Life GP-patient Encounters in the Multi-lingual City*. London: Department of Postgraduate General Practice, NHS London Deanery.

Roberts, C. and Moss, B. (no date b). *Words in Action: Communication Skills for Doctors New to UK General Practice.* London: Department of Postgraduate General Practice, NHS London Deanery.

Robson, C. (2002). *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner-Researchers.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Sarangi, S. and Candlin, C. (2003). 'Introduction. Researching the discourse of workplace practice'. *Applied Linguistics*, 24 (3), 271-85.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., and Sacks, H. (1977). 'The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation'. Language, 53 (2), 361-382.

Schegloff, E. A. (1982). 'Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of "uh huh" and other things that come between sentences'. In D. Tannen (Ed.), Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999a). 'Talk and social structure'. In A. Jaworski and N. Coupland (Eds), The Discourse Reader. London: Routledge.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999b). 'Schegloff's texts' as Billig's data: A critical reply'. Discourse and Society, 10 (4), 558-572.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999c). 'Naivete vs sophistication or discipline vs self-indulgence: A rejoinder to Billig'. Discourse and Society, 10 (4), 577-582.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis Volume 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2009). 'One perspective on *Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives*'. In J. Sidnell (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scollon, R. and Scollon, S. W. (1995). *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Scott, D. (1996). 'Methods and data in education research'. In D. Scott and R. Usher (Eds), *Understanding Educational Research.* London and New York: Routledge.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). 'Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11, 133-158.

Seidlhofer, B. (2002). 'The shape of things to come? Some basic questions about English as a lingua franca'. In K. Knapp and C. Meierkord (Eds), *Lingua franca communication*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Seidlhofer, B. (Ed.) (2003). *Controversies in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). 'Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca'. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209-239.

Seidlhofer, B. (2007). 'Common property: English as a lingua franca in Europe'. In J. Cummins and C. Davison (Eds), *International Handbook of English Language Teaching*. New York: Springer.

Smith, L. E. and Nelson, C. L. (1985). 'International intelligibility of English: directions and resources'. *World Englishes*, 4 (3), 333-342.

Swan, M. and Smith, B. (Eds) (2001). *Learner English: A Teacher's Guide to Interference and Other Problems.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sweeney, E. and Hua, Z. (2010). 'Accommodating towards your audience: Do native speakers of English know how to accommodate their communication strategies toward non-native speakers of English?'. *Journal of Business Communication*, 47 (4), 477-504.

Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tarone, E. (1977). 'Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage'. In H. Brown, C. Yorio, R. Crymes (Eds), *On TESOL '77.* Washington DC: TESOL.

Tarone, E. (2005), 'Speaking in a second language'. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Taylor, T. J. (1992). *Mutual misunderstanding: Scepticism and the theorizing of language and interpretation.* London: Routledge.

(Ten Have, P. see Have, P. ten)

Thornbury, S. and Slade, D. (2006). *Conversation: From Description to Pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ur, P. (2010). 'English as a Lingua Franca: A Teacher's Perspective'. *Cadernos de Letras* (UFRJ) (27) December 2010. Available at: http://www.letras.ufrj.br/anglo_germanicas/cadernos/numeros/122010/text os/cl301220100penny.pdf. [Last accessed 17 February 2012.]

Usher, R. (1996). 'A critique of the neglected epistemological assumptions of educational research'. In D. Scott and R. Usher (Eds), *Understanding Educational Research*. London and New York: Routledge.

Varonis, E. M. and Gass, S. (1985). 'Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning'. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 171-90.

VOICE, Vienna–Oxford International Corpus of English. (no date). Available at: http://www.univie.ac.at/voice. [Last accessed 17 February 2012.]

Wagner, J. (1996). 'Foreign language acquisition through interaction: A critical review of research on conversational adjustments'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26 (2), 215-235.

Wetherell, M. (1998). 'Positioning and interpretive repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue'. *Discourse and Society*, 9 (3), 387 – 412.

Wicaksono, R. (no date). *English as a lingua franca: an online tutorial*. Available at: http://www.englishlinguafranca.com [Last accessed 16 January 2012.]

Widdowson, H. G. (1996). 'Reply to Fairclough: Discourse and interpretation: Conjectures and refutations'. *Language and Literature,* 5 (1), 57-69.

York St John University (no date). *2007 – 2012 Corporate Plan*. Available at: http://w3.yorksj.ac.uk/about/mission-statement.aspx [Last accessed 30 April 2011.]

Young, R. F. (Ed.) (2008). *Language and interaction: An advanced resource book*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Yule, G. and Tarone, E. (1997). 'Investigating communication strategies in L2 reference: pros and cons'. In G. Kasper and E. Kellerman (Eds), *Communication Strategies*. London: Longman.

Zuegler, J. (1989). 'Performance variation in native speaker – non-native speaker interactions: Ethnolinguistic differences or discourse domain?' In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston and L. Selinker (Eds), *Variation in Second Language Acquisition. Volume 1: Discourse and Pragmatics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Zuegler, J. (1991). 'Accommodation in native – non-native interactions: Going beyond the 'what' to the 'why' in second-language research'. In H. Giles, J. Coupland and N. Coupland (Eds), *Contexts of Accommodation. Developments in Applied Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zuegler, J. (1993a). 'Encouraging learners' conversational participation: The effect of content knowledge'. *Language Learning*, 43 (3), 403-432.

Zuengler, J. (1993b). 'Explaining NNS interactional behavior: The effect of conversational topic'. In G. Kasper and S. Blum-Kulka (Eds), *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Appendices

Appendix A   Assessment brief for the TESOL module

INTRODUCTION TO TESOL: 2007-2008

SUMMATIVE ASSIGNMENT to be submitted to the Faculty Office by noon on Friday 11th January 2008.

TITLE (for cover sheet): Needs analysis and lesson planning

Task 1

In a group of three, prepare questions for International Foundation Programme students about their English language needs and wants, as well as their preferences for types of classroom interaction and task.

Use these questions to interview one student. The interview time and day will be arranged for you by Rachel. Record your interview (it should take about 20 – 30 minutes). Make field notes to supplement/back up your recording.

After the interview, review the recording for useful information about the student's needs and wants. Be ready to share these with the other two members of your group.

Task 2

Meet your group and share the information about your three students. Discuss how this information could be used to help you design a series of two 90-minute lesson plans.

You should:

d) consider the three students' 'target' language and communication needs (e.g. as future undergraduates as well as any of the other reasons for learning English they mentioned in their interview).

e) analyse the three students' current language and communication abilities as evidenced by your recordings.

f) identify any gaps between your three students' current abilities and their predicted/desired target needs.

Task 3

Individually,

g) decide on four points that you would want to work on with the Foundation class (**basing your choices on the three students you interviewed, the interviews with the two teachers and the samples of writing** – the latter two are available on BB) to help them develop their language and communication abilities in line with their target needs. These language points may relate to grammar, vocabulary, speaking, listening, reading or writing. Think about why you have chosen these four points specifically and why you have chosen not to work on other needs that you have identified.

h) for each language point specified in (d),

i) devise and present two linked lesson plans which you think would help the Foundation students improve their language ability. You may use authentic or published materials.

ii) explain the theoretical approach(es) to language learning which underpin (each of) the stages in the lesson plans and justify your choices on theoretical grounds. You may also use data from your interviews and the students' writing to justify your choices.

i) explain and justify the sequence in which you would complete these activities with the learner.

This assignment constitutes the full assessment for this module. Please use the template posted on BB for the **two lesson plans**, and accompany these with a **report of 3,000 words** evaluating the different theoretical approaches to language acquisition and teaching implied by the selection and sequencing of

materials, as well as reflection on sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic factors of the context in question (see d, e and f above).

Please submit a copy of your recorded interview as soon as possible. I will give a copy to the Foundation students for them to use in their Communication Skills module assessment.

The achievement of the following learning outcomes will be assessed by the lesson plans and report:

1. apply and evaluate different theoretical approaches to the language learning and acquiring situation;

2. identify the sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic factors relevant to a range of language learning situations which recognise the multilingualism of the modern world;

3. evaluate the range of materials and techniques available to a language learner;

4. evaluate the different approaches to language testing, evaluation and assessment;

5. devise an ELT programme for a specific (group of) learner(s);

6. understand the changing nature of work within TESOL and demonstrate sensitivity to professional organisations within TESOL;

7. demonstrate competence in the key skills: Learning How to Learn, Communication and IT.

Appendix B   Assessment brief for the Communication Skills module

Communication skills module: group presentation and group report

English as an international language

This assessment gives you the opportunity to show you are able to:

- apply key features of verbal and non-verbal communication effectively.

- identify personal strengths and weaknesses in group work

- work effectively within a team to produce a group solution in a problem-solving exercise.

- use IT applications, specifically: MS Word, Powerpoint, Excel and the Internet, to support effective communication.

You will prepare a **15-minute group presentation, an 800-word group report** and a **200-word individual piece of reflective writing**. The presentations will be held in weeks 13 and 14 of the semester. You should hand in the group report and the individual reflective writing by **16.00 on Friday 18th January** to the International Centre office.

Task one

Individually, listen to your interviews with the undergraduate students. Do you feel that the interview was successful? Why (not)? What did you learn about the undergraduate students you interviewed? Note down the main points. Can you find two examples of successful and two examples of failed communication in the interviews? Write down these four examples word for word. Why do you think the communication was (un)successful in each of these examples?

You will need your notes in task four.

Task two

Form a group of three or four students. If you have four students in your group, two students can take turns to be the secretary. You may not have more than four students in your group.

1. Coordinator

The coordinator should make sure that everyone knows when and where group meetings will be held.

2. Secretary

During your meetings, the secretary should take notes of the main points that are discussed, plus any 'action points' that are agreed. These notes will be included in your report.

3. Chair

During the meeting, the chair should make sure that everyone in the group gives their opinion and that all the items on the agenda are discussed

Task three

Arrange to meet for one hour.

Before the meeting read *Basic Assumptions in Teaching English as an International Language* (Talebinezhad & Aliakbari 2001):

http://iteslj.org/Articles/Talebinezhad-EIL.html

You may be able to use some of the points in this article in your discussion and in your presentation/report. Remember that you must not copy sentences from the article. If you want to use any of the ideas in your own writing, put the ideas into your own words or use quotes.

At the meeting, discuss the following question and look for similarities and differences. The secretary should take notes and give a copy of the notes to all group members.

1. Why are you learning English? What do you (and will you) use it for?

2. What other languages do you speak? What do you (and will you) use these languages for?

3. Do you want to speak a particular variety of English, like British or American English? Or do you prefer to have your own (personal, group or national) variety? Or a mixture? Why? Can you give examples of the varieties you prefer?

4. Is the spread of English around the world a good thing? Why (not)? Does English 'kill' other languages? How?

5. Does learning English change your 'culture' or your personality in any way? Can you give any examples?

Task four
Arrange to meet for one hour.
Share what you learned about the undergraduate students you interviewed.
Note down the main points.
Compare your examples of successful and two examples of failed communication in the interviews? Choose the four most interesting ones and discuss why you think these are the most interesting.
The secretary should take notes and give a copy of the notes to all group members.

Task five
Arrange to meet for one hour.
Bring all the notes you have made so far.

Discuss how you can prepare an 800-word group report and a 15-minute group presentation, based on all the information you have collected. The following questions might help you:

1. What is our topic?

2. What are the main points? What order should we put the main points in? Could each point be a paragraph in our report and a slide in our presentation?

3. Do we need pictures for our slides?

4. What should be in our introduction and conclusion?

5. What questions might the audience ask us?

6. How can we share the responsibility of writing the 800 words?

7. Who should talk about which slides in the presentation?

8. When should we look at the first draft of the report?

9. When should we practise the presentation?

Task six

Write your section of the report and prepare the slides you are responsible for.

Task seven

Arrange to meet for one hour, perhaps in an IT room. Bring your writing and slides to the meeting. Look at everyone's work. Discuss how it could be improved. Make improvements.

When you are happy with the final product, print your 800-word report and slides.

Task eight

Individually, write 200 words on the following:

1. who was in your group?

2. why did you choose these students?

3. what roles did the students in your group take?

4. why did you take these roles?

5. which section of your group report were your responsible for?

6. why did you choose this section?

7. what, in general, did you contribute to your group? For example, were you good at motivating the other students to do the work; were you always on time for meetings etc?

8. what weaknesses in group performance did you show?

9. how could you improve your own contribution to future group-work?

10. what specific targets can you set yourself to improve your performance in one of your areas of weakness? For example, if you did not say very much during group meetings you could try making a note, before the meeting, of two things you plan to say and keep your notes in front of you during the meeting.

Task nine

Arrange to meet for thirty minutes. Put your PowerPoint slides, 800-word report and individual 200 words into a file and be ready to submit everything to Elaine by **16.00 on Monday 16 January 2008.**

Appendix C   Transcription symbols key

[ ]	Overlapping talk: denotes when more than one person is speaking.
=	Latching: denotes an utterance that follows another without a gap.
(.h)	Audible inbreath.
(h.)	Audible outbreath.
(.)	Micro pause: a pause of less than 0.2 seconds.
(5.6)	Timed pause: The number represents the time of the pause i.e.5.6 seconds.
( )	Transcription doubt: denotes an utterance too unclear to transcribe.
> <	Faster talk: denotes talk at a faster rate.
< >	Slower talk: denotes talk at a slower rate.
?	Gradual rising intonation: not necessarily a question, it is an indication of rising intonation.
.	Gradual falling intonation: the pitch gradually falls to this point.
,	Fall-rise intonation: on the immediately preceding utterance.
° °	Quieter talk: denotes quieter talk to the surrounding talk.
CAPITALS	Loud talk: denotes louder talk for an utterance or part of.
underlining	Loud talk: denotes louder talk for an utterance or part of.
↑	Higher pitch: denotes a higher shift in pitch.
↓	Lower pitch: denotes a lower shift in pitch.
Wha-	A sharp cut-off
Ye:s	Colons show that the speaker has stretched the preceding sound. More colons, longer stretch.
((LS))	Lip smack

Appendix D   Interview transcriptions

Interview 1: Claire = UK student, Markus = International student

Time: 7:40 - 8:50 (1 minute and 10 seconds) of 11:51

26 lines

```
01   C:   (.h) err (1.9) which do you feel is most important when you
02        learn English th- the writing and understanding of the
03        language or the speaking and pronunciation which do you find
04        (.h) you should (.) you: should err (.) err work more active?
05        err (.) to be emm (1.2) so to grammatically understand the
06        language or err (.) Just so you can speak and get by the
07        pronunciation which do you think is most important?
08   M:   en it depends on situation I think =
09   C:   =okay=
10   M:   =because for academic purposes=
11   C:   =enhhh=
12   M:   =you need to know [acquire] and understand every aspects of
13   C:                     [yeah]
14   M:   [English]=
15   C:   [yeah]
16   M:   =if you just want to (.) en (.) I don't know (.) go shopping
17        or go to a pub [I think] vocabulary [is more] important
18   C:                  [yeah a bar, yeah]   [is that be] °ok
19        brilliant° ok brilliant that's that's my questions finished
20        (.) en should we keep tape running when I to do mine or?
21   M:   en (.) should we what?
22   C:   sh-should we keep the tape running to do mine?=
23   M:   =en=
24   C:   =do we need a recording to do my questions (.) or?=
25   M:   =yeah yeah=
26   C:   =yeah you'd (.) okay cool
```

Interview 2: Bryn = UK student, Giorgios = International student

Time: 5:28 - 6:05 (37 seconds) of 18:51

46 lines

```
01    B:    So whilst you've been learning English what kinds of
02          things have you done already (.) what kind of areas have you
03          covered whilst you've been here.
04    G:    (.) What do you mean?
05    B:    (.)(.h ) Well, have you looked at (.) Um (.) Travelling and
06          Directions °have you looked at° °°how to you know like how
07          to°° °actual words. Like in the supermarket° like buying and
08          selling [food?]
09    G:           [yeah] if I improve my. (.)
10    B:    And so what kind of areas have you looked at what have you
11          covered.
12    G:    Oh, any notes
13    B:    Any notes yeah.
14    G:    Err
15    B:    So what topics have you looked at?
16    G:    About the communication? What likes?
17    B:    Well, anything really, a bit. Ah if there is something that
18          you enjoy is there a topic that you particularly enjoyed or
19          that you would like to cover so say out of all the things
20          that you've learned is there a part of it that you really
21          enjoyed like say something you really enjoyed like say
22          something about your hobbies (.) or (.) urm travelling and is
23          there anything that you'd like to develop more. So say that
24          you really do like a couple of weeks on hobbies like but you
25          really do that you'd like to learn more on that is there
26          anything that you think. (.) (.h)
27    G:    °I think err° (.) not really because I am just three months
28    B:    Three months
29    G:    Three months yeah and s-sdifficult to:o you know develop your
30          hopes or your ideas on something.
31    B:    ↑okay↓ but from what you've been learning °so far° have you
32          enjoyed anything particularly? or (.)
33    G:    Yeah like er I like very much when I'm going to have to
34          communicate with British people.
35    B:    Okay (.) So (.) when you're talking to different people?
36    G:    °yes°
```

```
37   B:   (7.0) °°okay°° (.) and do you find that its (.)So its
38        greetings, so its finding out about people that you really
39        like.
40   G:   err. well. err=
41   B:   =So finding out about what they d:o (.) and (.) where they
42        live (.h)
43   G:   Well it's a good level but err err each of the the English
44        people are very polite because all the time say? I'm sorry.
45        Thank you. And err (1.0)
46   B:   SO
```

Interview 3: Valerie = UK student, Ling = International student

Time: 32:07

1027 lines

```
01  V:  Um (.) so: (0.7) Why did you choose to learn (.) English.
02  L:  .hh er because I think da: English language is really .h
03      important fo::r (.) ((LS)) ur for me, .h and I think it's
04      very a:ah (0.6) to- (.) to give me for opportunity to dur
05      my bizznip and er: conversation with er.h anather
06      people.[.h]
07  V:          [˚˚mm˚˚]
08  L:  specially dur foreigner and er. (.) .hh ˚ah:˚ (.) .h
09      for action
10      my: (.) for (.) for sharing my idea, .hh and for ra: (.)
11      good for relationship. (.) [˚ahh˚]
12  V:                             [with ]other people,
13  L:  YE:ah. [[um
14  V:         [[do your- do any of your family (0.7) [speak]
15      English
16  L:                                                [Er   ]
17      YE:ah.=
18  V:  =˚yea˚=
19  L:  =.h my fah-ter e::r he can speak english very well. because
20      ah .hh he is study here ah- he ever study here in london,
21      .h but I can't remembe:r dur: (.) dur name of er (.)
22      university in london.
23  V:  O::h! [ri:ght!]
24  L:        [YE::a  ].h But (.) this is the: first er reason for
25      <she want to send me er study here.>
26  V:  [:h! so:]
27  L:  [A:::h, ] Yea, .h but er (.) I ha- Also (.) I have my
28      sister. but now she live in the OFfar city with her
29      husband, and she:: have been here for twenty (.) four
30      years.
31  V:  Has [↑she↑e:]!
32  L:      [NNYEE::]:a! and now she: she Got the .hh uh britia pa-
33      BRItis- passport.
34  V:  Has ↑she↑[e!
35  L:          [Ah: ˚yea˚. because er (.) she: she got married
36      (0.8) with (.) with a:h Britian.
```

```
37   V:   Ah her husband is: British.
38   L:   A:h (.) Ye[:a.
39   V:            [↓Yea↓.=
40   L:   =ri[gh…
41   V:      [↓yea↓ (.) °and she works >here°. .hh so are< YO:u
42        learning English to:: get a <JOb using (.)> [English.]
43   L:                                              [NNYEe:::]:a I
44        thing get a good job. An: e:r (.) ((LS)) for me I l- I
45        lie' (.) i- English language .h a:h (.) and I wan' to:, I
46        think it's (.) good for opportunity to da: my future.
47   V:   yea.=
48   L:   =Hmm:=
49   V:   =.hh um- ((LS)) is there a reason why you chose to learn
50        English in England, is th[a- be ]cause (.) yur Dad's learnt
51        eng- (pause)
52   L:   °hmmm.°
53   V:   came to En:gland and your sister came to England (.) [o:r ]
54   L:                                                        [A:h.]
55   L:   NO:. I- I have ur:: (.) I haven' been to: eng- England. (.)
56        I haven' (.) go to England, .hh BUt .hh ah when I study in
57        my (0.8)in Thailan' in my country, .h ahh: ((LS)) EVery
58        person evr- EVeryone ah (1.8) she give information ah:
59        about (.) this here for me, .h an:: I think this here is
60        very good for da: tish (.) farda TEeshing.
61   V:   for [°te:achin°.]
62   L:       [.hh an:    ] very good fo:r conversation. .hhh an:
63        specially er dis here duh- .hh de <OWn AH> Language.
64        (0.6)
65   L:   [[↓Yea↓. So I sho:uld ah study here.
66   V:   [[↓righ↓…
67   V:   O↑o↑[h!
68   L:       [nyea:ahuh=
69   V:   =Um: (.) so what d'you want to Do with the language when
70        (.) you've learnt it. (0.9) so when you lear[- when you]
71        can speak
72   L:                                              [Ahh:      ]
73   V:   English quite well,
74   L:   Nyea.=
75   V:   =Is it just so you can: (.) um: get a job, .hh (.) [o:r ]
76   L:                                                      [Hmm?]
77        (1.1)
78   V:   >so it's< Not JUs' so: you have the language. (.) d'you
79        want ta- hh (.) LEarn it so that you can do something with
```

```
80           it (.) in the [future.
81   L:                     [Ahhh:, sure:, in the future I want to:: er
82           .hh work (.) my jo' up, work my (0.4) work jo' .hhh ↓e:r↓
83           in my country, .h ahh e- especially ahh (.) ((LS)) I Have
84           my plan, (.) ah when I finiss (.) this programme, .hh ah I
85           want to: stu:dy continue this here,and when I: (.) get my
86           degree from de- ah from here .hh (.) e:r I want to:: (.)
87           <work job in my country> .h err:↓(0.4)especially (.) de ah:
88           about airport.
89        (1.0)
90   L:   Be[cause ah…]
91   V:     [RI::ght! ]
92   L:   Ah: ye:a,=
93   V:   =So you'd Like to work in the airport, in Thailan:d.
94   L:   Nye::a [˚in Thailand˚    NATIo]nal AIrpo:rt.
95   V:          [↑Ahh↑! tha would be ni-]
96   V:   ˚Oh[hh˚! (.) tha-]
97   L:      [Er:: in   Tha]iland in (.) in Bangkok.
98   V:   ↓Ah:↓ that [˚would be] really good˚
99   L:              [˚↓ye:a.↓˚]
100  V:   .h so WHAt's your degree actually: (.) in here, what's yur
101       degree you're doin'
102  L:   Ah Ye:a. .h ah: (.) for first year, (.) ah I study for
103       prepare master. because er .hh I: (0.9) I Graduate,
104       Bachelor
105       right,=
106  L:   =in my country,=
107  V:   =OH you've >graduated al[ready in your< country. Oh:!]=
108  L:                           [↑NYE::↑:Aa::.          Ah  ]
109  L:   =Ah I graduate a baw-ah, (.) hhotel, (.) manag- hh=
110  L:   =[ment in my coun]try,
111  V:    [O::h! Ri↑E::t↑!]
112  L:   .hh SO:: .h ah we- (.) I wan- (.) when I fi- (.) GEt my
113       degree,I want to: study he:re, .hh an: THen I thing ah (.)
114       .h I want to:: study. (0.8) FOunDation programme for
115       prepare,
116       (0.5)
117  V:   [[right?
118  L:   [[prepare my langua- (pause) an I want to Improve
119       Engliss,(.) .h ah for the stu- (.) study her:e continue
120       (.) in the neg- year
121  V:   =So then when you go: back to:: (Pause) bangkok and work in
122       a hotel, you can speak…
```

```
123 CUTS OFF AT 04.20
124 RESUMES AT 06.50


125 V:  What abou:t wri:tin'. do you find that quite (.) difficult
126     to WRIte english.
127 L:  MMm… (.) Sometime, I thing very difficul', but
128     sometime is er (0.3) Ok, .hh because a:h (1.9) a:h(.)I
129     study English every day,
130 V:  ↓right↓=
131 L:  =Ah and full time an:: it's make me fo:r da:: <HAbit of
132     English .h language>. (0.6) mmhm.
133 V:  ↓ri[ght↓
134 L:     [SO er:: (.) NOw I'm thi (.) ah I think sometime is .hh
135     easy for me:,(.) BUT (.) sometime is (.) ↑diffi↑cu-hult for
136     me:.
137 V:  ri[ght,
138 L:    [Hmmm:
139 V:  So: Out- um: (1.1) do you find readin' or w- writin' one of
140     'em more difficult than the other, (.) >so you do you< find
141     it EASier to RE:ad (.) [the Eng]lish than you do to
142 L:                        [Mmmm.  ]
143 V:  <ACtually WRIte it DO:wn,
144 L:  ↓ye::a↓=
145 V:  =O:r do you find <Writin' it do:wn harder>, than actually
146     readin' it. o:r both the same
147 L:  .h Oh: both the sa[m:e,
148 V:                    [both the sa[me.
149 L:                                [NYE::a ah- because I think
150     together fo:r r- reading and wri[ting, ]
151                                     [you ne]ed to d- be able to
152     do bo:th.
153 L:  NY [Ee:a ]
154 V:     [Yea I] think so too
155 V:  .hh And (.) Um you think yur speaking and your listening is
156     improving
157 L:  Ah! ye:a, su:re, ah I think every skill, ah (.) ↑wri↑ting:
158     reading: lis'ning: an speaking .h I think it er (.)
159     together.=
160 V:  =ALL of them together=
161 L:  =nye:ah.
162 V:  (0.7) ((LS)) ˙↓yea↓˙. .h Um- .h ↑WHen↑ (.) um Rachel's
163     teachin you, is there any particular activities that yo:u
```

```
164       (.) like the bes:t.
165  L:   ↑Ah↑! (.) I l- I lize .h ↓er↓ (.) I lize EVery (.) activity
166       when a- when her tursh- Er when (.) <HER TEACH Me::>, .hh
167       ah because its make me ah not (.) worry it make me not ah
168       (.) se:rious, .h an: then: ah:: and feel be:tter and feel
169       er: (.) ANd feeling happy with tha- learning.
170  V:   [[↓yea↓.]
171  L:   [[˚Ah˚ I] thing: it mmm it CAN improve my English. (.) BUT
172       I not sur:e, is not er make me serious. BUT, I thing ah
173       (pause) if NOt activity in my -hhass ah is make er (.) ME:
174       (.) or: (.) another friend serious, an (.) they ar:e boring
175       about tha: learning. (0.5) ˚mmhmm,˚ .h an I thing wery good
176       for the activity in my class .h ↓ah↓˚ and I thing .h ˚↓ah↓˚
177       I: (.) and my friend in my class ah (.) we ah love (.)↓ah↓
178       activity.
179  V:   ye:a.=
180  L:   =Every activity.=
181  V:   =S:o [you like] (.) A:LL the activities.
182  L:        [˚↓yea↓˚.]
183  L:   ↑YE::a↑ ev- every [activity]
184  V:                     [Is any::] yur fa:v'rut, (.) any: >>is
185       there anything you like<< doin the MO::st. so do you like
186       it when .h um: (.) you have tu::r (.) <read something by
187       yurself?> or would you rather be doing an activity whe:re
188       (.) you're workin with a(.) Partner?
189       (0.8)
190  V:   Is [there anything you like the mo:st.
191  L:      [Ahh.
192  L:   ((LS)) (0.8) Ah: (pause) ba- (.) both. (.)
193  V:   both,
194  L:   Yea Both, .h ah (2.1) I thing:: (0.i8) the- ah: depend on
195       da:: (.) depend on the topic.
196  V:   yea.=
197  L:   =some Topic ↓ah:↓ we ah must ↓ah:↓ (.) learning by: (.)
198       myself=
199  V:   =ye-
200  L:   .h ah some- some topic we are must ah: speaking with
201       partner.
202  V:   ye-.=
203  L:   =˚mmmm˚ depend on: da topic=
204  V:   =So if [it was a speaking topic,
205  L:          [˚ye:a˚.
206  L:   [˚ye:a˚ ]
```

```
207 V:   [obvious]ly: (.) um: (1.2) you need to >talk to other
208      people. <so: then that's >better to work in pairs but if it
209      was <reading,
210 L:   ye[:a  ]
211 V:     [then] (.) it's: (.) probably better to do it on your
212      own,
213 L:   nye:a (.) ah: I thing so.=
214 V:   =AN: IF you're doing the reading: (.) topics do you like it
215      when: um: (.) .h rachel gives you: .h something: (.) ermm:
216      (.) (LS)) authentic so something that she's got from
217      somewhere maybe in york? like a leafle:t o[r: a] brochure.
218      do you like that when=
219 L:                                              [uh-huh]
220 V:   =you have materials what (.) [we (.)] use here,
221 L:                                [˚↓mmmm↓˚]
222 L:   [[Mm?
223 V:   [[.h or would you rather just use something from a text
224      book.
225 L:   .h mmm: something from the text book.=
226 V:   =Yea=
227 L:   =ah: something from da: (.) ah- ˚another information… Ah˚-
228      (1.6) I thing um: I'm free: um: (.) I thing um: (.) I can:
229      open: for da (0.8) ah: fo::r (.) every skill she:she teach
230      me:,.h ˚mm˚ I thing it's er (0.6) it's oka:y for::
231      <learning and easy for:> .hh ah understanding.
232 L:   [[nyee:a he he
233 V:   [[↓right. yea.↓
234 L:   I thing it's a- bette:r:: (.)˚better (.) nyea˚.=
235 V:   =And um- .hh (.) at the beginning: of: your lesson, (.)
236      does Rachel do ice breakers with you. (.)
237 L:   [[ah ye:a.]
238 V:   [[Um: the ]warm up activities.
239 L:   NYe:[a ˚˚right˚˚
240 V:       [and what do you think to those. (0.6) d'you like them.
241       d'you like it when she does a warm up activity.
242 L:   (.) ˚mmhmm˚,
243 V:   (.) yea.
244 L:   (.) .hh er I: (.) er: (.) I li:e warm: (.) I lie warm
245      pativity. .hh because er I thing it ah: (1.0) ((LS)) I can
246      prepare mysel. .hh ↑AN:,↑ (.) .h and when: (0.5) she teash
247      me wery quick er:: I thing it's er: (.) wery hard for
248      understanding. .h wery hard for::ah: (.) listening. (.)
249      nye[:a:.
```

```
250  V:      [SO it's BEst for her ta start with something:: (.) and
251          you get ya brain going before: (.)
252  V:      [going inTA] REALLY HA:RD ENGlish.
253  L:      [NYE::a::  ]↑NYe-he-he↑-[he-ha
254  V:                        [↓ye:a.↓
255  L:      .h I thing it's er (.)((LS)) it's oka:y more than er:: she:
256          teash ↓er:↓ (.) quickly.
257  V:      [[↓yea.↓ ]
258  L:      [[↓ahh::.] nyea.↓
259  V:      ((LS)) I think that's ↑everything↑ (.) thank yo:u, >is
260          there anything you'd like to ask< me,
261  L:      Ah: Sure:. (2.0) ah .h (.)↑WHy did you↑ choose to take tha
262          (0.4) T- E- S- O- L: (.) ah language student. module.
263  V:      ((LS)) I chose to do (.) tesol, becau:se when I:: (.)
264          finish here, >when [I finish my] de<gree this year,=
265  L:                        [↓ah: yea↓  ]
266  V:      =.hh I'm hoping to do: (.) um: (.) an English P- G- C- E,
267  L:      ˚a:[h ↓ye:a↓.˚ ]
268  V:         [<WHIch is: ]my::> TEachin qualification,
269  L:      ↑AHH↑h:=
270  V:      =um: (.) because I'd like to ↑teach↑.
271  L:      ah real↑ly↑!=
272  V:      =ye:a=
273  L:      =˚˚oh˚˚
274  V:      =n::d (.) I thought that this would prepare me:, (.)
275          beca:use (.) um (.) it would (.) HElp me ta: learn how to:=
276  L:      =˚mm[mm::˚    ]
277  V:          [plan les]sons,
278  L:      =˚nyea˚.=
279  V:      =and (0.5) there's a lot of (.) foreign students in our
280          country, (.) .h now, so:: if I: h- have to ↑teach↑ any
281          foreign students, [then (.)] I will be prepared to do so.
282  L:                        [ahhh!    ]
283  L:      ↑Ahh↑! SO do you want to te:ash ah:: (.) international
284          student. ˚˚↑ri[gh…↑˚˚
285  V:                    [um: IT's (.) an option o:pen to me, ↑yea↑
286          I'd [like to Think I'd do] it one day,
287  L:          [o:↑o::o↑o::h.        ] ˚o↑[o↑oh.˚]
288  V:                                     [↑yea↑ ]
289  L:      .h DO you have any plan for::ah: .hh when you get your
290          degee do you want to:: (1.0) ah where do you want to work.
291  V:      .hh um:: to STart with: I want tur:: (.) work in England.
292          tea [chin: um  ] SECond'ry students. So students from (.)
```

```
293        age=
294   L:        [Ahh:: ↓yea↓]=
295   V:   =eleven (.) to [eighte]en,
296   L:                   [°↓Oh↓°]
297   L:   ↑O:[::h↑ yea.]
298   V:      [Um (.) I ] want to teach them English, (0.4) BUT (.)
299        I've not (.) crossed it out as: an option to: maybe go
300        abroad and teach English tu-=
301   L:   =°mmhmm::?°=
302   V:   =um- foreign students so I'd like to think I would do it
303        one day,
304   L:   ya↑[a::↑ah°
305   V:      [So that's why I chose to do this: (.) [module]
306   L:                                             [Ss::: ]o I thi-
307        hink you are [very] good [teacher]
308   V:                [Huhm      [hu- hu-] huh=
309   L:   =nyea.=
310   V:   =.hh I-hi-hi °o:pe so:
311   L:   SO: and ↑then↑ ah (.) what are your future plans, After
312        you ah (.) graduate.
313   V:   yep. SO::: urm (.)°to become° (.) an English teacher.
314   L:   Ah: ↓yea↓ (.)
315   V:   ↓ye:a °so: I (pause) I'd like ta-↓° .h when I FInish he:re
316        .hh in: (.) Ma:y, I'm hoping to start the teaching
317        qualification [in-]
318   L:                 [mm ]hm?
319   V:   (.) SEPTEmber which takes a ye:ar,
320   L:   =°↓nyea.↓°=
321   V:   =and then hopefully find a ↑JOb↑! and teach (.)
322   L:   A:↑a:↑ah (.)
323   V:   Students how to (0.6)
324   L:   °nyea° .hh and DO you speak any ah: (.) foreign language.
325   V:   .hh (.) I DO:n't (.) speak any foreign language fluently,=
326   L:   =[[°mmhmm?°]=
327   V:   =[[Um- (.) ] when I was in scho:ol (.) I did (.) a G- C- S-
328        E in French so:[I kno::w    ] some French, but not- I
329        couldn't have
330   L:                  [°↓o::h yea.↓°]
331   V:   =a: fluent conversation,=
332   L:   =°↑o::↑oh.°
333   V:   =UM: (.) and this: (.) last year, when:: I was here, .h I
334        um (.) did a:: (.) british sign language course?=
335   L:   =A::h °ye:[:a°.
```

```
336  V          [So: I can (.) do some sign language now, for
337       people who: (.) [are::   ] (0.6) DEaf or partially
338  L:                   [˚U-huh˚?]
339  L:  =Mmmm=
340  V:  =partial hearing, .h um but (.)˚no::˚ I think it's just
341       because .hh (.) the option hasn't- (0.9) been there for
342       [me really,]
343  L:  [a:h yea.  ]
344  V:  An:d (1.1) IF (.) I wanted to lea:rn (.) a foreign
345       language, to learn it well I think I would have to go:
346  L:  ↓a:[ah↓
347  V:     [abro::ad=
348  L:  =↑A:[:H NYE::A::. (.) SU:_RE.↑
349  V:      [TO THE COUNTRY:,(.) defini]tely, so you can .h (.)
350       speak to people with that language and use it more.=
351  L:  =↓nyea.↓=
352  V:  =because I found with sign language, (.) I've learnt it to
353       li- (.) I've learnt- (.) I did (.) beginners in:: my first
354       year and I did level one last year,=
355  L:  =mmhmm?=
356  V:  =I find that I forget it beca:use (.) I'm not workin with=
357  L:  =↓ah [yea.↓
358  V:       [deaf people all the time, or: (.) communicating with
359       them all the time,(.) [I'm not u:sing it [so:: (.) if I]
360       ↑did↑ learn=
361  L:                         [˚˚↓yea↓˚˚        [˚↓a:h ye:a.↓ ]
362  V:  =.hh like I learnt French,
363  L:  ˚↑mm↑ mm:˚
364  V:  because I've not spo:ke to anybody French since I learnt it
365  L:  ˚a::hh.˚
366  V:  you forget it do:n't ya. you need to be commu:nicatin the
367       [language   ](.) I think.
368  L:  [a::h ↓yea.↓]
369       (1.2)
370  L:  .hh So: (.) er- (0.7) ↑what↑ do you think is the best way
371       (.) to learn (.) a foreign: language.
372       (0.7)
373  V:  ((LS)).hhh (.)I thin::k (.) the best way to learn a foreign
374       language is [to go] to the country. [↓where↓]
375  L:              [nyea ]              [A::H   ] YE:A.
376  V:  [=↓you're-]
377  L:  [=he he   ]he he [he
378  V:                   [WHERE you're learning it DEFinitely,
```

```
379      L:Ike you've come to England to learn English I think
380        that's definitely the best way because .h then you're
381        communicating with English people.=
382  L:  =˚yes?˚
383  V:  =AN: it's making you u:se it mo:re, an: [become ]more
384        confident =
385  L:                                          [˚mhmm˚?]
386  V:  =(.) in using it (.) definitely I think you need to go to
387        the country.
388  L:  a::hh.˚=
389  V:  =an:d (.) spend some time there.
390  L:  ↓ye:a↓ I thing: so:. .h ah- (1.3) ↑what↑ do you think is
391        tha: (.) best wa:y, (pause) for foreign- (.)↑A::↑h:: (.) it
392        the same question righ-,
393  V:  [No:   ] to teach.
394  L:  [↓A:h↓.]
395  V:  [˚He hee- he- ↑he↑-˚=
396  L:  [˚˚Oh-hur˚˚
397  L:  =↓sorry↓ what do you think is the best way por- fo:r to
398        TEA:sh a foreign (.) language.
399  V:  .hhhh (.) er:r-
400  V:  (.) to be hone-hest hi do-[ho-hh-n:'t kno-ho-ho]
401  L:                            [hehe hur hur hur?   ]
402  V:  .hhhh um: (.) I'm learnin te:sol at the minute so: (0.4)
403        I'm LEArnin. ↓like↓ the steps to:: [um ]
404  L:                                       [mm:]:hmm?
405  V:  (0.6) to teach it [but]
406  L:                    [Ah:]: ↓yea↓.=
407  V:  =I- (0.9) I:: don't know enough yet to sa:y (.)
408  L:  mmh[mm:?
409  V:     [the best wa:y (.) to teach it.
410  L:  ˚mhm?˚=
411  V:  =Um:: (1.6) definitely not.(0.4)
412  L:  [˚mmhmm?˚]
413  V:  [Um: (.) ]˚I don't think˚ anybody knows. the BEST WA-hay...
414  L:  Ah-↓ha: [˚yea˚↓
415  V:          [to teach it (.) I think=
416  L:  =mhm, =
417  V:  =you know you just have to go through the(0.4)
418  L:  ˚mmhmm,˚ (0.4)
419  V:  [˚proc ]esses˚
420  L:  [˚yea.˚]
421  L:  Do you thin- Do you thing: (.) grammar o:r voca'ulary is
```

```
422        the m:o:st important, (.) .h when learning a- Foreign
423        language.
424  V:    ((LS)).hh I ↑THI:NK↑ they're BO:th important,(.)
425        [But I think↑]
426  L:    [Ah:↓:: yea.↓]=
427  V:    =↑you need↑- (.) I think (0.7) GRAmma:r is: definitely
428        important because you need to know how to::
429  L:    =NYEe[:a.
430  V:        [BUIl:d the sentences,
431  L:    =A::h [↓yea↓ I ↑THING:↑ SO:! °↑hehe↑° ]
432  V:          [IT'S O:K KNOWING THE WO:RDS BUT ]it's .hh
433  L:    =°yar° ?=
434  V:    =>extre:mely important to know how to< put them in a
435        sentence so you can have a conversation,
436  L:    ↓nye:a.↓
437  V:    .hh um: (.) BUt I think you need to kno::w (.) the
438        vocabulary first,
439  L:    ↑YEA. [RIGHT!↑]
440  V:          [BEFO:: ]::RE (.) you [can:] >put them in a< SENTENCE
441  L:                                [nyea]
442  V:    SO THEY'RE [BO:TH AS E::]QUAL!
443  L:               [YE-he-he-he.]
444  V:    Bu- (.) >I think you need to know the< (.) vocabulary
445        fi:rst, .h (.) and then it's extremely [important] to kno:w
446        the grammar.
447  L:                                            [↓nye::a.↓]
448  V:    SO:: the same English language i- the: gramma:h an
449        vocabu'ry °uh° (.) toge:ther for learning.
450  V:    ye::a [Definitely.]
451  L:          [nye::a     ] ↑hu hu↑. .h and to bui:ld a:: senten-
452  V:    (.)ye[:a.]
453  L:         [NYe]:a.
454  V:    =DEFinit'ly know how to [build    ] a sentence.=
455  L:                            [°↓nyea.↓°]
456  L:    =And do you speak a:: °panich°- (1.0) PA:rti- CU::la:h. (.)
457        variety. (.) of (.) ↑English↑
458  V:    (.) .hhhh um↑mm↑ (1.5) I think I definitely have an actio-
459        an accent,
460  L:    A::h [↓yea↓.]
461  V:         [Um (.)] I'm fro:m (2.0) east yo:rkshire,
462  L:    A:↓a:h↓.
463  V:    AN::d (.) a lot of people from Yorkshire have a: very broad
464        accent.
```

```
465  V:    [an::d ]
466  L:    [Aa::ah] really? =
467  V:    =yea (.) an [when I: ]came here, (.) um (.)I moved into a
468        house=
469  L:                 [°o↑o↑hh°]=
470  V:    =with three other girls,
471  L:    Ah::h.
472  V:    An:d (.) ur: (.) they a:ll say I:'ve definitely got th-
473        broadest (.) accent (.) [and ] have (0.8)
474  L:                            [yea.]
475  V:    um:: (.) a very strong way o' sayin things.=
476  L:    =↓o:h yea↓.=
477  V:    =um: (.) My accent does a lot of things like .hhh it (.)
478        cuts w it cuts letter off wo::rds, [so:::  ]
479  L:                                       [°mhmm?°]
480  V:    >'specially like the< ha:itch in [front of] wo:rds.[.h so
481        ]=
482  L:                                     [Ooh.    ]        [°nyea.°]
483  V:    =instead of pronouncing the ha:itch as in (.) HO:le,
484  L:    Oh.=
485  V:    =I would just say 'O:le.
486  L:    oo↑oo::↑ohh.
487  V:    °do you see,° it's a very complicated accent. I think. but
488        it's:(.) um[:: very] broad (.) [definitely]
489  L:               [°mmm::°]           [°↑a:::h↑°  ] so are you
490        (.)different for: (.)↓ah↓ accent of (.) Britain people.
491  V:    [↑YEA DE:F]ini↑te[ly:.    ] um::
492  L:    [ye:aa.   ]      [°↑Ohm↑°]
493  V:    .hh I don't think there's no:: (1.4) one, who:: (.) you
494        know, (.) spea- (.) >everybody can speak< STandard (.)
495        English, (.) [as in:] they can speak
496  L:                 [O:h.  ]=
497  L:    =Ah [yea
498  V:        [English: (.) you know,(.)mmhmm,.h But- (1.4) dependin
499        where you li:ve, (.)= =n [where you've been brought] u:p,
500        (.) um: you will
501  L:                             [↑Aaa↑a:::h.      °↓ye:a↓°]=
502  V:    =SOUND a little bit different?
503  L:    A::h ye:a.=
504  V:    =SO:::o I mean: this is what (.) it makes you wonder when
505        people are te:achin.
506  L:    ye:a?=
507  V:    =people like you English whether: .h (.) you would (.) um
```

```
508        (1.7) say things how I: say them because that's how I
509        soun:d?
510   L:   ˙˙↓yea.↓˙˙=
511   V:   =because a lot of people: (.) in England, they don:'t speak
512        English exactly the sam:e? >they have a little bit of< a:
513        Different (.) [WAY of] pronouncing thing::s?
514   L:                 [OH!   ]
515   L:   =↑I thing::↑ so:, same my country. [we ar:e] a lot of
516        dar:::
517   V:                                       [Ye:a.  ]=
518   L:   =accent.
519   V:   ye:a. [DEfinitely.]
520   L:         [and we have] (.) differen: (.) ah differen: for
521        accent in: Thailand.
522   V:   ny[ea.
523   L:     [ye::ah
524   L:   .hh an: ha- (pause) ↑have↑ you got an accent.
525   V:   yea. definitely [East Yo:rkshire ↑very↑] .h very [bro:ad!]
526   L:                   [↑Hu-hu-hu-hu-hu-huh  ↑]          [↓ye::s↓]
527   L:   What ↑is:↑ this. (0.5) a::h what is: it. (0.4)
528   V:   Um- (0.6) ACcent.=
529   L:   =ye:a.=
530   V:   =it's whe::re umm:: ((LS)) people:: (1.4) so:: ↑if you've
531        been↑ brought up, in a diff'rent eh- [part of] the
532        country,=
533   L:                                         [o:oh.  ]
534   L:   =nye:a.
535   V:   =in a diff'rent part of England, you will: (.) you ar:e
536        more
537        likely to sound different,(.) [to some]one who:'s bee:n
538        (.)=
539   L:                                 [o:oh.  ]
540   L:   =mhmm?=
541   V:   =brought up (.) somewhere else. so: (.) if you lived in
542        London,
543   L:   A::h yea.
544   V:   people in London, (.) would sound- (.) if you were speaking
545        to someone from London, they would sound different to yo:u,
546        (.)
547   L:   [Ooh.]
548   V:   [than] how I: sound to you now.
549   L:   OO↑O::↑OH! [YE:A! I thing- ]
550   V:             [<because they will] pronounce things,> they will
```

```
551        <<sound wo:rds differently,>> to [how I:'m sou]nding them
552        to you
553   L:                                      [°°oo↑o:h↑°° ]=
554   V:   =now.
555   L:   °°↑ooh↑°° can you:: example for me:, °for the accent of°
556        (.)
557   V:   [Oh-ho-ho? I'm ↑<NOT VERY GOOD AT ACCENTS>↑]
558   L:   [°London°  ↑↑wu:r-hu-hU-HU-HU-HU- (.) HA↑↑ ]
559   L:   ha-↑ha↑
560   V:   (GASP)[I'm ] r:ubbish at ac[cents,     ]
561   L:        [YEa.]                 [it's wery:] s:ou- sou- (.)
562        accent right? (0.4)
563   V:   London is, ye:a. it's [um: (.) becau-] (.) yea definitely.
564        um
565   L:                         [↑mmmm::::   ↑ ]=
566   V:   =CAN'T- I 'onestly: can't do it.°let me think if I can do
567        a° .hh (0.8)
568   L: It's HA:RD for:: (pause) listening. right?
569   V:   YE:a.
570   L:   [[O↑oo↑oh.
571   V:   [[.h do ↑you find↑ .h (.) um: ((LS)) (1.3) ↓ye:a↓ (.) I
572        thin:k when (.) um (1.9) when you're being taught, [by::  ]
573        (0.6)
574   L:                                                      [ye::a.]
575   V:   er Ra:chel, >I mean< Rachel sounds diff'rent to I: do,
576   L:   Ooohh [ye:a.     ]
577   V:         [do yur s-] do you think?
578   L:   nye:a=
579   V:   =because she:'s (0.8) um: (.) she lives: she's comes f-
580     come from sum:: a diff'rent place, (.) [than I have, ]
581   L:                                        [Aaaahh ↓yea.↓]
582   V:   so she'll soun:d different.
583   L:   Oo↑ooh [ye:↑a:h. ]
584   V:          [so do you] find it ha::rd (.) listenin (0.6)
585   L:   °ye:a.°
586   V:   >do you find it< ha:rd, (.) when you've been learnin
587     English, and speaking english to some[one else,]
588   L:                                       [su:re.   ]
589   L:   [[°hu-hu° ]
590   V:   [[and then] you speak to M:E::,
591   L:   YE-[He:a-hur]
592   V:      [and I:  ]sound a bit ↑dif↑f'rent [to how they sound,]
593   L:                                        [.hh (.) YE-He-hea]
```

```
594 L:   °sey-hey°=
595 V:   =does it sometimes com:plicate things a bit,[.hhh °he
596      ↑he↑°]
597 L:                                              [↑NYE:a it s-↑ ]
598 L:   =it ↑SOMETIM:E IT'S THE m- ah the m- MA:KE ME::↑ ah for (.)
599      ↑mis↑ta:ke.
600 V:   YE:aa.=
601 L:   =SAY some:[vocabu'ry]
602 V:              [mistake. ]
603 L:   [ye:a. °ah-↑hu-hu-hu↑°…]
604 V:   [ye:a. definitely.    ]
605 L:   .h ↓nyea.↓ (1.5)((LS)).hh an:d (.)↑if↑ you were Teaching
606      (.) English, .hh (.) would you shoose you're normal (.)
607      woice (.) accent, aw- (2.1) <were you: shaing it.>
608 V:   ((LS)) .hhh (pause) I'd TRY::: (.) if I was teachin English
609      [to (.) foreign] students, I would try:: (.) my hardest
610 L:   [mm:::hmm:?     ]
611 V:   to:: (.)pronounce everything::, (.) [correctly] n more
612      stan- (.)in a=
613 L:                                        [nnye::a.
614 V:   =more standard fo:rm,=
615 L:   =°°mhmm°°
616 V:   than (.) if I was: (.) at home, (0.4) in east Yorkshire
617      with my family,=
618 L:   =°↓nye:a↓°=
619 V:   =who:: (.) we all: have quite a broad accent, (.) speaking
620      °thing:s in:: (.) the° same time like (.) SO: for example
621      when .h if I was teachin you English, [I would] pronounce
622      wo:rds
623 L:                                          [↓ye:a↓ ]
624 V:   =properly .h and NOT(.)drop the ha:itches [off the front.]
625 L:                                              [hhh ha-ha-ha-
626      ha]=
627 V:   =so I would say (.) HO:le, (.) instead of sa[yin (.) `O:le]
628      heh°
629 L:                                                [°↑y:::e:a↑° ]
630 L:   do you think it's very: ↑hard↑ for:: (.) listening ↓ah↓
631      when you: talk with (.) foreigner.
632 V:   yea. ye:a.
633 L:   specially me:. [↑HA HA HA HA↑]
634 V:                  [↑Hu- hehe↑   ]
635 V:   u-humm ((LS)) =
636 L:   =↑do you think it's ah hard for you?↑
```

637 V: Erm- ↑YE↑a. (.) sometimes, some words, but I::=

638 L: =↑˚mm::˚↑ ↑↑HA HA HA he-ye-he-hea↑↑

639 L: =˚ooh.˚=

640 V: =i don't know,=

641 L: Aa:h yea.=

642 V: =I pr- I suppo:se it's just as ha:rd really, =

643 L: =ye::a.

644 V: I think it's easier for me: because: (.) erm: (.)

645   obviously:

646   YOU'RE speaking my language. [˚if˚-]

647 L: [Aa:h]↓yea↓.=

648 V: =if you were speaking your language, I: would've have a

649   ↑clue↑. He[he- ˚hehe˚]

650 L: [HH↑Ha ha ha]haha↑=

651 V: =But um:: (pause) in relation to this question, (.)

652 L: ˚↓ny[ea↓˚]

653 V: [l-]whe:re I >live in East Yorkshire we have a habit<

654   of (.) I think it's a very:: la:zy(.) accent, [so if we

655   in]stead

656 L: [Aaa::h

657   really]=

658 V: =of sayin:: (.) [um:]((LS)) (.) <I am going (.) to: the

659   shop,> L: [a:h.]

660 L: ˚ah is˚ it (.) EASY for:: listening.

661 V: y[ea-]

662 L: [↑ye]::a↑=

663 V: =if I was: speakin to someone: in east yorkshire I'd

664   say:(.) I'm off tu- (.) shop.

665 L: ˚Oh-hhhh˚ (0.9) [[↑It's] HA:RD↑=

666 V: [[It's-]

667 V: =It's hard =

668 L: =↑Ya↑[a::]

669 V: [so::] in that respect, when I:: (.) when I'm speakin

670   to:: (1.3) >if I was< teachin a:: foreign language,

671   [I would] (.)

672 L: [ye:a   ]=

673 V: =you know, make sure that all the sentences are (.) said

674   (.) properly. (.)

675 L: [˚a::h ye:::a.˚]

676 V: [Tur- (.) d'you] understand what I mean, .hh When-=

677 L: =Ye:a.

678 V: When I mean (.) at home,

679   (0.4)

```
680  L:  ˚mmhm?˚ (0.6)
681  V:  we have er:::m ((LS)) our accent, we jus:t(.)˚w-˚ cut words
682      out,
683  L:  Aa::hh.
684  V:  so:: (.) instead of saying TO::,
685  L:  ˚˚ah [yea˚˚
686  V:       [˚the english yorkshire accent˚ they just say T'-
687  L:  Oh!=
688  V:  =d'you see: what I mean, they sa:y: I'm off T'- (.) shop.
689  L:  ˚˚↑o:[::h↑˚˚
690  V:       [instead of sayin TO: (.) the shop.
691  L:  D- I: ↑think↑ sh:- ah (.) to: da shops is very: easy for
692      understanding… but a tu csh ↑↑
693      [:h↑↑ I CA:N'T UNDERSTA::ND!]
694  V:  [Uhhh hu hu (.) (gasp)]=
695  V:  =but <that's juhust> (.) <that's just whe::re [that's]
696  L:                                                [BUT IT] JU:=
697  L:  =↑U:SED↑ IN YOU::R (.)↑FA↑MILY.
698  V:  YE-HE[A::. tha-]
699  L:       [AA:↑A::::]::↑AH ˚↑↑he he[he he↑↑˚ ]
700  V:                               [er:: it's] U:SE u- wi- BY:
701      people from East ↑York↑shire. [it's u:sed by a:ll people in
702      my: <who
703  L:                                [↑Ooooh.↑
704  V:  speak my accent.> they JUst say T'- (.) SHOP,=
705  L:  =˚oo↑oo↑[oh˚
706  V:          [<goin [T'- SHOP,>        ]
707  L:                 [BUT you can un-] understand, (.)˚oh↑o:h↑˚ but-
708      An- .h (pause) I think because you are habit of your:
709      language,=
710  V:  =y:Ep.
711  L:  bu- sah when you wi'- (.) speak with foreigner, .h ˚a::h˚
712      (0.9)Do you want to: m::ake da. (.) incent for corre'-.
713  V:  [>YEA. I mean DEFinitely] if I was< tea]chin:: a foreigner
714      I=
715  L:  [˚yea  ↑aa:::h↑˚nyea::   ]=
716  V:  =would not sa:y that. [becau]se Obviously: I'd be TEACHin=
717  L:                        [hhh  ]
718  V:  yuh the wrong ↑wa-[ha:y to ]say it↑. (gasp)
719  L:                    [hahaha? ]=
720  V:  =I ope you sa:y (.) <I'm going to:: the shop.> because of
721      us- otherwise, you wouldn't understa:nd (.) >would you you
722      wun:t<=
```

```
723 L:    =↑AH [<YE::A        I     THI:NG: SO::> ↑ ↑↑haha↑↑]
724 V:        [>>IF I SAID TO YA<< .hh      ↑i'm OFF T'-hu- ]sho-
725       hop.↑ (gasp) youd think whats she ↑off: on[a↑bou- hu hu hu
726       (HIC)]
727 L:                                            [↑↑REALLY HARD
728       FOR YOU!↑↑]
729 L:    e-hehm  [(SNIFF)]
730 V:            [(GASP) ]
731 L:    er:: .hh is this tha:: sprea- o:f ↑ing↑liss around the
732       worl:' a ↑good↑ thing. (1.1)
733 V:    ((LS)) ↑↑Umm::?↑↑ (2.1) I ↑don't really↑ kno::w: I think
734       (1.7) obviously: (.) because I'm English (.) wherever you
735       go:: on holiday, [people ] speak English. don't they. so:
736       people=
737 L:                     [a↑a↑ah.]=
738 V:    =understand you. but I think it's (0.5) a sha::me, (.) erm:
739       (.)that erm: (0.4) °where you've got here does this kill
740       other languages,° (.) erm .hh I ↑think it do:↑es. I think
741       English is too: (.) Worldwi:de. [it's known by] everyone.
742
743 L:                                    [°↑mm↑mmm::.° ]
744 V:    an e:[ven   ]
745         [nye:a.]=
746 V:    =tho:ugh (0.4) that might be (.) a good thing,
747 L:    °mhmm?° (0.7)
748 V:    WHY: are other languages not known as well. I think
749       [beca]use-
750 L:    [a:h.]=
751 V:    = .hhh I THInk because, everybody:- (0.9) mo:st people,
752 L:    =ye:a:?=
753 V:    =know English: <from like>=
754 L:    =Oh-m=
755 V:    =↑PE↑=
756 L:    =Yea: [Sur:e.      ]
757 V:          [↑PEOPLE IN↑] Spa::in. n: [peopl:: n-] (.) France
758       they=
759 L:                                    [nye:↓::a.↓]
760 V:    =know Eng:lish. don't they.=
761 L:    =Mmm::=
762 V:    =which (.) I think it makes people from England less likely
763       to ↑L:EArn↑ another language
764 L:    a::[:h
765 V:       [because they thin:k well- .h I don't learn- need to
```

```
766        learn another language because everybody:: (.) a lot of
767        people speak english anyway
768  L:   Ye::[a. ˙I think so˙]
769  V:       [d'you understa: ]nd,
770  L:   nYE:[:ea.
771  V:       [umm:: (.) BEcause (0.7) English is so: worldwi:de,
772  L:   mm::-hmm?=
773  V:   =i think it makes a lot of people from england quite lazy
774        in the respect that they do:n't kno::w (.) [other
775        langua]ges because
776  L:                                               [Oo:::h.    ]=
777  L:   =˙mmmm.˙ (1.8)
778  V:   other people can speak their language so wherever you go:
779        you're likely to (.) be able to commu:nicate with someone
780        because (.) [>IF YOU GO on<] holiday to spa:in
781  L:               [mm↓hmm↓        ]=
782  L:   =˙m[hm˙
783  V:      [the Spanish (.)tend to speak ↑Eng:↑lish (.)
784        [because of the]
785  L:   [nye::a.]=
786  V:   =↑tour↑ists.
787  L:   mmhmm?
788  V:   so it's not like (.) you need to know the language to (.)
789        be able to ↑get somewhe::re↑ or::=
790  L:   =M:m[m::.
791  V:       [to ↑Ask direction:s↑ or: to:: (0.3) [get a  ] ↑drink↑=
792  L:                                            [˙↓mmm↓˙ ]=
793  V:   =because they: ↑know english anyway:y↑.
794  L:   ˙↑Aa::↑ah yea.˙ .h so you shoose fora stu- ˙a:h˙ study
795        your: subject because a:h your:- (.) you li'- for:: teach.
796        (0.7)
797  V:   My (0.4) I'm studying English [(.) um be]cause I want to
798        teach
799  L:                                 [nyea.    ]=
800  V:   =English. Yea.
801  L:   ˙↑o:::::h↑˙ nye::a. it's very good for: your ↑i↑dea.
802  V:   ˙u-huh˙=
803  L:   =˙yea˙ .h and then ah (1.3) ↑do you di:nk↑ das learning.
804        another language.(0.4) cha- gedd your: culture (.) OR your:
805        (.) personaw:y (.) in ↑an↑y way.
806  V:   .hhhh (.) <I thi:nk that> (.) erm:: (0.5) I ↑don't think
807        it↑ changes your culture but I [think (.) if you:: (.)
808        learn
```

```
809 L:                                    [↑mm↑mm:
810 V:   =another language, it open you- it opens your EYE:s.=
811 V:   =[To other cul]tu:res.
812 L:    [AH I ↑thi↑nk]=
813 L:   =nye:a.=
814 V:   =it makes you realize, erm
815 L:   mmhmm,(0.5)
816 V:   other cultu:res. AND (.) um: .hh I think it makes you a
817      mo::re(.) outgoing ↑per↑son. (.) [If you] learn another
818      language
819 L:                                    [Yea   ] =
820 V:   =because you can communicate wi:th=
821 L:   =mhmnm,=
822 V:   =more people than:
823 L:   mhmm=
824 V:   =Jus: (.) the language you ↑kno:w↑.=
825 L:   =Mmhmm, )(.)yea.
826 (3.4)
827 L:   and for the la:st question, (1.0) in your experien. do:
828      English(0.3) people use English (.)↑A↑-ffetivdey, .h To::
829      communication. (0.5) .h with people, ↑who ha:ve↑ a
830      <different first language>. (1.1)
831 V:   ((LS)) .hhh (0.9) ↑↑erm::?↑↑ ˚˚do people use English
832      affectively.˚˚ (.) e::rm. (0.8) ((LS)) (0.5) .hhhh
833      SOMetimes, (0.7) I think they do. (.) because:e (0.8) you
834      ↓kno:w↓ (.) they slo::w (.)
835 L:   mm[hmm,
836 V:     [their speech do:wn so peop- (.) so (.) people who:se
837      >English language it isn't< (.) their first language (.)
838      [can (.) ]
839 L:   [Ye:a.   ]
840 V:   understand them easier=
841 L:   =ye:a.
842 V:   .hh ↓um:↓ (.) >I mean< (.) NOW I'm speaking to you a bit
843      slower than: if I was speaking to someon:e English coz (.)
844      I worry that if I speak >really FAST,< (.)
845 L:   [a-↑↑HA!↑↑ ]
846 V:   [You're not] gon↑na:↑ (gasp) [understand,
847 L:                                [ah-↑he↑=
848 L:   =nyea.=
849 V:   =BU- SOMEti:mes <I thi::nk (.) that (.)> some peopl:e slow
850      it down too much,
851 L:   a:::h. [˚yea.˚
```

```
852  V:         [so: that (.) maybe the (.) person who:se (.)
853      >English language isn't their first language might< think
854      [that ](.)
855  L:  [ye:a.]=
856  V:  =they're saying it really slo:w because >you might
857      understand then they< might be a: (.) slightly a bit
858      offended. coz-
859  L:  nye:a.=
860  V:  =D'you un- (.) d'you understand (.) what I m- (.) what I
861      mean,
862  L:  NYe:[:a. (.) I understand. ]
863  V:      [YE::A. .hhh    SO THEY] (.) like (.) if I was going
864      (.)
865  L:  mhmm?
866  V:  <<=r:eall:y: (.) reall:y: (.) slo::w like thi:s,>> =
867  L:  =˚u-hu-˚
868  V:  <YOU might ↑thin:k…↑>
869  L:  I THINK IT'S [BE:TTER]
870  V:               [you-   ]=
871  V:  =↑you might thi-hink↑
872  L:  YEA=
873  V:  =you know:
874  V:  (sniff) [erm:
875  L:          [SO WHEN Y- a:h (.) when you speak with
876      foreigner,(.)ah .hh (0.8) ah do you s- ah do you speak
877      slowly.
878  V:  .hh I spe:[ak(.) sl:]o:wer, [but not to]o: slow,because I
879      think
880  L:            [oo↑oo↑ooh]       [Ohm: yea.]=
881  V:  =if you speak (.) really slow, then:: they might- (1.9)
882      ↑well foreign pe↑ople are going to be:: (.) tal- if they're
883      learnin English they gonna be talkin to people with
884      English=
885  L:  =mhmm:?=
886  V:  =all the time, so if (.) [>everyone was speakin to them<
887      really
888  L:                            [˚mmm?˚ =
889  V:  =slo:wly:,=
890  L:  =Ah: [˚yea.˚
891  V:       [Then they wouldn't (1.0) they'd never lear:n: to get
892      it to the sa:me=
893  L:  =Ah YEA ↑I thing:↑ so. (.)[nye:a.]
894  V:                            [PA::CE] n learn it as well, But
```

```
895    erm::(0.5) I DON't think people (.) so I don't think people
896    should go too: slo:w, because .hhh erm (.) I wouldn't li:ke
897    >the person who was< (.) [um: (.)] learning english to
898    think (.) they're
899 L:                                 [mmmm:]=
900 V: =[<goin] (.) re:ally slo:w because they think that I'm:>
901
902 L:    [ye:a.]
903 V: (.) a bit DAFT and I don't underSTAND.[do you::    ] d'you
904    see what=
905 L:                                       [˚↑o::h↑˚ yea.]
906 V: =(.) I mean, .h [but (.)] I don't think it's right to go
907    really=
908 L:                [nyea.  ]=
909 V: =qui:ck [ei:]ther. (.) because
910 L:         [Oh-]
911 L: HA:rd=
912 V: =>then it would be really< difficult e[specially if]theyre
913    just
914 L:                                        [↑YE:↑:aa.   ]=
915 V: =learning the language=
916 L: =So when you live ↓ah↓ with yo:ur: (.) family, (.) your
917    >speaking is< wery: faa-.
918    (0.6)
919 V: Quite fast. ye:a=
920 L: =↑Oo↑o::hh. ˚yea yea.˚ (.) ˚˚really?˚˚ .h because a::h .hh
921    (0.6)your:: family: a:h (.) they can: (.) speak english
922    really (.) really faa- (.) with you eh?
923 V: Yea. [Yea. erm: (.) >if] you was havin a conver<sation with
924 L:      [↑Oo↑˚o::hh nyea.˚]=
925 V: =someone,
926 L: mm:[hmm:  ]
927 V:    [Um (.)] you know, it would >probably be to a< faste:r
928    (.) [PA:ce than (.) >if you were speaking to< someone who
929 L:      [mhmm=
930 V: <didn't know Engl[ish>
931 L: Yee::a. I [think
932 V:           [because you would fe:el: if- (0.4)=
933    =because (.) you don't kno:w English=
934 L: =Ye::a.
935 V: very well, there [might be] WO:rds that you don't
936    understand.
937 L:                  [Yeaa.   ]
```

```
938  V:   =>so if< I:: was speakin (.)[rea  ]lly really fast,=
939  L:                               [˚˚mm˚˚]
940  L:   =NYE:e::a.=
941  V:   =Then (0.3) you'd become confu:sed wouldnt you. [and you]
942       would
943  L:                                                   [Mmhmm, ]
944  L:   NYEA I thing (.) I thing so. is:: (.) some vocabury an:
945       sometime when I speaking wit ↓ah:↓ brit- britain people, .h
946       ↓a:h↓ dey spea- (.) king with me very ↑faa↑ .hh an: not
947       slowly. .h ˚↓ah↓˚ (LS)) sometime (.)˚ah˚ I feel confre-
948       confract (1.1) ˚↓a:h↓˚ CONfiu:.
949  V:   CONfu:sed. =
950  L:   =Aah=
951  V:   =↓yea↓=
952  L:   =I feel confiu about tha senten: .h and about a:h (.) the
953       mean.
954  V:   [↓ye::a↓]
955  L:   [↓ye::a↓] it's a (.) hard for: healing. hard for: (.) a:h
956       (0.4) conversation.=
957  V:   =If:=
958  L   =↓ye::a↓
959  V:   Ai- IF (.) >you were speaking to someone from< englan:d
960       an::d (.) um:: (.) you ↑was↑ a bit confu:sed. [would you-]
961  L:                                                 [a::h yea. ]=
962  V:   =would you sa:y, [can you] just repeat that or what does
963       ↑that↑
964  L:                   [↑ah-↑  ]=
965  V:   =mean, or would you feel a bit(0.5)
966  L:   NYE:[:ea.]
967  V:       [Yea ]
968  L:   a:h sometime I want to:: I want to a::h (.) I want to:: (.)
969       listening=
970  V:   =↓Ye:a↓=
971  L:   =↓a:h↓ One mor:e (.) nye:a. .hh I want to ↓a:h↓ (.) I want
972       to they've (.)ah (.) repeat (.) repeat for: a:h speaking.
973       .hh beca:use a:h sometime I'm fe:el (.) hhh COn↑FIne an↑-
974       really HAr-  (.) hard har:d I think (.) I think so:. (1.3)
975  V:   um- ↑when you're um↑ (.)sorry. ↑when you're doing↑ the
976       listening task, with Rachel,[and does] she pla:y you
977       thing:s to listen to,
978  L:                               [mmhmm,  ](1.0) ah sorry?
979  V:   >so when you're doing a< <LIST'nin, (.)[TAsk,(.) with]
980       Rachel,>
```

```
981  L:                                              [mmm.    yea.]
982  V:   =in (.) in class,>=
983  L:   =A:h yea.=
984  V:   =does she pla:y you something: to listen to ma:ybe.
985  L:   ↑AA::H↑ [YEe:a.
986  V:          [>and do you have any:< (.) problems- (.) is it the
987       vocabulary that sometimes you
988       (0.9)
989  L:   OO↑OOo↑oh. SHUrah °°heh°° .hh IS THA: (.) .h is the mo:st
990       a:h pro- problem.for: da:(1.0) for da (.)[learning  A:H
991       for]=
992  V:                                           [listenin. ye:a.  ]
993  L:   =da: listening=
994  V:   =the vocabulary=
995  L:   =NYe:a. the vo>cabulry yep ah< because a:h they speak uh
996       .hh very ↑faa↑ .hh ↓ah↓ especially da(.)last Friday,.h we
997       are wa- (.) we are watch tha: wai- wideo,
998  V:   right=
999  L:   =A:h (.) AND the (0.5) a:h person a:h. (.) from Wideo they-
1000      the:y speak really faa. (0.5) °mmm° .hh an:: (0.8) ((LS))
1001      we are can't ↓daa↓ (pause) we are can't da listening again.
1002      .h So:o: is (.) some senten is soh- (.) wery ↑Hhard↑ for:
1003      da (.) listening.(.) >and very hard< for: understanding.
1004 V:   Ye[:a beca:u]s:e (0.6) y- (.) you hear a word and you're a
1005      bit
1006 L:     [↓nye:::a↓]=
1007 V:   =unsure of the vocabulary. but by the time
1008 L:   ↑nye::a.↑
1009 V:   it's gone ↑on↑ hasn't it.and [it's ↑SAYING] SOMETHING
1010      ELSE↑ and
1011 L:                                [↑NYE↑-HEea. ]
1012 V:   =yo::u=
1013 L:   =SU:[RE    ]
1014 V:       [you're] ↑tryin to think what it said before↑=
1015 L:   =NYEA-hea. .h SURE(.)↑WHAT DO YOU SA::Y!
1016      [↑↑hehe↑↑ (.)↑WHAT] DO
1017 V:   [huhu hu hu ha ha ]=
1018 L:   =YOU ME:AN!↑ I ↑CAN'T UNDERSTA::ND!↑=
1019 V:   =°u-huh°=
1020 L:   =COU' RE[PEAT DI'.  ]
1021 V:           [°Huhu- hu?°]
1022 L:   NYEe::a. (1.1) Okay. Thank you for your: answer: for my:
1023      (.) a:h (.) question=
```

```
1024  V:   =↓Yea↓. thank you very much for yo:ur time
1025  L:   ˙↓nyea.↓ ˙=
1026  V:   =O↑kay↑?
1027  L:   You're welcome.
```

Interview 4: Andrew = UK student, Stelios = International student

Time: 24 seconds

08 lines

```
01    A:   What- what parts of ummm like your lessons (.) have you
02         enjoyed (.) doing (.) with Rachel.
03    S:   (2.0) Hmm?
04    A:   What parts of your ermmm ((LS)) (1.0) foundation
05         programme have you enjoyed doing with Rachel.
06    S:   (.) We- I don't have Rachel.
07    A:   Oh you DO:N't? oh right. So what- (1.0) what lessons d-
08         what lessons are you doin'?
```

Interview 5: Stella = UK student, Giorgios = International student, Ella =
International student
Time: 5:28 - 6:05 (37 seconds) of 8:07
14 lines

```
15   G:  en (.) do you think grammar vocabulary is most important when

16       you learn a foreign language?
17   S:  Grammar=
18   G:  =Yeah=
19   S:  =en (.)
20   G:  Grammar and vocabulary
21   S:  Yeah °grammar and vocabulary° en ↑ I think it's Important but
22       if it's (.) if the other person (.) like the foreign language
23       person(.)say a Spanish en can just understand some words that
24       I'm saying then it's ok cause you are communicating (.) so I
25       (.) I don't (.) it's a little bit important but I don't think
26       it's really important
27   G:  =The vocabulary is important=
28   S:  =Yeah I think so yes
```

Interview 6: Eileen = UK student, Ali = International student

Time: 19:34

453 lines

```
01   E:   Okay right I that'll be fine. I'll put that there (.h)
02        >okay you can HHh(laughter) hold it,th(hh)[thats fine]<
03   A:                                              [Yeah right]
04   E:   Okay um right whi:ch ski:ll of reading or speaking or
05        listening (.h) do you feel you would like to practice more
06        (.) in class?
07   A:   urm (3.2) °um° (.h) (1.24) can you repeat please.
08   E:   Yeah (.) um (1.02) do you feel that you would like more
09        practice (.) <of reading or writing or speaking or
10        listening> (.) in class.
11   A:   Yeah, um (.) I I feel like I want to (.h) (.) to practice
12        more wri[ting        ] and li[stening  ]
13   E:           [more writing]       [listening] both writing and
14        listening=
15   A:   =yeah
16   E:   any any reason?
17   A:   yeah in writing its very com completely different from my
18        language. Completely different=
19   E:   =right=
20   A:   =so I want to get used to write fast a lot and li[stening]
21   E:                                                    [yeah   ]
22        Is the um the script dif[ferent] then.
23   A:                           [yeah  ] also the way we write >°we
24        write this way°<=
25   E:   =of course >Its harder for you to learn<=
26   A:   =to write fast=
27   E:   =fluently. Yeah. Oh ok, um, (.h) do you practice your
28        English at home?
29   A:   (.) at home in york do you mean=
30   E:   =yeah=
31   A:   =yeah. Um I live with four ur English people=
32   E:   =yeah=
33   A:   =from the university so we talk.
34   E:   Okay so lots of speaking=
35   A:   =yeah lots of speaking.
36   E:   Um do you watch English films or.
```

```
37   A:   Yeah I watch English films at the cinemas and on my tee vee
38        in my room.
39   E:   Okay so you you have English tee vee at home.
40   A:   yeah
41   E:   Okay (.) that's great=
42   A:   =°mmyeah°=
43   E:   =Okay um which lessons or activities have you enjoyed most
44        so far in your English lesson?
45   A:   (2.00) urm you mean where I am studying. This year.
46   E:   Yeah in i-i-in your English lesson this year which lesson
47        has been your favourite.
48   A:   (.) um (.) well (.) all (.) I like
49   E:   All of them= (sniff)
50   A:   =Yeah and I am studying British culture which is like I
51        have to study geography and history=
52   E:   =Yeah=
53   A:   =This is what I don't like but I have to.
54   E:   O-okay. So so you you don't like history=
55   A:   =yeah I don't like study history=
56   E:   =yeah (.h) (.) ok [um     ]
57   A:                     [laughs]
58   E:   How um how far have you been able to erm use the English
59        that you learnt in class. in the real world.
60   A:   (1.30) urm how far. What do you mean?
61   E:   like urm the:: English that you use in class
62   A:   yeah
63   E:   can you use all of it in the real world?
64   A:   Yeah I can use it when I go somewhere abroad. Its not
65        English country=
66   E:   =uh huh=
67   A:   =or someone speaks English=
68   E:   =yeah=
69   A:   =or not in England and I can speak=
70   E:   =yeah=
71   A:   =I can communicate with it. I can learn and what I have
72        remembered in the same time.
73   E:   Good. So you find your lessons use[ful          ]
74   A:                                     [oh yeah yeah] very
75        useful.
76   E:   Good. Good. Ok.um is there something that you would like to
77        do in your class that you haven't done yet?(1.67) is there
78        something that you would like to learn or.=
79   A:   =urm=
```

```
80   E:  =an activity that you would like to do?
81   A:  No really. But from time to time what we are doing now.
82       Okay=
83   E:  =Okay=
84   A:  =I don't have anything that I want to do.
85   E:  yeah
86   A:  mm
87   E:  So theres mm. so theres mm n-nothing that you feel that you
88       need to learn? (.) or nothing that you feel you would enjoy
89       doing in the future?
90   A:  (2.50) urm (.)
91   E:  Y-you happy w-with the less[ons ] as they [are. ]
92   A:                             [yeah]        [yeah]
93   A:  They are [yeah  ]
94   E:           [s-s-so] your happy for them to continue as they
95       are [then]
96   A:      [yeah]
97   E:  Tha:ts (laughing) fh:i:ne. he he he. Sorry I don't mean
98       ToHoo confu:se [anything    ]
99   A:                 [that's fine]
100  E:  Okay um right. Out of vocabulary and grammar which do you
101      feel you need to improve on most?
102  A:  Um (.) both (.) actually
103  E:  Both=
104  A:  =yeah. Grammar and vocabulary.
105  E:  Yeah?
106  A:  Yeah
107  E:  So ur urm is there anything in particular with the grammar
108      and vocabulary?
109  A:  Yeah um grammar is um (.)
110  E:  Yeah
111  A:  I-I need to have more grammar.
112  E:  Yeah
113  A:  To speak err normal when I am speaking to someone you know,
114      when [(.h) ]
115  E:       [laughs] Is that like urm (.) more like verb grammar
116      or sentence structure or is that (.) j'you understand what
117      I'm saying [yeah]
118  A:             [yeah](.) (.h) err
119  E:  Y'you don't understand what I'm saying he he (laughs)
120  A:  Yeah=
121  E:  =Okay, okay that's fine=
122  A:  =Yeah.
```

```
123  E:  (.h) Urm (.) right. In - in class, j'you prefer to to do
124      anything that where err the teacher is standing and talking
125      to you using the board (.) or do you prefer (.) textbooks
126      or worksheets.
127  A:  Yeah, I prefer worksheets an(.)
128  E:  Yeah
129  A:  and text book from the book
130  E:  Okay (.) (.h) and what about role plays, do you like role
131      plays?
132  A:  What's that?
133  E:  Urm where you have, you're told what you have to say in a
134      conversation (.) do you have them in your lessons?
135  A:  No I don't think=
136  E:  =You don't=
137  A:  =No=
138  E:  =O-okay its like a speaking activity
139  A:  Yeah, speaking activity.
140  E:  Yeah.
141  A:  Yeah. Umm (.)
142  E:  Okay, that's fine. Urm is there anything you don't like
143      about your English lessons?
144  A:  Urr no I'm happy, I like them as they are now.
145  E:  ↑Okay↓ That's great (laughs)so, so there isn't anything you
146      would change?
147  A:  (.) No not at the moment (.h) If I can change. Yeah, but
148      one subject (.) British culture. (.)
149  E:  British Culture (.) he he he (.) why? (.ha.ha.ha)
150  A:  You know, cause even in my language, I don't like study all
151      history of these things. You know, geo[graphy ]
152  E:                                          [laughing] yeah, yeah
153      its not err I know [wh-] when I had to learn French and we
154  A:                     [yeah]
155  E:  were just French and we were just doing politics all the
156      time.=
157  A:  =Yeah
158  E:  Its like I just want to learn the lh::anguage I don't want
159      to learn the pholithhhics  [laughing]
160  A:                             [laughing]
161  E:  ↑Yeah, okay↑ That's all of my questions. Do you have any
162      questions for me?
163  A:  Yeah, yeah I [have           ]
164  E:              [↑WOOooohahaha↑] (sniffs)
```

```
165   A:   (.h) urm (.) why did you choose to take urm T-E-Sol I'll,
166        T-E-C-O-L
167   E:   TESOL
168   A:   TESOL um the language studies module?
169   E:   Urm I think its because, I would like maybe in a few years
170        time to travel and teach English, to travel to teach
171        English. Not in England=
172   A:   =mmmm=
173   E:   =So I would maybe like to work in an ↑Inter↓national school
174        maybe somewhere in Europe=
175   A    =Yeah=
176   E    =Maybe anywhere really he he he (laughs).
177   A    Why you don't like to teach in England?
178   E    (.h) um (.) (.h) I think its more because I want to lh-h-
179        ive(laughs) in another country [hee hee]
180   A:                                 [yeah   ]
181   E:   I err I used to live in France and I also lived in Greece,=
182   A:   =hm mm=
183   E:   =as well and I just like the experiencing the new
184        [cultures ] and its really fun
185   A:   [yeah yeah]
186   A:   What are your future plans after your graduate?
187   E:   Urr um I want to do another course at another university in
188        um creative writing?(.) err like writing fiction=
189   A:   =mm hm
190   E:   things like that(.) and (.) then (.) move on to travel(.)
191        so maybe I'll do another TESOL=
192   A:   =mhm=
193   E:   =qualification so I can travel but work while I travel.=
194   A:   =yeah (.) ok (.)(.h) do you speak any foreign languages?
195   E:   Urm (.) I speak French. And urm (.) I learn (.) I did
196        learn Chinese but th-ha-hat, was very hard and I'm not
197        very good at it at all he he ha ha so um when I was very
198        young my mother was born in Kenya?
199   A:   mm hmm
200   E:   So:o and she used to teach me Swahili.
201   A:   oh
202   E:   and I was very um and I don't remember much of it. I can
203        speak a little but not much TEHAHAhahehe
204   A:   Why are you learning French. um why have you learned
205        French?
206   E:   Um (.) because (.) in (.) the (.) um the English school
207        system you have to learn a language. but it's only at
```

```
208        secondary school?
209   A:   mm hmm
210   E:   So from the age of about twelve you have to learn a
211        language and it's normally either French or German.
212   A:   ↑ok↑=
213   E:   I think that's (.)[because] they're cl[osest]
214   A:                    [yeah  ]           [yeah ]
215   A:   Um what do you think is um the best way to learn a foreign
216        language.
217   E:   (.h) I think the best way (.) is to (.) actually go to the
218        country (.h) and as well as having lessons(.) to be able to
219        talk to um people um in their native language every day so
220        the more you speak to.(.)like i-if your learning Eng[lish]
221        the more you
222   A:                                                        [yeah]
223   E:   speak to an Eng[lish] person the more you will
224   A:                  [yeah]
225   E:   get the feel for the language? (.h) so the (.h) easier to
226        pra[ctice] more?
227   A:      [mmhm]
228   E:   coz with me when I first started learning French, (.) I um
229        I was learning in Eng[land]
230   A:                        [uhhm]
231   E:   So I was only practicing like once or twice a week=
232   A:   =yeah=
233   E:   =and it's just not enough=
234   A:   =°yeah it is°
235   E:   so when I moved to France (.) my (.) French improved so
236        much I think I think you're doing the right thing by
237        lear[ning] in Englah[and he he]
238   A:       [yes ]           [ye:ss    ]
239   A:   Yeah (.) urm ok.(.h) urm what do you think is the best
240   A:   way to teach a foreign language?
241   E:   Oh. That's hard. Hehehhehe↑heheheHEHE↑ Urm (1.03) (.h) (.)
242        (.h) urm I don't know I think maybe that as long as you're
243        like very friendly and (.) you're (.) you (.) um engage
244        with the student so the students like you then I think its
245        easier for them to learn from you.
246   A:   m hmm
247   E:   and (.) yeah (.) I-I think like having like quite long
248        lessons as well so that the students have a long.ha-ha-have
249        lots of time to practice and get to learn rather than just
```

```
250        really (.)(.h) short quick lessons like that.
251   A:   mmm
252   E:   Um I'm not sure weather that's the right answer ha ha hee
253        hee hehehehehe?
254   A:   Okay right.
255   E:   (sniffs)
256   A:   Okay um do you think grammar or vocabulary is the most
257        important way when learning a foreign language?
258   E:   (.h) err I think. I think both is very important but I also
259        think that vocabulary is maybe more important than grammar
260        because(.h)you can be <un:derstood with having> like not
261        perfect grammar if your grammar isn't perfect (.) then you
262        can still sometimes then be understood but if you don't
263        have the vocabulary? If you don't have the words?=
264   A:   =yeah=
265   E:   You can't get your meaning across (.h) so I think (.) >yeah
266        yeah< I think they're both very important, but I think
267        vocabulary is slightly more?
268   A:   (1.02) hm
269   E:   I think. A hehe huh
270   A:   Why you think that?
271   E:   Urm (.)I think because it's usually the um the vocabulary
272        that has the meaning whereas (.) y-y- with the grammar you
273        don't need it as such to get your meaning across all the
274        time. To sound like a native speaker you really do need the
275        grammar but at first I-I think vocabulary.(1.11)Do you see
276        what I mean?
277   A: ↑YEah yeah yeah.
278   E:   Um
279   A:   Yeah (.h) okay
280   E:   That's just my opinion so hahaha[haha]
281   A:                                   [ok  ]
282   A:   (.h) urm do you speak a particular variety of English?
283   E:   Any particular variety?
284   A:   Yeah
285   E:   (.h) urm (.) you know what (.) a lot of people tell me
286        that they cant they don't think I have an accent? So I
287        think I speak quite standard English most of the time.
288   A:   mm
289   E:   (.h) but when I'm speaking with some of my friends I do
290        speak in more of a Yorkshire dialect.
291   A:   ah
292   E:   U-u-urm (.) yeah, m-most people say I sound quite
```

```
293        (.) Northern but not any particular region like I don't have
294        a strong accent?
295   A:   mm
296   E:   C-c-c-can you hear accents? Like different British accents?
297   A:   mm (.h) Idon't know (.) just a little bit I can.
298   E:   mm it's hard isn't it ahhehe↑hehehehe↑hehe(.h)coo,
299   A:   If you were teaching english °teaching english°
300   E:   °uh hum°
301   A:   Yeah (.) would you use your normal voice or accent? Or
302        would you change it?
303   E:   (.h) urm (.) I think I'd try to sound more (.)
304   A:   Standard=
305   E:   =Proper, yeah more standard and try and speak with a more
306        neutral accent but (.) I th- I think i-it would be quite
307        hard, but I do think that it would be (.) um I do think I'd
308        probably try and speak.=
309   A:   =°yes°=
310   E:   More formally. Hehehe
311   A:   How?
312   E:   So (.) er um er just pronounce my words better. Speak
313        slower (.) urm (.) I wouldn't really use much slang (.) I'd
314        just (.) yeah. Probably like that you knohehe (.h)
315   A:   Why you think this?
316   E:   Erm I think if because somebody is taught to speak i:n I-I-
317        don't think accent matters as much but I think if somebody
318        is taught to speak in a-a-ur:m speak in a certain dialect?
319   A:   mm
320   E:   (.h) it's not erm (.) it's only understood in that small
321        region of England. And so if if you were taught to speak in
322        a a dialect and you went to America or A-Australia they
323        wouldn't (.h) necessarily understand you as much So.
324   A:   mm
325   E:   I think its better because i-i-if you teach standard
326        Eng[lish] because you could apply it to
327   A:      [mm  ]
328   E:   Anywhere in the world.
329   A:   Yeah
330   E:   Rather than just (.)
331   A:   Yeah
332   E:   One small area haha yeahaa.
333   A:   Okay. Is the spread of English around the world a good
334        thing?
335   E:   Is there sorry?
```

```
336  A:  Is the spread (.) of English (.) around the world a good
337      thing?
338  E:  Um err( h..) (.h) I think there's a few different arguments
339      for that. I think (.) erm (.) I-I think it's a good thing
340      because it means that instead of having to learn a hundred
341      languages (.) you can learn one and pretty much be
342      under[stood ] most of the places that
343  A:        [°yeah°]
344  E:  You go (.h) but also I don't (.) I wouldn't like to think
345      English was going out and killing any other languages
346      hehehe=
347  A:  =mm hmm=
348  E:  =You know I think urm (.h) I think its i-i-it is go-go-good
349      t-t-to have separate languages because because it shows
350      your own identity. But at the same time it's good to have
351      one language that can be understood by a whole lot, y-y-you
352      know. By a lot of the world.
353  A:  Yeah. Do you think English killing other languages.
354  E:  Urm (.h) I-I think it may. I-I don't think it is now but I
355      think it may in the future (.) I (.)
356  A:  How?
357  E:  (.) um (.h) because in at urm right now (.)
358  A:  mm
359  E:  In many like business conferences (.) and like a-a lot of
360      international gatherings English is the language that is
361      used.
362  A:  mm hmm
363  E:  (.) an:d (.) (.h) I think if if English i-is used more and
364      more people will use it more as their first language (.h)
365      for example. In the British Isles there were lots of
366      different languages but  Eng[lish  ] has taken over like in
367      Wales (.)
368  A:                            [mm hmm] yeah
369  E:  Not many people speak Welsh any more
370  A:  Hmm
371  E:  Because um english has taken over
372  A:  Yeah
373  E:  And in Scotland not many people speak Scotts anymore (.)
374      but because English has been taking over and now there's a
375      bit of a backlash?
376  A:  Yeah
377  E:  Because there's lots of schools that are just teaching in
378      Welsh now in Wales just to keep the language alive.
```

```
379  A:  Yeah
380  E:  I think in in Edinburgh there theres a Gallic school?
381  A:  Yes
382  E:  Th-th-that just teaches in that language just to keep the
383      language alive because I think (.h)
384  E:  Yeah do-do you see what [I mean  ] ahehehehe
385  A:                          [yeah yeah]
386  E:  I-I think if it's happened here it could happen in the
387      future but I don't think it is on a global scale right now.
388  A:  mm
389  E:  But (.) yeah it has ha ha (sniffs)
390  A:  Okay (.) urm do you think that learning another language
391      change your culture or personality in any way?
392  E:  No no I don't think I think um.  language. To me is just a
393      way to express yourself?
394  A:  Yes
395  E:  So I don't think( .) like for example if I went to France
396      and I was speaking French all the time (.) I'd still be me,
397      (.) I just wouldn't be speaking in English. So I would still
398      be me. I would still have my own ideas.=
399  A:  =yes=
400  E:  =But I would be expressing them in French.=
401  A:  =Yeah=
402  E:  =Instead of English so I don't think it would change my
403      personality=
404  A:  =mm hmm=
405  E:  =But I don't that's me personally again hehe.
406  A:  Thank you. (.h) In your experience do you do English people
407      use English effectively to communicate with people who have
408      a different first language?
409  E:  Oh (.) probably Not. No. hahahaha. No I think that a lot of
410      English people are quite impatient or or they get annoyed
411      if they are not understood with not speaking English.=
412  A:  =Yeah=
413  E:  =Because (.h) I think they have this idea in their head
414      that everybody in the world speaks English so everybody
415      should understand them when they're speaking english.=
416  A:  =yeah
417  E:  (.h) (h.) (.h) Have you found that? When when youre?
418  A:  Yeah when I first came to England.=
419  E:  =Yeah=
420  A:  =Yeah.
421  E:  (.h) oh right but um not so much now?
```

```
422  A:  Er no its ok not too much. But when I came first here some
423       people just speak. (makes a gesture?)
424  E:  Oh an
425  A:  Yeah
426  E:  Speak really f[ast an]
427  A:              [yeah re]ally fast and you know. Not standard
428       accent just a particular accent.=
429  E:  =Yeah yeah yeah. There are urm. I think think Y-York i-is
430       ok.=
431  A:  =yeah=
432  E:  =I I think there are a lot of cities that have really
433       really.=
434  A:  =Yeah=
435  E:  =Really h-h-hard acchhenthhs to learn he he
436  A:  Yeah
437  E:  Like like I suppose like in Newcastle its very hard for me
438       to understand people there.
439  A:  Edinburgh.
440  E:  Yeah yeah yeah. Edinburgh very hard.
441  A:  Yeah=
442  E:  =Yeah I cant underst-hh-and so-ho-me peo-heo-ple th-there
443       so so do-h-n't worry hehehe. (.h)
444  A:  Yeah ok I think that's all the questions.
445  E:  Is that everything?
446  A:  Yeah
447  E:  ↑OK↓ cool cool
448  A:  Yeah thank you
449  E:  Right so I'll just on the end of that. So your names Ali
450  A:  Ali yeah
451  E:  And you're from Libya
452  A:  From Libya yeah
453  E:  Okay right I'll stop that there.
```

Interview 7: Kate = UK student, Tom = International student

Time: 21:24

353 lines

```
01  K:  Friday November 23rd, TESOL interview

02  K:  Okay (.) en I'm on en (.) Third year now of my (.) BA

03      degree linguistics so we want to just interview today to

04      look at your English language skills so that we can

05      (.) assess for what we feel your needs are to do a

06      lesson plan and it's the very assignment that we're

07      doing, Okay? So, first of all en (.) do you think it is

08      important to learn English as a second language?

09  T:  Yes, that's very important for (.) English students.

10  K:  Okay, yeah, so (.) why do you think it's important? so you

11      learning English so why it's important to you ?=

12  T:  =en (.) actually before when I was in China my parents are

13      force me to study English, because they think they thought

14      the English is (.) it a it a i:international in language=

15  K:  =right=

16  T:  =and in mu: in many countries, if you speak another language

17      you can (.) find a good job easily=

18  K:  =Okay=

19  T:  =so and (.) in our country there is a lot of company en (.)

20      companies came from (.) American or (.) England or Canada so

21      they speak English ,so if you speak good English you

22      can (.) find a job=

23  K:  =Okay=

24  T:  =and °it's a very good job°

25  K:  Okay, so did you learn English at school?=

26  T:  =en, actually two years ago I (.) I was studying in (.) in

27      China, it's a intensive (.) English course.

28  K:  Okay (.) so was that one you left school? You you completed

29      your education and you did an intensive course.

30  T:  en just do intensive course=

31  K:  =how how long was that?

32  T:  en (.) one year and (.) change another school for 3 ye-3

33      months=

34  K:  =so you did one course for one year and second course for

35      3 months yeah? Was that when you first started learning?

36  T:  First started learning (.) Primary school
```

```
37   K:   Primary school
38   T:   just the bas[ic  ]
39   K:              [Okay]
40   T:   they teach you how to (xxx) and the letter=
41   K:   =Okay, so in primary school you did as part of your lessons
42        in primary school you learnt English and then you're done your
43        intensive course and been 3 months intensive course as
44        we[ll].
45   T:     [Yes]
46   K:   =So maybe when you perhaps 6,7 then when you first started
47        learning English? (4.1) Did you find it difficult learning
48        English?
49   T:   (.) I think is grammar
50   K:   Okay, is that the only thing that you find hard?
51   T:   en (.) I think grammar and listening listening
52   K:   Listening, yeah? (.) What do you find hard about listening?
53   T:   en because en well en China my my tutor was (.) was a a (.)
54        was was (.) a  foreign people came
55   K:   [sh-whi-in-en]
56   T:   [Austra]-Austral=
57   K:   =Australia or Austral?=
58   T:   =Australia=
59   K:   =Australia?
60   T:   Yeah, And another one came from (.) another one came from A-
61        Aland
62   K:   Ireland?
63   T:   Yeah=
64   K:   =So they have quite strong accent.
65   T:   =Yes, very strong accent and when I ca-came to UK and when I
66        talk to young people completely couldn't understand [yes]
67   K:                                                        [en]
68   T:   Because it's quite fast and it's not clear and they always
69        speaking they speak is not average is is different accent (.)
70        so it's difficult to
71   K:   Okay, so (.) really it's grammar you find difficult i-is the
72        grammar (.h) difficult for because it's so different to
73        Chinese?
74   T:   Yes, different=
75   K:   =TOTALLY different
76   T:   en, not really s-some ha-[half-half]
77   K:                            [some things are similar] half and
78        half ok, so grammar (.) quite  difficult and listening quite
79        difficult and many pronunciations? (.) Possibly or not will
```

```
80            you okay with that?=
81    T:      =en (.) I'm not sure.
82    K:      You are not sure, okay (.) so why you learning English? we
83            said you said you-y hopefully to get a better job (.) en in
84            China because lots of companies want you to speak [English].
85    T:                                                        [en]
86    K:      So are there any other reasons? (.) Is it mainly you learning
87            English for work? (.) for job prospects?=
88    T:      =yes probably for future=
89    K:      =[future    ] work
90    T:       [future work]
91    K:      Will you do any more academic study, Tom, once you finish
92            your course here?=
93    T:      =en, the first year I finish, then academic study.=
94    K:      =Okay, so it's gonna be to look at the job but also you need
95            English for doing more academic study yeah? Wha-What do you
96            think you might study in? (.) What course do you think you
97            might do when you finish your English course?=
98    T:      =en (.) business manage[ment]
99    K:                             [okay]
100   T:      in the college=
101   K:      =Okay, in England?=
102   T:      =Yes, probably I'm interesting on financial.
103   K:      Okay, so business management (.) finance and maybe psychology.
104   T:      [psy-]
105   K:      [en  ]it's an interesting combina[tion        ]
106   T:                                       °[combination]°
107   K:      Okay, Do you think you might study here? at Yorkshire
108           University? eah?=
109   T:      =Yorkshire University yeah Nex-Next September.
110   K:      Okay (5.0) What's the things to do in English now if you were
111           going out,would you (.) speak English maybe if you were going
112           to a bar or (.) if you are going shopping or (.) do you tend
113           to speak (.) your own language with with colleagues or
114           friends. When when do you using English?=
115   T:      =en it's depends on on what kind of friends are talking to
116           i-if I talking to my (.) my friends er who come from my own
117           country we speak we are speaking Chinese. If talk to a foreign
118           stu-International [student]
119   K:                       [yeah]
120   T:      are speaking English, °we speak°
121   K:      Okay, so if you go shopping or if you go out to a bar with
122           international students you trying to speak English (.)
```

```
123        usually. Yeah? (5.6) °Ok ° (.) Do you think you can improve
124        your English dramatically since you've started the course here
125        in England?
126 T:     [it's a] very
127 K:     [yeah  ] you speed up (.) understanding and speak[ing     ]?
128 T:                                                       [yeah,yeah]
129        and improved I improved my speaking and lstening.
130 K:     Okay, (3.7) why do you think that is, Why do you think it's
131        improved?
132 T:     Because, because i-in this er (.) environment.
133 K:     environment=
134 T:     =Yeah, because lots of people around-arounding they speaking
135        English and so en in the class in the college you always
136        speaking you are always speaking English.
137 K:     [yeah]
138 T:     [so  ] so long time long time (.) long time later you can
139        speak-improve your speaking °and and°
140 K:     so you you getting lots of more Practice aren't you? yeah
141 T:     °Cost time°.
142 K:     Okay (5.0) wha-what do you find I know you talked about what
143        do you found hard about learning English to begin with but(.)
144        out of certain skills could you tell me what you find hardest?
145        So if I said to you that things we would look at would be
146        reading (.) listening (.) speaking (.)or writing. Which of
147        those do you find most difficult? (.) You said you found
148        listening difficult didn't you? So we're looked that so you
149        got speaking, writing en (.) and reading do you find any of
150        those difficult?=
151 T:     =en like er (.) all of the Chinese students before came learn
152        er UK and we have to take a exa-IELTS examination
153 K:     =en, what? sorry=
154 T:     =IELTS
155 K:     right
156 T:     It's er a (.) international language system.=
157 K:     =right=
158 T:     =yeah and we have to er-they include speaking,writing,reading
159        and listening (.) er the reading is more difficult because the
160        articles more than=
161 K:     =Okay=
162 T:     =So actually we don't (.) we don't understand wha-what the
163        article want to say or tell [us].
164 K:                                 [so] (.)so right(.) so you said
165        you you may be guess the gist
```

```
166 T:   ↑[just,just] guess
167 K:   [yeah]
168 T:   what does it mean a lot words, I don't=
169 K:   =so you understand some but not all=
170 T:   =yeah it quite academic,quite[la-]          °[la-      ]°
171 K:                                  [academic] and [okay, okay] so
172      reading then you find. Do you find everyday things that you
173      have to do,do you find that Ok? Is just the academic work?
174      yeah, and listening (.) it's tricky. Yeah, ok.
175      (10)
176 K:   Do you think er with the way the lessons are structured
177      now in your en (.) English language lessons is there anything
178      that you'd like to change? or that you think could work
179      better? Or do you think the lessons (.) are quite work (.)
180      quite work for you?
181 T:   en (.) I think (.) it's school [school]
182 K:                                  [it's] you you quite like it?=
183 T:   =Yeah en don't need to change (.) it's quite interesting and
184       in the class tutor always (.) tell tell us (.) some some (.)
185       en information on story about(.) England.
186 K:   °okay° What sort of activities do you like doing best in the
187       class? What do you enjoy most?
188 T:   (4.9) Watching movie.
189 K:   en?
190 T:   Watching movie
191 K:   ↑Watching Watching something on the Tele [(laugh) Yeah]
192 T:                                            [(laugh) Yeah]
193 K:   So watching a clip or movie or something like that okay
194       (.) Why?
195 T:   It's en because en (.) sometimes it's different it's depend
196       on (.) which season en because in some season (.) in the
197       morning the student quite s-er-sleepy=
198 K:   =Okay=
199 T:   =it has so er tu-tutor en choose something you can't en you
200       en you can keep mind is clear=
201 K:   =en so to get your mind going. Yeah ,you want something
202        more interesting on the morning, yeah=
203 T:   =Yeah so maybe watching a movie is en=
204 K:   =Ok so what type of activities do you do in your classes
205       then if you had a movie clip (.) wha-what sorts of things
206       would you do after you'd watched the movie?
207 T:   en the tutor will give you some (.) some question about the
208       story=
```

```
209 K:   =Okay
210 T:   en you have to watch and write down some informations and
211      answer the question and en write report=
212 K:   =Okay, so you write report listen to the language on the
213      movie and then you'd have to write some[comprehension]
214 T:                                          [yes and then]
215      repeat story.
216 K:   Okay, yeah so repeat parts of the stories.
217      (11)
218 K:   Do you think everybody in your class is at the similar level
219      to [you]?
220 T:      [en n-no]
221 K:   Do you think [all], No?
222 T:                [n-n] it's quite different distance.
223 K:   Okay, so where would er you say you fit into the class in
224      skills?
225 T:   en (.) in in my class (.) because we got (.) twenty I think
226      twenty-one [students, in-international]
227 K:              [so twen-twenty-one        ] international
228      students, yeah?=
229 T:   =yeah, yeah from different country.
230 T:   and some students who came from er (.) Poland, Angola (.)
231      en (.) their English level is quite high.=
232 K:   =Okay
233 T:   Higher than other students their English en we got (.) we got
234      maybe six or seven Chinese students because som-some of them
235      (.) some of them their English is quite low.=
236 K:   =Okay, is is that in speaking? Or i-in all areas? is it just
237      in speaking or=
238 T:   =just listening.
239 K:   speaking and listening or JUST listening?=
240 T:   =just listening.=
241 K:   =JUST listening.
242 T:   yeah, and in class some Chinese students always ask me and
243      always talk to me in (.) in Chinese so I don't like it.
244 K:   no, cause you need to speak English.=
245 T:   =yeah, maybe this is this is their first year.=
246 K:   =Okay=
247 T:   =so en so they can't be so expressive (.) express themselves
248      [in English].
249 K:   [en        ] so they'll find it very hard so they'll get
250      explanation from you in Chinese. [yeah?]
251 T:                                    [yeah]
```

```
252 K:   okay (.) do you work in pairs in the class sometimes?=
253 T:   =yeah, sometimes ,sometimes in pair sometimes in group,
254      [so ] metimes individual.=
255 K:   =[Okay] What do you like best?
256 T:   en (.) I think (pairs)
257 K:   pairs, why is that?
258 T:   en (.) because just two people and you can(.) you can make
259      the idea together it's very [clearly].
260 K:                              [so      ]=
261 T:   =and group too many people to a lot of idea for you to
262      (.) which [is] (.)
263 K:             [Okay]
264 T:   you have to spend lots of time.
265 K:   so you like work in pairs best cause you can share ideas but
266      groups you find harder because too many different en ideas and
267      opinions.=
268 T:   =en you have to (.) spend long time to (.) to compare.
269 K:   Okay
270      (10)
271 K:   What does your tutor do now to (.) en (.) to try confront the
272      fact that there are so many different abilities in you class?
273      you said you've got (.) some Polish, Angolan students whose
274      English level is very high and then maybe some Chinese
275      students whose English they'll find it more difficult so how
276      does the teacher cope with that? (.) Do they do, maybe does
277      she do any extra tasks for the students (.) that work more
278      quickly or?=
279 T:   =en I think, I think (.) en (.) en (.) I think maybe these
280      students who English level en i-is is lower maybe they not
281      enough (.) en working working working harder.
282 K:   Okay, so does she give them extra work to do? o:r?
283 T:   en sometimes yes, en some homework on [blackboard].
284 K:                                         [Okay,Okay ] so that's
285      for the students that find things easy. She might do more (.)
286      or do you mean that she does extra work for the students that
287      find things difficult?
288 T:   easy
289 K:   easy. so the students who find things Easy she may do (.)
290      extra examples on the board for them while everybody else is
291      working out the other (.) a-activities perhaps.
292 T:   en
293 K:   Yeah?
294      (15)
```

```
295 T:  She may have to improve every individual study.
296 K:  okay
297     (10)
298 T:  not individual, independence study.
299 K:  Independence study? Okay.
300     (7)
301 K:  Okay, Tom, have you got any questions you want to ask me?
302     Because you've got some (.) I think you've got an assignment#
303     to do. Rachel said you might want to ask us some questions?
304 T:  en (.)
305 K:  or you are not sure?=
306 T:  =let me see because yesterday I don't know what kind of
307     interview, er (.)
308     (10)
309 T:  So er you said you said you er your subject ling-
310 K:  Linguistics
311 T:  Linguistics, yeah, yeah, so. [are you going to be a English
312 K:                              [So en- yeah en-yeah English
313 T:  teacher?                                        ]
314 K:  language, quite a lot to do with] grammar. Yes, hopefully I
315     want to teach er (.)=
316 T:  =teaching English=
317 K:  =No, I want to teach ALL subjects for for primary school
318     children? en (.) so I'll finish my degree in May. And then
319     I'll have to do a year's teacher training to be able to teach.
320     So I'll have a year (.) after study (.) So quite looking
321     forward to finishing now (.) cause it's a long time, I have my
322     degree for three years(.) And then en (.) a year's teaching
323     practice in the end.
324 T:  so do you think er, i-it's er if you te- if you (.) teach (.)
325     international students so (.) er what do you think which way
326     is better to(.) en to improve English (.) en International
327     students English level very quickly?
328 K:  ↑WHICH is the best way to do it very quickly? En, it's
329     difficult I think to be a good English teacher (.) you for
330     international students it has to be interesting and fun and
331     everybody has to feel relaxed and feel like they want to do
332     it but I think the most important thing is lots of practice
333     (.) so having the opportunity to practice lots (.) Always
334     speaking English not speaking in your own language as much as
335     you possibly can. So I think that's really good (.) and I
336     think(.) it's good that you are in a mixed class with lots of
337     nationalities because you've got students that (.) have
```

```
338      different abilities and they can help each other so like you
339      said if you work in a pair (.) you could have somebody that
340      whose English level is a little bit higher than the other
341      person and they can help each other so that's good too (.) But
342      think it has to be fun and interesting. Like you say when you
343      come in the morning, in the first lesson (.) if it's lots of
344      reading and it's very boring, it can be (.) not much fun.
345      Whereas if you have something very interesting to look at
346      you've got a movie or a video clip or some music that you
347      could look at that makes it a little bit more interesting.
348      cause you're all interested in that then, aren't you? so
349 T:   en
350 K:   Okay, Anything else you'd like to ask?
351 T:   en
352 K:   That's all? Ok, well thank you Tom for er (.) taking part, so
353      very grateful.
```

Interview 8a: Kate = UK student, Roy = International student

Time: 1:39 - 2:32 (53 seconds) of 13:11

22 lines

```
01  K: yeah (.) okay did you find it difficult to learn English?
02  R: a-at the beginning I think it's it's Easy but (.) if you er (.)
03     °(…)°
04  K: maybe once you learn the basic thing then you get to the more
05     difficult thing [th  ] en you find harder=
06  R:                 [yeah] =yeah yeah right °[what I mean]°
07  K:                                          [yeah yeah] okay so
08     (.) when you at primary school you learn (.) basic conversation
09     did [you]?
10  R:      [yeah] basic conversa[tion]
11  K:                           [and] (.) you found that okay?=
12  R: =yeah err err how are you[yeah then    ]
13  K:                          [yeah (.) yeah] Hello (.) how
14     are[you]
15  R:     [yeah]=
16  K: = yeah ok (.) why you learning a language why you learning
17     English?
18  R: (1.9) en you (1.9) I I said it's get a job if if you can learn
19     English you can get a good job and E-English is more more
20     popular in in China=
21  K: =right =
22  R: =so (.) we we just learn English=
```

Interview 8b: Kate = UK student, Roy = International student

Time: 5:40 - 6:55 (75 seconds) of 13:11

34 lines

```
01  K: en (.) what sort of things in your lessons now do you think
02     (.) en you really enjoy doing=
03  R: =yeah, I really enjoying =
04  K: y-you enjoy your les[sons] =
05  R:                     [yeah]
06  K: =what type of activities that Rachel does with you (.) do you
```

```
07        enjoy doing (.) so maybe (.) practicing your writing maybe (.)
08        listening to things (.) maybe watching something on the video
09        clip (.) what types of things do you enjoy?
10   R:   I enjoy to en (.) we'll discuss something=
11   K:   =discussions=
12   R:   =yeah discussions=
13   K:   =right=
14   R:   =yeah wi-with tutor or students=
15   K:   =right=
16   R:   =yeah=
17   K:   =okay and do you normally en:(.) work in small groups? (.) or
18        do you work in pairs?=
19   R:   =yeah, I I prefer working alone as I wor- I know we must with
20        a group=
21   K:   =right so you like work as part of (.) maybe part of small
22        group do you? =
23   R:   =yes small group just three of th[em]
24   K:                                    [right]
25   R:   if more then I don't like
26   K:   you you don't like big groups
27   R:   yeah, big group
28   K:   okay why?
29   R:   (.) I th- er it's difficult to control everything if we get a
30        big group everyone have a different idea we should discuss
31        and talk too much if there three people or two people it's
32        easy to=
33   K:   to agree or [something] yeah
34   R:               [to agree] agree something
```

Interview 8c: Kate = UK student, Roy = International student

Time: 9:34 - 11:03 (89 seconds) of 13:11

30 lines

```
01   K:   right (.) brilliant okay (.) how much (.)time do you think
02        you've spent on em listening and speaking in your lessons? do
03        you think they spent a lot of time on listening and speaking
04        or is there more time spent on (.)(.h) vocabulary and grammar
05   R:   I don't organize [the the]=
06   K:                    [or writing]
07   R:   =actually th:e the (.) particularly the time=
```

```
08   K:  =right you are not sure=
09   R:  =yeah yeah [I'm not sure]
10   K:             [just] it's a mixture=
11   R:  =yeah [a mixture yeah]
12   K:        [about lessons] right okay en (5.8) what do you feel is
13       more important when your learning English? to learn your
14       vocabulary and have quite big range of things that you know
15       how to say or do you think that grammar is more important (.)
16       what's more important for you personally
17   R:  I think gram-no no en pronunciation [no] VOCABULARY yeah
18   K:                                      [you]
19   R:  [yeah]
20   K:  [yeah] vocabulary is more important because you can get your
21        meaning over=
22   R:  =yeah yeah you can say the words the others can understand the
23       words maybe get the meaning (.) whole meaning (.) yeah you
24       must now the grammar but don't know the words (.) how to
25       explain them=
26   K:  =yeah=
27   R:  =I think the vocabulary is more important [their]
28   K:                                            [more] important for
29       you for what you [want] use English [for] yeah (.) okay
30   R:                   [yeah]              [right]
```

Interview 9: Grace = UK student, Tom = International student

Time: 6:37

126 lines

```
01   G: right, so hello (ha ha ha)=
02   T: =hello
03   G: I'm Grace (ha ha)=
04   T: =I'm Tony
05   G: so why are you learning English?
06   T: um (2.3) there are many [r-Reason-s why] (.) I learning
07      English um (.) in my er English is(.)er international
08      language=
09   G: =yeah=
10   T: =and in my country er English is very important because er if
11      we can speak English you can find a job (.)
12      good job[in a]
13   G:          [right yeah]
14   T: in a big company er or something (.) if you go to another
15      country you speak another country's language but you can speak
16      English=
17   G: =yeah=
18   T: =you can you can er have a good conversation with=
19   G: =you can find a (.) common ground yeah=
20   T: =yeah
21   G: so wha-where are you from?
22   T: I'm from China the north of China
23   G: and Chinese is also the other big language [so if]you can
24      speak
25   T:                                         [er] I DON't think
26      so (laugh)=
27   G: I think it is I think one day everything will be English and
28      Chinese cos they're I [think] theyre the two (.) big languages
29   T:                       [yeah]well er when I er when(.) in China
30      when student (.) er when children go to(.) primary
31      sch[ool] they
32   G:    [yes yeah yeah]
33   T: have to study (.) some er some basic language er [English]
34   G:                                                  [yeah]
35   T: and in middle school high school have to study some low level
36      English
```

```
37   G: yeah so you start from young age
38   T: as main subject
39   G: so er in the lessons that you do with Rachel=
40   T: =yeah=
41   G: =um um what part of the class do you enjoy? like(.) is there
42      particular things that she does with you that you think are
43      really good and really useful for learning English
44   T: ummmm=
45   G: =like(.) is it best when shes=
46   T: =I think (.) I think errr the advantage English skill um
47      grammar is more useful=
48   G: =grammar yeah=
49   T: =yeah grammar is more useful (.) and I'm not good at grammar=
50   G: =yeah=
51   T: =so=
52   G: =so you think that's an area that you need to improve=
53   T: =en yeah
54   G: so um (2.5) wha (.) um do you like working on your own like so
55      say if Rachel gave you a task
56   T: en
57   G: would you rather (.) like go away and work on it on your own
58      and then come back when you memorize it all of it or do you
59      prefer like work in groups or
60   T: em I thin=
61   G: =or like when Rachel picks people like says you (.) what's
62      that (laugh)
63   T: um (.) it's depends on what kind of task sometimes (.) I like
64      to work in group
65   G: um
66   T: sometimes err(.) because I'm not errr wha- and takes take a
67      task
68   G: yeah
69   T: like to library and do by myself=
70   G: =yeah=
71   T: =and then take er take paper back
72   G: yeah so you like do it (.) do it with the class
73   T: yeah
74   G: and then look at it yourself and yeah (.) so um do you use
75      English at home and outside the classroom [as well I mean]
76   T:                                           [ummmm]
77   G: obviously if yer in England [(laugh)]
78   T:                             [s- ]
79   G: you gonna have to use it (laugh) [sometimes]
```

```
80   T:                                    [some some] yeah sometimes
81        but in er in class er have to use English and you know it's
82        depends er who is your [room] er housemate
83   G:                             [room] yeah yeah
84   T:  yeah my housemate is Chinese so
85   G:  alright (laugh)
86   T:  so always speak Chinese
87   G:  yeah yeah (.) so erm what do you think makes a good English
88        teacher? (1.7) anyone if there is one thing about (.) an
89        English teacher that you think makes they makes them good
90   T:  em? you your question of ? What is your question? Sorry
91   G:  um what what makes what makes Rachel a good English teacher
92   T:  oh
93   G:  em
94   T:  errrr (2.5) errrr (1.8) I think Rachel is a good good English
95        teacher like er in our class er we have three teacher three
96        teach[ers]
97   G:       [yeah]
98   T:  so have a good um they have a good teaching experience
99   G:  yeah
100  T:  and er (.) they know how to have good communication with
101       students and umm (.)errr(.) gave student more useful
102       information the student wanted=
103  G:  =yeah=
104  T:  =and errr(.)they do do some more active activity in class and
105       make student very interesting on er in class
106  G:  yeh so do you think the do you think the information that you
107       learn in the lessons is useful to use in real life
108  T:  you mean in foundation or
109  G:  yeah well a-any
110  T:  I think that in foundation is er information is more useful er
111       in next year a year errr we study in year one
112  G:  yeah yeah
113  T:  yeah(3.2)
114  G:  yeah
115  T:  but in class all t-teacher they have a good patience
116  G:  yeah
117  T:  because er English is not our er first language so our t=
118  G:  =so they are not trying to go too fast
119  T:  yeah so lots of so a lot of like local language or something
120       you don't understand always asked ask er teachers and they
121       have a good patience and tell to tell you what's this mean and
122       er something
```

123 G: yeah so er that's about it? thank you very much and I think
124   you are very good English speaker (ha ha)
125 T: no I just try try my best
126 G: no you sound very (.) very natural

Interview 10: Ursula = UK student, Xin = International student

Time: 2:41

54 lines

```
01  U: right, k, so how old were you when you started to learn
02     English?
03  X: en when I (.) was in primary school in China about (.) six or
04     seven years old.
05  U: °yeah° did you find easy to pick up at that age? is it quite
06     difficult?
07  X: em, sometimes it's easy word and easy things i-it's easy to
08     understand but sometime (.) it's hard=
09  U: =yeah (laugh) (.) en why did you want come to England to learn
10     English?
11  X: em it's for my job in the future.
12  U: and what's that going to be?
13  X: I'd like to be a businesswoman yeah and use English to talk
14     with my customer.
15     (6.8)
16  U: en in your lessons then (.) wha-which ones do you find the
17     most valuable to your learning? your reading or your speaking=
18  X: =speaking
19  U: speaking?
20  X: yeah
21  U: do you think that's the most important? (.) [skill to learn]
22  X:                                             [it's it's quite]
23     important and writing is the same important I think
24  U: °yeah° (.h) (5.2) erm which one which one the lessons do you
25     find the most challenging? which one do your struggle with the
26     most
27  X: yeah writing=
28  U: =the writing (.) is the the grammar all that different to your
29     Chinese?=
30  X: = yes, it's quite different
31  U: like word order, is is that different?
32  X: yes
33  U: do you find it quite easy to pick up?
34  X: em, sometimes it's how to say it's depend on different (.)
35     type °yes°
36  U: =yeah (4.3) um (.) do you feel that the skills yer learn in
```

```
37         yer lessons help yer when yer talking to friends or to people
38         that you meet?
39   X:    yes=
40   U:    =yeah, do you find that the topics are the same topics that
41         come up when your with your friends?
42   X:    yeah=
43   U:    =yes (.h) (4.8) um is there anything that you would like to
44         cover that doesn't get brought up in yer the class any topics
45         that you'd like to learn about
46   X:    writing
47   U:    writing?
48   X:    yeah (.h)(.) and grammar
49   U:    then more on grammar
50   X:    yes, it's very important
51         (3.1)
52   U:    do you do a lot of grammar in your lessons?
53   X:    yes, sometime
54   U:    yeah.
```

Interview 11: Natalie = UK student, Magda = Poland and Xin = International
student

Time: 00:00 - 20:46 of 32:12

384 lines

```
01   N: hopefully, it's recording we'll have a little chat and then
02      play it back (.h) so °Mag[da]°
03   M:                         [are] we recording now?
04   N: yeah, we are, ok, hopefully we are (laugh)
05   M: okay, so we'll check in a minute.
06   N: (laugh) we'll check in a minute. urmmm so Magda you're you're
07      Polish, yes=
08   M: =yes=
09   N: =and and ummm your mother tongue is obviously [P]olish
10   M:                                             [Polish]
11   N: (.h) and do you speak any other languages?
12   M: er ummm apart from English what I used to learn German for a
13      couple of years quite many actually but I don't think if I can
14      write I know the foundations but I don't I don't think if I
15      can er write this language as the language I speak.
16   N: okay (.h) and um (.) and English and your mother [language]=
17   M:                                                 [yes] and
18      English
19   M: and English and how long have you (.h) been learning English
20      for?
21   M: um since for about ummm (.) can't remem-er for about (.)
22      I can't remember maybe (.) 10 years altogether=
23   N: =okay, that's lovely (.h)
24   M: yeah
25   N: we'll stop it to see if it's working (laugh)
26   (stop the recorder)
27   N: okay, Xin and what your nationality (.) is?
28   X: Chinese=
29   N: =Chinese=
30   X: I'm Chinese
31   N: °okay° and (.) what language do you speak?
32   X: just Chinese and English=
33   N: =English (.) and how long have you been studying or learning
34      English for? (.) °approximately°
35   X: um I started learning English about (.) six years
```

```
36   N: right (.) okay (.) and er (1.3) Magda do you think better to
37      study English in an English speaking community?
38   M: yes, definitely, but because it's completely different if you
39      learn English i-i as I used to learn English in my
40      country, it's completely different I I wasn't surrounded w-w-
41      by wh-what people er what native speakers are (.) yeah, I
42      think we could we learn a lot more from the native speakers so
43      that,change your accent, like that yeah=
44   N: =yeah that's 1 [an-]
45   M:                 [I] think it's definitely better
46   N: yeah, good, good and Xin what do you do, do you think it's
47      better to learn in an English speaking community as well?
48   X: I don't know (laugh) because ummm I just a Chinese English
49      speaker my first time came here I even can't understand
50      a-anything=
51   N: =yes=
52   X: =so I I don't know it's better well I just try to keep going
53      speak with some people you know it's difficult to er about
54      when I was speak something wrong in grammar but I didn't er
55      (.) exactly know how to use grammar I just remember the
56      vocabulary when you said the vocabulary people will understand
57      what you said but they will say you are right this this
58      sentence=
59   N: =righ-=
60   X: =if they can understand you but they won't say you can't say
61      THAT you should say THAT=
62   N: =people don't correct you=
63   X: =yeah so I think I keep the wrong way (laugh) to speak
64   N: right, okay(.h) Margaret for your reasons for actually
65      learning English what would you like to tell me about those
66      please?
67   M: (laugh) umm well at first I started my my parent they
68      encourage me at to go for the private lessons but yeah
69      probably because of umm English (.) b-because of a l-anguge
70      global yeah because of it's popularity its
71      English is every where jus-just every where I can get er if I
72      speak English I can get better job I can get better
73      opportunities in the future=
74   N: =en en=
75   M: =and I think that's why yeah so
76   N: right and you Xin? what-
77   X: yeah, I can be quite similar, but I started English in my
78      middle school just started learn how to say A B C D (.) I came
```

```
79       here is my father's idea (laugh)=
80   N:  =right=
81   X:  =so (laugh) I think exactly the same as you=
82   M:  =yeah, yeah=
83   X:  =I think I can get the better job get better opportunity
84   M:  get better job I think [it's] right
85   X:                         [it's] yeah English is an international
86       (.) language=
87   M:  =yeah yeah=
88   X:  language I really th-=
89   M:  = you can get better [better] job better job for the
90   N:                       [yeah yeah] so you both believe
91        that that is a good reason=
92   M:  =yeah =
93   N:  =that your job opportunities will be (.) better for you yeah,
94       excellent
95   X:  or maybe not
96   M:  (laugh)=
97   X:  because=
98   M:  =we hope =
99   X:  =yeah because in my country most of people they learn English
100      because they are in my country have the exactly language
101      school they just study language maybe four or three, different
102      two so they speak VERY WEll English and another language so
103      it's natural be opportunity in China because
104  M:  wooo because =
105  X:  =because in a big company you'll find everyone speaks
106      Eng[lish]
107  M:     [every]one yeah yeah yeah everyone speaks English everyone
108      learns English yeah
109  N:  right ok so so basically bo- if you (.) if I ask you Magda
110      first you are going to use your knowledge of English in the
111      future=
112  M:  =yes=
113  N:  =basically for work=
114  M:  =work yeah work, life if I stay here longer (laugh) for longer
115  N:  right and Xin too?
116  X:  I don't think so I think E-English is just like a (.) how to
117      say that I'm learning English because I want to learn the
118      knowledge about an-another things but if I can't speak English
119      I can't understand what teacher said so I SHOULD know but I
120      want to study another things maybe finance or something like
121      that just because I live here I SHOULD speak English
```

```
122      (laugh)=
123  M:  =yeah (laugh)=
124  N:  =right ok umm Magda firstly what do you think your
125      priority language and communication needs are (.) or what what
126      sort of skills do you do you think that you'll need in
127      preparation for any further studies.
128  M:  (1.3) umm=
129  N:  =for instance=
130  M:  =w-what needs to be improved=
131  N:  =yes just like do you do you think reading or writing or=
132  M:  =yeah well at first I would say that umm speaking about umm I
133      think I need to improve about (.) actually a writing ones and
134      then to reading writing and speaking everything needs to be
135      improved
136  N:  right (laugh) and and you Xin then wha- what what do you think
137      you'll need for your further study which areas of language
138      like reading or writing or listening
139  X:  I think everything
140  N:  or
141  X:  (laugh) yeah
142  N:  ok umm umm what do you feel that you need I suppose that's
143      almost repeating it(.) and you you you you feel that you NEED
144      to work on all aspects=
145  M:  =yes=
146  N:  =of the language skills=
147  M:  =yeah it's definitely and grammar as well I didn't say
148      about grammar yeah I got a few problems with grammar as
149      well
150  N:  right=
151  M:  =so ACTUALLY everything (laugh)=
152  N:  =everything
153  X:  I have really bad grammar
154  M:  (laugh) bad grammar=
155  N:  =I'm sure you are not (laugh) ok so you think that all those
156      skills reading writing listening speaking grammar work all are
157      all important aspects for your teaching
158  X:  yes
159  N:  yeah right what sort of Magda you first what sort of
160      activities do you like doing umm (.) in in class?
161  M:  yes=
162  N:  =yes?=
163  M:  =umm I like group work (.) but (.) only during the lessons I
164      don't group works umm group work er umm team work after
```

```
165      classes because it's it's very hard it's hard to organise our
166      ourselves and=
167  N:  =yeah=
168  M:  =sometimes it really doesn't work =
169  N:  =right if you asked to do a presentation =
170  M:  =yes=
171  N:  =as a group do you find that difficult=
172  M:  =yes=
173  N:  =but in the [cla]ss
174  M:              [because] yes in in the class it's alright i-it's
175      really nice but after class there are umm always problems yeah
176      to me and organize our time and=
177  N:  =yes yeah and you Xin do you like group work or pair work?
178  X:  exactly the same as Margaret I LIKE group work in the lesson
179      but you know after lesson for example we are going to do the
180      presentation and you will find the group work sometimes you
181      can't communication with your (.) team
182  N:  yeah
183  X:  yeah I though some group they have the problem they can't
184      communication you know this thing this people is=
185  N:  =yeah=
186  X:  =is really difficult to (.) to communicate (.) you can't just
187      er (.) think about yourself you have to with your group and
188      it's really hard
189  N:  so organizing =
190  X:  =yeah =
191  N:  =everybody is very difficult for you=
192  X:  yeah yes
193  N:  but in the CLASS you like pair work and group work?
194  X:  yeah yeah
195  N:  yes? do you like err discussions?
196  M:  yes
197  N:  what sort of discussions do you like? to listen or talk
198      about
199  M:  about everything=
200  N:  =everything =
201  M:  =right=
202  N:  =curren-current affair =
203  M:  =yes everything=
204  N:  =right do you like err reading articles and then discussing=
205  M:  =yeah as well [emm]
206  N:                [emm] do you like cultural activities?
207      around cultural things in in er Britain?
```

```
208   X: umm like gallery?=
209   N: =yes yeah=
210   M: =well oh actually last time we went to museum=
211   X: =yeah=
212   M: =and it's I don't like museums (laugh) but it was really nice
213      (laugh)
214   N: which one did you go to?
215   M: umm wha-what is the name?
216   X: er castle museum=
217   M: yeah castle museum (laugh)
218   X: I think you should go into the theatre in London really nice
219      museum you'll like
220   M: really okay
221   N: IT IS yeah yeah so you like you like sort of you go out and do
222      class activities [out]side
223   M:                   [yeah yeah] it's really interesting
224   N: do you like umm surveys? have you done the [sur]vey?
225   M:                                            [surveys] like err
226      questionnaires or something?
227   N: yeah=
228   M: =yeah I don't mind
229   N: have you done those in your class work yet? asking?
230   M: err we have one for British cultu[re] about prejudices
231   X:                                  [yeah]
232   M: so we have we have to ask different people but only English
233      people about er prejudices
234   X: I don't like that because you have to chat with strangers(.h)
235      I don't like(h.)=
236   N: =no=
237   X: =that because you just ask can I have er can I ask a couple of
238      er questions =
239   M: =er um yeah=
240   X: =I think really strange
241   N: yes okay=
242   M: yeah just mu- yeah=
243   X: =and I met some people just leave yours we don't mind =
244   N: =yeah okay =
245   X: =they don't want to say=
246   N: =yeah okay they don't want to take part (.h) okay er umm so
247      you are happy to have discussions you like working in groups
248      you like reading about life issues (.) and global issues
249   M: yes=
250   X: yes=
```

```
251  N:  =yeah do you like err what are the lan- what sort that you
252      tell me the sort of things you have in your in your classroom
253      activities (.) do you have films or=
254  M:  =yeah films and (.)or (.) what else
255  X:  umm=
256  M:  =sometimes you watch films and what else?
257  X:  what's ummm I think it's like a lecture you wa-watching about
258      what was it called it about? ta-talk about global warming=
259  M:  =yeah [yes]=
260  N:        [umm]=
261  X:  =it's like a lecture
262  N:  umm umm
263  M:  yes for example we watched a film about global warming and and
264      then we we have to write about it and then we have to take
265      part in discussion
266  N:  umm yes yeah (.h)=
267  M:  =and lecture to ourselves (laugh)=
268  N:  =yeah=
269  M:  our opinions=
270  N:  =yeah yes okay are and is there anything that you would like
271      on your course that doesn't happen now? Magda first
272  M:  en yes I remember we just spoke about it er yeah we would like
273      to be er corrected?
274  N:  umm
275  M:  =yes because sometimes when I saying something I don't know if
276      I am saying it properly if it's i-if I'm using the right
277      grammar and yes, and I would like to be corrected
278  N:  =right and this start when you're speaking? as well as when
279      you are [writ  ]ing
280  M:          [every-]yes speaking writing (.) yes listening oh well
281      listening yes speaking and writing [yes]
282  N:                                     [yes]=
283  M:  because then I can I can have a look and then I can remember
284      it °remember it° yeah and improve umm my =
285  N:  =yes yeah=
286  M:  =language =
287  N:  =and do you think Xin it's about the same for you?
288  X:  yeah I think because I think Chinese people are quite shy we
289      we always er worry about mistakes so we don't like speaking=
290  N:  =umm=
291  X:  =most of Chinese people their English improve quite s-slowly
292      because we just think about if I'm right? or not so we always
293      think about that people don't like speaking something because
```

```
294        we worry about the grammar is wrong [pe]ople will laughing us
295   N:                                       [right]        [okay]
296   M:                                                      [yeah] but I
297        used to have have this feeling as well but now I'm thinking
298        well that's why I'm HERE [you know]
299   X:                            [umm me too]
300   M: you know [when I came to I went to England] to yeah to improve
301   N:           [yes you have to speak]
302   M: my English so I need to(.) speak to be corrected some to
303        improve that
304   X: I remember my my first year I never speak I always think if I
305        I say wrong way=
306   M: =yeah=
307   X: =people will laughing me (laugh)=
308   N: =oh, okay they wouldn't (laugh) they wouldn't they they make
309        allowances they they appreciate that they would respect that
310        you two speak er as native person speak (.h) umm so what do
311        you think Magda first that make a good language learner?
312        what what do you think make someone really (.) umm=
313   M: =a goo-a good learner=
314   N: =umm=
315   M: =learner=
316   N: =ummm=
317   M: =umm I think the best way is to err spend time with with er
318        not only English people native speakers but w-w-w-just use
319        this language with with un-un oh my god un -to speak er to use
320        this language with international students as well because er
321        you can improve it you can learn from them  a lot as well and
322        err you need to read a lot=
323   N: =umm=
324   M: =write or just practice =
325   N: =°right°=
326   M: =even watching TV listening music everything will help you to
327        improve it improve your your speaking and
328   N: right,ummm=
329   M: =understanding
330   N: ummm and you Xin what do you [th-]
331   X:                              [I think] errr reading is
332        important what I always do (.) just listen and repeat and we
333        have the reading time I always keep repeating just to read
334        and say again again again try my best to remember the word =
335   N: =yes=
336   X: =and I think the vocabulary you can guess through the
```

337   sentences er someone you can't understand you guess and in the
338   sentences you will know what's this word you can learn the new
339   vocabularies (.) you don't have to just remember all the
340   vocabulary first and then reading=
341 N: =um so you think vocabulary learning is an important aspect of
342   increasing the knowledge you think you can build up
343   understanding=
344 M: =yeah=
345 X: =yeah=
346 N: =and if you have a wide vocabulary
347 M: yeah bu- yes, but you need grammar as well=
348 N: =yes yes to actually (.) [put] the words together
349 M: [yes yes]
350 X: yes sometimes I find a the sentence I understand every word
351   but I don't know what's the exactly meaning
352 M: yeah, sometimes to like do you call it you read from the
353   context? like=
354 N: =yes=
355 M: =if you read it and translate exactly you will not understand
356   [it]
357 M: [be]cause you well oh yeah=
358 X: well I always think about my own language=
359 M: =yeah yeah translating into [your own language]=
360 X: =yeah   [translating]
361 M: and then it doesn't work
362 X: =well actually our grammar is exactly opposite way as English
363   so I always get a wrong er a wrong place er of the word for
364   example we er say that I like something very much but in
365   Chinese the very much in the first place [in the]=
366 M: =oh yes,like   [like] very much I
367   like some=
368 X: =yeah=
369 M: =opposi-[opposite] =
370 N: [yes]=
371 X: =so I always translate and end going on the opposite way=
372 N: [yes]
373 M: [but a]ctually in my language I would say er in er in a in a
374   different way I would say er very much I like it
375 X: No we say I very much like it (laugh)
376 N: =oh, okay
377 M: [yeah] that's it's completely different that I have never
378 N: [yeah]
379 M: thought about it actually

```
380  N:  yeah so do you think umm your own mother tongue does
381      influence (.) your(.) learning of English? I think you said
382  X:  in you would translate back into Chinese then
383  X:  yeah it's only have the Chinglish=
384  N:  (laugh) Chinglish=
```

Interview 12: Ann = UK student, Stefano = International student

Time: 00.00 - 01:34 of 12:39

24 lines

```
01  A: (cough) ok here are the questions hopefully (.) so (.) urm
02     what topics have you already covered in your lessons what kind
03     of THINGS have you done (.) can you remember (laughing)
04  S: I (.)(.h .h) (laughing) er well (.) that's a kind of hard
05     question really.   HAHA [HAHA     ]
06  A:                         [oh is it?]=
07  S: =no I'm joking. But is like we've covered (.) err. do you mean
08     in communication skills or (.) [any area
09  A:                                [yeh kind of ha-have you had
10     like (.) looked at transport or birthdays or what kind of
11     things have you talked about?
12  S: well urm for example language and culture we talked about
13     err things about England er well mainly about the UK (.)
14     things like er the culture=
15  A: =oh
16  S: main habits er er the history ge- er geography things like
17     that er communication skills we talked basically about
18     communication and skills=
19  A: =oh
20  S: er we talk about things like er body language err (.) how to
21     present a word er things like that and we got er (.) what do
22     you call it English as a language where we learn stuff like
23     grammar and things like that many [(XXX)
24  A:                                   [OK
```